

DIPLOMARBEIT

Titel der Diplomarbeit

TRANSATLANTIC RAPPROCHEMENT ?
The Politics of U.S.-German and U.S.-French Relations
after the Iraq War in 2003.

Verfasserin

Sophie Psihoda

angestrebter akademischer Grad

Magistra der Philosophie (Mag. phil.)

Wien, Oktober 2010

Studienkennzahl lt. Studienblatt: A 300

Studienrichtung lt. Studienblatt: Politikwissenschaft

Betreuer: Univ.-Doz. Dr. Paul Luif

Contents

CONTENTS	III
TABLES	IV
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	V
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	VII
<u>I. INTRODUCTION</u>	<u>1</u>
Purpose and Framework	1
Research Questions and Theses	3
Methodology	5
Structure of the Thesis	6
<u>II. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND</u>	<u>7</u>
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS THEORIES	7
1. REALISM AND NEOREALISM	7
2. LIBERALISM AND NEOLIBERALISM	11
3. CONSTRUCTIVISM	18
4. NEOCONSERVATISM OR DEMOCRATIC REALISM	22
<u>III. ANALYSIS OF THE TRANSATLANTIC RELATIONS BY SCHOLARS</u>	<u>25</u>
1. ROBERT KAGAN: "POWER AND WEAKNESS"	25
2. STEPHANIE B. ANDERSON: <i>CRAFTING EU SECURITY POLICY</i>	28
<u>IV. THE TRANSATLANTIC RELATIONS FROM 2001-2008</u>	<u>32</u>
1. THE TRANSATLANTIC SPLIT: GEORGE W. BUSH'S FIRST TERM	32
1.1. THE FOREIGN POLICY OF THE BUSH ADMINISTRATION IN ITS FIRST TERM	33
Neoconservatism as the Ideological Basis	34
President George W. Bush's Personality	35
The Decision-Making Unit (DMU)	36
The September 11 Terrorist Attacks and the Unipolar Supremacy of the U.S.	38
1.2. 9/11 AND THE WAR IN AFGHANISTAN	40
European Solidarity with the U.S.	40
The Architecture of the International Engagement in Afghanistan	44
The Conduct of Operation Enduring Freedom	46
Recreating the State of Afghanistan	49
1.3. THE 2003 IRAQ CRISIS	51
The Issue of Iraq in the Bush Administrations	51
European Reactions: German-American Relations	53
European Reactions: French-American Relations	55
The Paris-Berlin-Moscow Axis	56
The struggle at the United Nations	57
The Conduct of Operation Iraqi Freedom	60
1.4. POSTWAR RECONCILIATION	62
German-American Reconciliation	63
French-American Reconciliation	64
Russia	65

2. TRANSATLANTIC RAPPROCHEMENT: GEORGE W. BUSH'S SECOND TERM	67
2.1. U.S. FOREIGN POLICY DURING THE BUSH ADMINISTRATION'S SECOND TERM	68
“Second Term Blues”	68
Changes in the Personnel.....	71
Changes in the Policies.....	74
Resume	75
2.2. DEVELOPMENTS IN AFGHANISTAN	76
The Rise of Insurgency Attacks in Afghanistan	76
ISAF's Expansion	77
U.S. and European Troop Deployments in Afghanistan.....	79
Cooperation between ISAF and OEF	83
ISAF's New Upper Command Structure under the Obama Administration.....	85
2.3. THE DETERIORATING SITUATION IN IRAQ	85
The Rise of Insurgency in Iraq.....	86
The Crumbling Coalition	88
2.4. REACHING OUT TO EUROPE	89
2.4.1. GERMAN-AMERICAN RAPPROCHEMENT	90
The Beginning of the Repair: Chancellor Gerhard Schröder	90
The Establishment of Good Personal Relations: Chancellor Angela Merkel	91
2.4.2. FRENCH-AMERICAN RAPPROCHEMENT	93
The Beginning of the Repair: President Jacques Chirac	93
Embracing the New French President Nicolas Sarkozy	95
V. CONCLUSION	100
Short-Term Effects, but No Long-Term Effects	100
Influencing Factors behind the Rapprochement	103
The Change of Leadership in Europe.....	107
The Transatlantic Military Cooperation in Iraq and Afghanistan	109
VI. PROSPECTS	111
Prospects for the Transatlantic Relations during the Obama Presidency.....	111
Prospect for the Wider Context of the Transatlantic Relations	114
VII. BIBLIOGRAPHY	117
Books and Journals	117
Government and Other Official Documents.....	125
Webpages.....	127
VIII. APPENDIX	131
A. INTERVIEWS	131
B. ABSTRACT	216
C. DEUTSCHE ZUSAMMENFASSUNG	217
D. CURRICULUM VITAE	219

Tables

TABLE 1: TROOP DEPLOYMENTS IN AFGHANISTAN, TOTAL NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES	82
--	----

List of Abbreviations

ABM Treaty	Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty
AEI	American Enterprise Institute
CIA	Central Intelligence Agency
COMISAF	Commander ISAF
CTBT	Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty
DoD	Department of Defense
DoS	Department of State
DMU	Decision-Making Unit
ESDP	European Security and Defense Policy
ESS	European Security Strategy
EU	European Union
GDR	German Democratic Republic
GWOT	Global War on Terror
ICC	International Criminal Court
IR	International Relations (academic discipline)
ISAF	International Security Assistance Force
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NSC	National Security Council
NSS	National Security Strategy
OEF	Operation Enduring Freedom
OEF-HOA	Operation Enduring Freedom – Horn of Africa
p. i.	personal interview
PNAC	Project for the New American Century
PRT	Provincial Reconstruction Team
UN	United Nations
UNSCR	United Nations Security Council Resolution
UK	United Kingdom
U.S.	United States
WMD	Weapons of Mass Destruction

Acknowledgments

This thesis grew out of personal interest that I developed during my term abroad at Georgetown University in Washington, D.C., for which I am very grateful for having had the opportunity to study. During my eight months stay in the United States my interest in American politics grew stronger. Together with my background in European politics my awareness for U.S. politics developed into the research topic of this thesis, the transatlantic relations between Europe and the United States.

At this point I would like to thank Dr. Paul Luif, my thesis supervisor, without his distinguished support this thesis could not have been written. He not only helped me to get into contact with U.S. scholars at Washington based think tanks but also gave helpful advice on my questions and patiently supported me at different stages of the research process of this study. I also want to thank my interview partners Jeremy Shapiro, M.A., Justin Vaisse, Ph.D., Daniel Hamilton, Ph.D., Dr. Karen Donfried, and James Goldgeier, Ph.D., for their time, availability and willingness to give me extensive interviews. Further thanks go to Mag. Friedrich Dornhofer and Katharina Psihoda, M.A., who not only proofread this thesis several times but also made valuable suggestions, which helped to make this thesis more coherent and comprehensible.

However, I do not only owe debt for the intellectual help but also for the various supports that I received from my family and friends throughout my studies and the writing of this thesis. In particular, I want to thank my parents who have supported me throughout my studies in many ways, which enabled me to always go after my aspirations and realize my projects. Moreover, I want to thank my sister who I not only owe a lot of suggestions and advice on this thesis but who also supported me throughout my studies with her academic experience gained at English universities. I also want to thank my *big brother*, Tope Aloba, for the inspirational discussions that we had on this thesis and the motivation that I received through our talks. Last but not least thanks go to all my friends, who

have accompanied me for many years during my academic education, for their motivation and their open ears.

This thesis has been written in American English, which is not my native language. Hence, the text could never be as flawless as the publication of an author whose mother tongue is English. Errors in the text are strictly my responsibility.

I. INTRODUCTION

Since the end of the Cold War the transatlantic relations have continuously been an issue of academic debate. Whereas, during the Cold War, the Soviet Union as the common enemy united Europe and the U.S., which led to close cooperation, the implosion of the communist regime put an end to the original purpose of the military alliance between Europe and the U.S., the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). This had an effect not only on the transatlantic cooperation in the fields of military, foreign and security policy but also affected the transatlantic relations in general. During the 1990s the U.S. and its European allies were occupied with the search for a new framework and purpose of the transatlantic cooperation. The perception that Europe and the U.S. were more and more parting ways was widespread. Differences between the two allies that seemed to have been concealed by the Cold War came to the surface and have been emphasized by government officials on both sides and exaggerated by the media. The climax of Europe's estrangement from the U.S. became obvious in 2003 when the dispute over whether the Iraq invasion by the Americans and British was justified or not resulted in a deep and troubling crisis of the transatlantic relations. For several months the media attention as well as academic discussions were focused on the U.S.-European relations. Books and articles telling about an unbridgeable gap in values as well as strategic and cultural differences made for good reading. Some authors even proclaimed the end of the West. However, when the U.S. announced the end of the combat operations in Iraq and the transatlantic relationship seemed to be in a deadlock situation as the fronts were frozen, public and academic attention shifted to other topics. Publishing about the transatlantic relations between Europe and the U.S. seemed to have been halted by then.

Purpose and Framework

This thesis has been written for the purpose of making a contribution to the academic discussion of the transatlantic relations between Europe and the U.S. with the particular focus on the U.S.-German and U.S.-French relationships after

the 2003 Iraq crisis. In contrast to many publications arguing for an estrangement between Europe and the U.S. or even portraying the end of the transatlantic relations, this thesis argues for a rapprochement that started in with the beginning of the second term of the George W. Bush administration, as a result of the 2003 Iraq crisis.

The timeline for the investigation has been set from the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001 to the end of the George W. Bush administration in 2008. The years preceding the 2003 Iraq crisis must be taken into account. As in order to be able to analyze the effects of the crisis on the transatlantic relations in the years after 2003, it is indispensable to analyze how the disagreements manifested. In the prospects the timeline will be extended until January 2010, thus including the first year of the Barack Obama administration into the analysis. The focus on the two European countries, Germany and France, is reasoned by at least two considerations. Firstly and foremost, these two countries were the ones most involved in the transatlantic split over the Iraq invasion. Secondly, Germany and France are two of the most influential countries in Europe and, together with the United Kingdom, part of the so-called EU-3. Hence, they influence the transatlantic relations between the U.S. and Europe, in particular Western Europe, to a higher degree than other countries. The role that other Western European and Eastern European countries or Russia played in the dispute over the Iraq invasion in 2003 as well as the way in which they influenced the transatlantic relationship during that period of time and afterwards will be only very peripherally addressed. There is considerable literature about the crisis surrounding the Iraq War in 2003 and the share that each Western or Eastern European country played in it. Moreover, the U.S.-Russian relations are a topic of their own that should not be mixed with the transatlantic relationship and therefore goes beyond the focus of this thesis.

Furthermore, when talking about German-American and French-American relations¹, some limitations to the agenda need to be set. As the economic

¹ Throughout this thesis the terms 'German-American' and 'U.S.-German' as well as the terms 'French-American' and 'U.S.-French' are synonymously used and refer to the relations between the United States and Germany and respectively the United States and France.

relations between the U.S. and Germany and the U.S. and France and their relations in the fields of science, technology or even intelligence cooperation remained unaffected by the Iraq crisis, these fields of cooperation will not be investigated in this study. Instead it will focus on the field of foreign and security policy in relation to the events in Afghanistan and Iraq. It aims to analyze which impact the Iraq War had on U.S.-German and U.S-French foreign and security policy relations with the main focus of attention being on the foreign policy relations. Thus, diplomatic exchanges and the roles that the heads of government played will be the center of attention. Moreover, the analysis will be supported by facts about coalition efforts in Afghanistan and Iraq, including troop deployment numbers as well as mission and operation extensions.

Research Questions and Theses

The overarching research question of the study is as follows:

Analyzing the recent events in Iraq and Afghanistan, what impact did the disagreement over the Iraq War have on the transatlantic relations between the United States and Germany on the one hand and France on the other hand in the years between 2003 and 2008?

The thesis answering this question, which is the initial point of analysis and research of this study and source for further sub-questions and sub-theses, is as follows:

The 2003 Iraq crisis had short-term effects on the German-American and French-American relations resulting in a deep rift between these allies. However, there has not been any serious rupture as the relations between these strategic allies are too important to allow for any long-term effects. As a consequence, after a period of cool-down in their relations, a period of rapprochement beginning with the second term of the George W. Bush administration set in.

There are several sub-questions (SQ) and sub-theses (ST), which have further guided the research:

SQ 1: *Which factors influenced the rapprochement in the U.S.-German and U.S.-French relations?*

ST 1: There were external as well as domestic factors influencing the rapprochement of the German-American and French-American relations. Among the external factors were the events occurring on the grounds in the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, the overstretched U.S. military as a result of fighting two wars simultaneously, and developments in coalition efforts of the missions on the spot in Iraq and Afghanistan. Among the domestic factors there were the personalities in office as heads of governments and of important government positions, the political arrangements of the governments, and the approach to foreign and security policy by the administrations and governments. It is further argued that domestic politics in Germany, France, and the U.S. had considerably affected their foreign policies as well as their mutual relations.

SQ 2: *What role did the personalities in office as heads of government in Germany, France and the United States play in the 2003 Iraq crisis and the following rapprochement and what effect did the changes in leadership in Germany and France have on the rapprochement?*

ST 2: The personalities in office as heads of government in the years from 2001 to 2005 (Germany), 2007 (France) and 2008 (U.S.) played a significant role in the dispute over the Iraq invasion and consequently also in the following period of rapprochement. This, in particular, was the case because the relationships between these political leaders were based on good personal relations.

It is assumed that the changes in leadership in Germany and France mattered quite a lot in regard to the rapprochement pursued by the U.S. and its allies. However, this was more the case for Germany than for France. While German Chancellor Angela Merkel and President George W. Bush spent three and a half years together in office, French President Nicolas Sarkozy and the American President did so for only one and a half year.

SQ 3: *What effects did the 2003 Iraq crisis have on the military cooperation between the United States and its European allies in Afghanistan and Iraq?*

ST 3: The split between the U.S. and some Western European countries in 2003 had a negative impact on the coalition efforts in Iraq and affected those in Afghanistan positively. In Iraq, the crisis resulted in the refusal of Germany and France and some smaller European countries to participate in military engagement. The Iraq War, for the most part, remained a taboo topic for military cooperation in the relations between Germany and the U.S. and France and the U.S. It can further be assumed that the rapprochement in the diplomatic relations also had its effects on the coalition efforts on the battleground of Afghanistan resulting in closer cooperation between the U.S. and European troops.

Methodology

The research process has followed three stages with different methods applied. At the first stage exploratory expert interviews with scholars at Washington based think tanks were conducted in the summer of 2009. The purpose of these interviews was to gather ideas and to develop a research agenda, research questions, and research theses. However, the interviews were also particularly valuable since they offered insights and interrelations impossible to comprise by only referring to the available literature. In addition, they offered a good way of obtaining newsworthy information as, due to the topicality, it was not easy to find up-to-date literature. Since the thesis in large part is written from the perspective of the United States, it was particularly important to conduct interviews with American experts in the fields of U.S. foreign and security policy and transatlantic relations between Europe and the U.S. At the second stage, after the main research questions and theses had been generated, an extensive literature review including speeches by political leaders, transcripts of press conferences, news articles and online news, and statements of diplomatic exchanges was carried out. At a third stage, the findings relevant for addressing the research questions and theses were comprised and interpreted. Applying the hermeneutical approach the meanings of the texts were interpreted through continual references to their context.

Structure of the Thesis

The thesis consists of six main chapters. The introduction presents the research agenda and purpose as well as the research questions and theses and the relevant methodology. The second chapter gives the necessary theoretical background about International Relations theories essential in order to analyze bilateral as well as multilateral relations between countries. The third chapter discusses the analyses of two scholars of the transatlantic relations between Europe and the U.S. in the years after 9/11. Each scholar follows a certain school of International Relations theories in his/her analysis. The fourth chapter unfolds the main part of the study. In this chapter the analysis of the transatlantic relations in the years from 2001 to 2008 is carried out. Following a chronological order it is divided into two larger sections, the first George W. Bush administration and the second George W. Bush administration. In each of the two parts the constellation of the Bush administration and its approach to foreign policy, the events and developments in Iraq and Afghanistan, and the bilateral relations between the U.S. and Germany and the U.S. and France are analyzed. The fifth chapter summarizes and interprets the results of the analysis of the preceding chapter and addresses the research questions and theses of the first chapter. The last chapter gives some prospects in regards to the transatlantic relations under U.S. President Barack Obama and the changes that occurred from the Bush administration to the Obama administration. Furthermore, by putting the crisis of 2003 and the ensuing rapprochement into the larger context of the evolution of the transatlantic relations since the end of the Second World War some prospects about the future of the transatlantic partnership in the coming years of the 21st century are anticipated.

II. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

International Relations Theories

The following pages are meant to present an overview of International Relations theories, including the two traditional theories *realism* and *liberalism* and their continuations in the form of *neorealism* and *neoliberalism*. Furthermore, *constructivism* will be discussed taking into account the discussion whether it is an approach to social sciences or a substantive theory of international relations. Finally, the doctrine of *neoconservatism* will be presented briefly. Considering the fact that neoconservatism is not a theory of international relations as it lacks the requirements that would establish neoconservatism as a theory; it is well worth being outlined in brief as it will be essential in order to address the research question.

1. Realism and Neorealism

It has often been asserted that realism dates back to the writings of the fifth-century (B.C.) Greek historian Thucydides about the Peloponnesian War between Athens and Sparta (see Lebow, 2007; Elman, 2007). In those days, however, neither was International Relations established as an academic discipline, nor did realism exist as a coherent worldview. It was only Carr's publication of *The Twenty Years' Crisis*, published in 1939, which established the realist school of international relations theory. This happened as a reaction to the writings by liberals of the interwar period who, as some claimed, were strongly tending towards idealism. As a consequence, the '*first debate*' of International Relations theory, which was carried out "between idealists and realists before, during and immediately after the Second World War" (Kurki & Wight, 2007, 16) evolved. For twentieth-century classical realism, however, it is Morgenthau's publication *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*, going through six editions from 1948 to 1985, which is often claimed to be the standard

guide of reference to classical realism (Elman, 2007, 12). Morgenthau's writings reflect the central role of power in politics that is inherent in realist thought.

Mearsheimer (2007, 73ff) justifies the competition for power by five assumptions about the international system. First, great powers are established as the main actors in an international system that is characterized by anarchy. Second, each nation state possesses a specific amount of offensive military capabilities making all players on the world stage possible enemies. Third, in general there is no certainty concerning the intentions of their counterparts among the actors of international politics. Fourth, survival is the nation states' main goal. Fifth, the behavior of states is guided by rationality. Partly overlapping with Mearsheimer's five assumptions, Holsti (1995, 36f) identifies five core premises that all classical realists share. First, the "causes of war and the conditions of peace" (ibid., 36) constitute the central questions for classical realists. Second, according to the Hobbesian worldview, conflict or chaos, to use Hobbes' expression, is viewed to be the natural state of affairs. Third, to classical realists, reflecting "focus on geographically based groups" (ibid., 37), nation states are the principal actors and dominant units. Fourth, states behave in a rational manner. Fifth, nation states are unitary actors.

As a consequence of this particular architecture of international politics inherent in realist thought, nation states continuously seek to increase their material capabilities as their survival depends on them. Elman (2007, 12) states that the desire for power "is rooted in the flawed nature of humanity". Since the international system is characterized by anarchy, there is no higher authority that would restrain nation states from continuously seeking power. Thus, realists hold a pessimistic outlook for the world in general and for the possibilities of international cooperation in particular. Realists recognize the existence of multinational bodies though, but they disclaim that these bodies can influence the behavior of states. Furthermore, classical realists maintain that great powers are unable of exercising self-restraint. This often makes them "their own worst enemies" (Lebow, 2007, 68) as the unchecked search for power often results in conflict.

The concept of the *balance of power* is very essential in the realist school of international relations theory. In order to balance other states' power, alliances are agreed. Sometimes, however, alliances are also built in order to increase the power of one nation state or 'bloc' of nation states. Thucydides, however, views them as "double-edged swords; they are as likely to provoke as to prevent conflict" (Lebow, 2007, 56). This is due to the fact that it is impossible to assess the capabilities and motives of other states. The distinction between offensive and defensive weapons, as some assert to exist, is difficult to maintain. This is because the strategy to accumulate weapons at the border to a neighboring state pursued by a defensive state could be regarded as defensive but also as the preparation of an attack. Hence, the realist assessment is that only a strong community, which states and their rulers feel attached to by common culture, conventions or personal ties, can restrain the competition for power (Lebow, 2007, 58).

Structural realism or neorealism, as it is also called, began to replace classical realism in the late 1980s when Kenneth Waltz first published his book *Theory of International Politics* in 1979. According to Waltz, the international system is defined by a structure and its interacting units (Elman, 2007, 13). The structure of the international system is defined by two elements, "first, by the ordering principle of the system, in our case anarchy, and second, by the distribution of capabilities across units" (Waltz, 1995, 74). The distribution of capabilities defines how many poles exist in the international system. There can be one (unipolarity), two (bipolarity), or three or more (multipolarity). Thus, structural realists differ from classical realists, who analyze international relations from the state level of analysis, by analyzing international relations from the systemic level of analysis. Nevertheless, like classical realism, structural realism is also based on power politics and the concept of the balance of power. However, whereas classical realists worry about the relative gains of power in comparison to other states by itself, structural realists are concerned about relative gains of power in comparison to other states in order to keep the international system balanced. Consequently, the balance of power concept is even more important for structural realism.

Furthermore, neorealism emphasizes the structure of the international system. Nation states remain the principal actors on the world's stage in neorealist thought, though they become functionally alike units due to the constraints of the structure of the international system. Waltz argues against the classical realists' assumptions of leaders' motivations and state characteristics. Structural realists therefore differ from classical realists "on the source and content of states' preferences" (Elman, 2007, 13). In neorealist theory, states do not strive for power because of human nature, but owing to the structure or architecture of the international system. The survival of nation states is not defined by the individual state's capabilities, as assumed by classical realists, but by the structure of the international system. Thus, structural realists assume that nation states seek power as a means to an end and not as an end in itself, as assumed by classical realists.

The disagreement with the question of how much power a nation state should strive for led to a split into defensive and offensive neorealism. Defensive neorealists, such as Kenneth Waltz, argue for an "appropriate amount of power" (Waltz, 1979, 40, quoted in Mearsheimer, 2007, 75). Structural factors are expected to limit the amount of power a state can obtain. If some states tried to maximize their power, which, in the worst case, could eventually lead to overexpansion, other states would take balancing measures. The offence-defense balance is said to be usually in the defender's favor (Mearsheimer, 2007, 76). Offensive neorealists, like John Mearsheimer, on the contrary argue that structural factors encourage states to maximize their share of power. States are even expected to strive for hegemony, as it is the best guarantee for a state's survival. Balancing may occur but defensive neorealists argue that it is often inefficient as buck-passing² is frequently opted for by threatened states (ibid.). Whereas defensive neorealists perceive states more in terms of maintaining the status quo, offensive neorealists argue that states are aggressive and expansionist by nature (Chernoff, 2007, 51).

² Buck-passing occurs if a threatened state decides not to act against the aggressor but to let somebody else 'do the work'.

The realist school of international relations theory has been criticized by its challengers in several ways. Realism accounts for merely a poor predictive and descriptive power and its prescribing policy has been questioned. Besides, realism fails to meaningfully address the new issues, cleavages and actors on today's global agenda, such as the transnational interdependence, transnational networks or nonstate actors (Kegley, 1995, 6f). The last critique in particular led to a decreased interest in the realist thought in the 1970s when the focus shifted from nation states to these new issues and actors. Structural realism managed to revive the realist school of international relations theory when the pendulum swung against it then. International events in the last decade of the 20th century, however, with an even increased degree than in the 1970s, further led to realism's decline. In particular, the peaceful and surprising end of the Cold War simultaneous with the voluntary dissolution of the Soviet Union and the wave of democratization throughout East Europe as well as the continuation of European integration in Western Europe in the absence of the Cold War challenged the theories and the assumptions of the realist and neorealist school of International Relations theory (Jervis, 2002, quoted in Elman, 2007, 14). In the wake of the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon on September 11, 2001, realist thought has again been revived since it is considered more capable of addressing threats to national security (Elman, 2007, 14f). Elman (ibid.), however, notices the irony that realism owes its comeback to transnational terrorist networks and religious extremism, both of which lie well outside the domain of realist thought.

2. Liberalism and Neoliberalism

The liberal school of International Relations theory is not as simple to conceptualize as is its counterpart, the realist school. Unlike publications by Morgenthau, Carr or Waltz, which incorporate the roots and the fundamental logic of realism and neorealism, "a systemic presentation of liberal international theory is not offered in any well-known texts" (Zacher & Matthew, 1995, 107). Even Doyle, an International Relations scholar often cited when referring to liberalism, highlights in one of his most famous texts *Liberalism and World Politics* that

“[t]here is no canonical description of liberalism” (Doyle, 1986, 1152). MacMillan therefore argues that “liberalism is better understood [...] as a cluster or matrix of underlying values, principles, and purposes that provide a guide and framework” (MacMillan, 2007, 21).

Liberalism has its roots in the liberal political theory, which developed in the seventeenth century. It is generally asserted that it was in the Enlightenment era when liberal thought emerged as a coherent worldview and was first transformed into a systematic statement after World War I by the proclamation of Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points (see Zacher et al., 1995; MacMillan, 2007). Hence, liberalism is the older school of international relations theory. Even though some scholars identify the writings of the Greek historian Thucydides as realist, realism did not exist as a coherent worldview until the 1930s. It was Carr's publication of *The 20 Year's Crisis* (1939), which established realism in response to the writings by liberals of the interwar period.

Since International Relations was only established as an academic discipline at the beginning of the twentieth century, the major contributors to liberal theory were “political philosophers, political economists, and people generally interested in international affairs” (Zacher et al., 1995, 108). Consequently, in his effort to conceptualize liberalism, Doyle discusses the writings of three political philosophers who have been regarded as major exponents of liberal International Relations theory to this day. In his text *Liberalism and World Politics* Doyle distinguishes between Schumpeter's liberal pacifism, Machiavelli's liberal imperialism, and Kant's liberal internationalism.

Schumpeter's liberal pacifism is based on the interaction of capitalism and democracy. In his *Sociology of Imperialism*, which was published in 1919, he argues that if free trade is established, war becomes unnecessary since “[f]oreign raw materials and food stuffs are as accessible to each nation as though they were in its own territory” (Schumpeter, 1955, 75f, quoted in Doyle, 1986, 1153). In addition, Schumpeter makes a compelling argument in favor of liberal institutions and principles and their pacifying effects (Doyle, 1986, 1152). By contrast, Machiavelli considers that imperial expansion as the best guarantee of a state's

survival. According to his liberal imperialism, free republics represent the best form of government to pursue imperial expansion, which is why they are not pacifistic [sic] (ibid., 1153). Kant's liberal internationalism is based on his work on *Perpetual Peace*, written in 1795, in which he presents three *Definitive Articles* for peace. They, however, do not cease war, but only “introduce republican caution” (ibid., 1160) as liberal states will still go to war. If they do though, it is rarely with other liberal states but more commonly with nonliberal states.

While some arguments of all three approaches of liberalism have survived in modern twentieth-century liberalism, it is the Kantian theory that has found most resonance. According to Doyle (1986, 1155ff), modern liberal international theory is defined by two *legacies*. The *first legacy* is the “pacification of foreign relations among liberal states” (ibid., 1155f), which establishes a “zone of peace” resonating Kant's *Third Definitive Article*, in which he calls for a “pacific federation” or “pacific union” (ibid., 1156). Thus, a separate peace exists among liberal states because the peaceful restraint exercised by liberal states only seems to work among themselves and not with states governed by different civil constitutions. This is what Hume called international “imprudence” (Hume, 1963, 346f, quoted in Doyle, 1986, 1156) and is carried by the *second legacy*.

Even though one has to refer to several authors to present an overview of contemporary international liberalism, Zacher et al. (1995) identify three central theses out of the multitude of texts associated with liberal thought.

1. The first thesis concerns international liberals' belief in a transformation of international relations, which evolves gradually and irregularly along different paths with the objective to promote greater human freedom. This goal is to be achieved by establishing peace, prosperity and justice. International liberals, however, do not believe that this evolution of international relations is teleological. Thus, they do not predict a particular final state in which perfect human freedom would be realized (Zacher et al., 1995, 109).

2. The second thesis concerns the assumption that evolution of international relations and the establishment of “peace, welfare, and justice are realized significantly through *international cooperation*” (ibid., 117). This “can include an acceptance of moral norms, adherence to international law, or collaboration through international organizations” (ibid.).
3. The third thesis is constituted by the means that drive international cooperation. These are interdependent forces which are viewed “as aspects of *the process of modernization*” (ibid.). The five key components of the modernization process are “liberal democracy or republican government; international interdependence; cognitive progress; international sociological integration; and international institutions” (ibid., 110). These five components, however, were not considered as core elements by all pre-World War II liberal writers, which again shows the incoherence intrinsic to liberal thought. Yet, it can be said that “liberal democracy, a growth in economic transactions and interdependence, and the expansion in humankind's knowledge and reasoning capacities” (ibid., 118) were present in the thought of nearly all adherents of liberal international theory from the 18th to the mid-20th century.

Zacher et al. further identify some general assumptions that most proponents of liberal international theory would share. First, individual human beings constitute the primary international actors. States are regarded as the most important collective actors, yet they are viewed as pluralistic actors. Second, the interests of states are multiple and changing. Third, these state interests as well as individual human interests are shaped by domestic and international conditions. Fourth, there is a belief in a growing influence of patterns of interest on international outcomes compared to the impact of coercion. In particular, cooperation does not necessitate a hegemonic power in order to be successful, rather international regimes can be sustained by mutual interests (ibid., 118).

According to the above presented theses and assumptions, a number of differences between liberal internationalism and realism can be identified. The

following summary of aspects of correspondence and divergence is drawn from Chernoff (2007, 60-64). First and foremost, adherents of liberal internationalism reject the negative worldview that realists have, especially concerning international cooperation. Realists believe that international forums for cooperation are established by great powers in order to deliver their interests. For them, the achieved international outcomes are the same with or without international organizations. Liberal theories in general share a positive and optimistic worldview about the possibilities of international cooperation and believe that institutions strongly influence the patterns of international cooperation. In international organizations or institutions they see a way to overcome the conflict-promoting effects of anarchy, which characterizes the international system. Another aspect of divergence is the states' pursuit of self-interest. Although liberals agree with realists that states seek their own self-interest in a rational manner, they disagree with the realists' definition of self-interest in terms of zero-sum games. Whereas realists following a zero-sum framework look primarily at relative gains, liberals argue that states consider absolute gains when evaluating their options. Moreover, in contrast to realists, liberals argue that some governments look for private self-interest instead of pursuing the collective interest of a state. Furthermore, liberals and realists differ on the status of units of analysis. For realists all units of analysis are alike. Conversely, liberals believe that there are different units of analysis. There is the individual level, the state level, the systemic level of analysis and some liberal theories even include nonstate actors. For liberals there are also particular types of states that pursue different foreign policies, an argument generally denied by realists. Moreover, adherents of a relatively new strand of liberal thinking, the neoliberalism, believe that a system will behave differently depending on the types of regimes that operate within the system. After all, there are two points of agreement between realists and liberals as well. These are the belief in fixed preferences and identities of states and the assumption that states behave rationally.

When the realist school of international relations theory was born in a reaction to and criticism of the liberal writings, some of the interwar period liberals became equated with idealists. Although "[i]dealism has a great deal of overlap

with liberalism” (Chernoff, 2007, 64), it is, however, important to note that there are three differences by which idealists should be clearly distinguished from liberals. First, idealism maintains a moral component that liberalism denies. Idealists believe that human beings have moral obligations, which make a person in a position of leadership act morally. In contrast, liberals justify the actions of a person in a position of leadership by reasoning that it is the long-term self-interest of a state (ibid.). Second, as a consequence, idealists almost exclusively operate on the individual level of analysis since it is impossible to argue that states, bureaucracies or systems act morally. Third, whereas both liberals and realists take “material means-ends considerations” into account, idealists argue “that states sometimes follow a value-laden ideology” (ibid., 65).

In the postwar period of the twentieth century liberal international theory developed into six different strands: republican liberalism; commercial liberalism and military liberalism, which both fall into interdependence liberalism; cognitive liberalism; sociological liberalism; and institutional liberalism. Of those six strands republican liberalism, commercial liberalism, and institutional liberalism “can be regarded as the backbone of a traditional liberal understanding of progress in international relations” (Zacher et al., 1995, 139). Especially institutional liberalism has attracted more attention when it developed in the 1980s and later on when it evolved into a new strand of liberal thinking called 'neoliberalism'. Before going into greater detail about liberal institutionalism and neoliberalism, however, two interrelated criticisms directed at liberal international theory should be considered. First, it has been criticized for its general assumptions and its complex causal processes. Both are supposed to hinder providing “a good understanding of international relations or a clear research agenda” (ibid.). Second, liberal international theory has been criticized for its inability to stand on its own. In order to present a complete understanding of international politics, it has to be supplemented with other theories (ibid.).

According to Grieco (1995, 151), liberal institutionalism has been the major challenge to the realist thought of international relations. Adherents of liberal institutionalism consider the body of international institutions not only as a dependent variable. They also see it as an independent variable, which strongly

influences prospects for further cooperation. International institutions can be transnational value or belief systems, substantive regimes, or international organizations (Zacher et al., 1995, 133). Liberal institutionalists seek in their various forms of theoretical conceptions to rebut the realist understanding of international politics. They reject the realist proposition that states are the central actors in international politics and instead see new key actors in international agencies, labor unions, political parties, multinational corporations, or transnational coalitions. In addition, they also reject the realist assumption that states are unitary or rational actors. Furthermore, liberal institutionalists argue that power and security were becoming less important for states, which view other states increasingly as partners and not as enemies. Of course, they also reject the pessimism that realists maintain concerning the capabilities of international institutions (Grieco, 1995, 153ff).

Neoliberalism, which was established in the 1980s, differs from prior liberal institutional thought in some respects. It accepts that states are the central actors in international politics and agrees with realists insofar as states are unitary-rational agents. However, neoliberals strongly differ with realists on the potential for international cooperation. They argue that “countervailing forces [...] that cause states to keep their promises” (ibid., 156) in international arrangements do exist. Neoliberal theory sees two ways in order to “manage verification and sanctioning problems” (ibid., 158). One way is to limit the number of partners in international arrangements. It is, however, of greater importance to neoliberals to establish international institutions since they “reduce the verification costs, create iterativeness, and make it easier to punish cheaters” (ibid., 158). Additionally, they argue for cooperation on a conditional basis in order to resolve the problem of cheating. Realists have accused neoliberals for their exclusive focus on the problem of cheating because they see the problem of relative gains as a worse hindrance to international cooperation. Since neoliberals, however, define states as atomistic actors which lay out their interests individually, they do not see the problem of relative gains among states. This divergence in their views of the problem of cooperation is due to different interpretations of the meaning of anarchy by realists and liberals in general. Whereas for liberals anarchy means

the “*lack of a central agency to enforce promises*”, for realists it means that “*there is no overarching authority to prevent others from using violence*” (ibid., 160).

3. Constructivism

The roots of Constructivism can be traced back to the ‘*third debate*’³, which was caused by the emergence of a reflectivist opposition to the positivist and rationalist approaches to the study of International Relations. Chernoff (2007; see Chapter 4) subsumes critical theory, poststructuralism and interpretive constructivism under the notion of reflective theories. In contrast, realist and liberal theories are referred to as rationalist theories. To put realism and liberalism with their almost contrary conceptions of the nature of the state and the condition of anarchy “under the common banner of rationalism is explicable only through reference to the fleeting convergence of traditions that accompanied the ‘neo’ ascendancy of the 1980s” (Phillips, 2007, 69).

The ‘*third debate*’, which some scholars have not attributed an ordinal number but instead just called the ‘*interparadigm debate*’ (see Kurki & Wight, 2007, 18f), was carried out between rationalists and scholars of the critical theory. It prevailed in the discussions of the discipline of International Relations in the 1980s. The critique of the mainstream International Relations theories by scholars of critical theory, however, coincided with the ascendancy of neorealism and neoliberalism. This led mainstream International Relations scholars to react in a rather imperturbable way to the critique by critical theorists. Moreover, the divide between rationalist and critical theorists was debilitated before it could manifest itself as the end of the Cold War revealed weaknesses on both sides. Thus, the end of the Cold War “served as an intellectual circuit breaker, exposing the limitation of existing approaches and providing an opening for the development of a more diverse range of explanations for the contemporary international phenomena” (Phillips, 2007, 62). It was the “more fluid disciplinary context of the immediate post-Cold War period” (ibid.) in that constructivism developed.

³ The ‘second debate’, carried out between traditionalists and behaviorists (Kurki & Wight, 2007, 17f), has not been mentioned because it is insignificant in the context of the thesis.

Whereas some refer to the “‘dialogue’ over constructivism” (Fierke, 2007, 168) as the *‘fourth debate’* in the discipline of International Relations, others see it tied to the interparadigm debate between rationalists and critical theorists and therefore refer to it as only the *‘third debate’* (Kurki & Wight, 2007, 19).

Chernoff (2007, 139f) identifies two important differences that distinguish reflectivist/interpretive theories from naturalist/rationalist theories. The first important difference lies in the distinct meanings of “causation” that rationalists and constructivist hold. For rationalists, one event *causes* another, which is perceived as the outcome of a first event. Both events can be analyzed independently of each other. The first event “brings about the occurrence of a separate and independent [second] event” (Chernoff, 2007, 139f). For reflectivists, however, one event *constitutes* another. The two events cannot be analyzed independently of but only in connection to each other. A causation does not exist because both events are interrelated to one another. They are *mutually constitutive* of each other, a term elaborated in greater detail below. The relationships that rationalists and reflectivists attribute to two events occurring consecutively are distinct because of their dissimilar understanding of structure.

The second important difference between rationalist and reflective theories concerns “reflexivity”. Chernoff (2007, 142) defines reflexivity as “the effects of theories on the behavior of leaders and states”. Scholars of reflective theories argue that international relations theories are reflexive in the way that they change the “subject matter they are studying by affecting the decisions leaders make” (ibid., 140f). As an example Chernoff mentions the actions that President Wilson took during and after the First World War. Influenced by the study of Kant's theory of a perpetual peace Wilson created the first real world institution, the League of Nations. Institutions then became a subject matter studied by international relations scholars resulting in the theory of liberal institutionalism. Rationalist theories lack this “reflexive effect” (ibid., 142) because they deny its existence.

Constructivism has introduced a social dimension into the analysis of international relations by stressing the significance of norms, rules, and language. Constructivists reject the rationalists’ perception of one single objective reality and

maintain that the actors' interests and identities are socially constructed. Thus, constructivism argues for a social ontology by emphasizing that objects cannot be analyzed separately from their normative meaning since the meaning shapes the objects' identities and possible ways of action. The notion 'ontology' "refers to the nature of being and focuses on the types of objects the world is composed of" (Fierke, 2007, 169). A popular example for illustration, often referred to in the literature, are chess pieces. In a chess game, the knight cannot be analyzed separately from its normative meaning, as it would then only be a piece of wood shaped differently from the other chess figures. The identity of the knight and the moves it can conduct can only be analyzed in connection with its normative meaning attributed by the rules of the game. In the context of a chess game, the knight is a social fact, which "exists because of the meaning and value attributed" (ibid., 171) to it, rather than a material fact reducing its meaning to a piece of wood or plastic. Constructivists argue that the majority of international relations are social facts established by human acts of construction. The example of the knight in a chess game can be applied to international institutions, sovereignties, states or many more objects of international relations. They are all social facts defined by their normative meaning attributed by human beings.

To emphasize again, constructivists maintain that the objects' identities are constituted by their "doing" (Chernoff, 2007, 144) and therefore are not fixed as assumed by rationalists. Referring again to the example of pieces in a chess game, the identity of a knight is constituted by its moves. If the rules of the chess game were altered in a way that the knight were to move like a pawn, the identity of the knight would change as well, rendering it less important. How states interact with other states in the international arena constitutes their identity. Identities and actions are constitutive of one another. However, this "constitutive nature [...] depends on the social structure" (ibid.), which leads to the next point of divergence between rationalists and constructivists.

Constructivists differ significantly from rationalists in their understanding of the relationship between agents and structures. According to rationalists, structures constrain an agent's actions. Within these constraints an agent pursues rational acts that are to produce a result. Thus, agents of rational theories are

guided by “logic of consequence” (Fierke, 2007, 170). According to constructivists, however, structures do not only constrain an agent's actions, but “they also constitute the identity of actors” (ibid.). A particular structure allows agents to carry out certain actions, which then constitute their identity. Agents of constructivist theories are guided by “logic of appropriateness” (ibid.). Thus, agents and structures are “mutually constituted” or “cogenerated” (Chernoff, 2007, 147). The term *mutually constitutive* is applied not only to the relationship between agents and structures. As demonstrated above, identities and actions are also mutually constitutive of each other, as are identities and interests. In all of these relationships “constructivists focus on the constitutive role of norms and shared understandings” (Fierke, 2007, 170).

Whereas the concept of ontology separates constructivists from rationalists, the interpretation of epistemology splits constructivists among themselves. Epistemology “deals with the origin and nature of knowledge” (Fierke, 2007, 172). Some constructivists have adopted a positivist epistemology and thereby gained considerable legitimacy among their peer scholars of the positivist/rationalist camp. This first group of constructivists is called “conventional constructivists” (see Chernoff, 2007; Fierke, 2007) or “American constructivists” (see Chernoff, 2007). They are seen as inhabiting “a ‘middle ground’ between rationalist and poststructuralist approaches to IR” (Fierke, 2007, 172). Others have argued, though, that adopting a social ontology and a positivist epistemology is inconsistent and have adopted a social epistemology instead. This second group of constructivists is referred to as the “consistent” (see Fierke, 2007) or “interpretive” (see Chernoff, 2007) constructivists. The social or constructivist epistemology is “a product of the linguistic turn” (Fierke, 2007, 173f) and holds that the word or language used for an object is inseparable from itself and its meaning. Referring again to the knight in a chess game, the name of this particular chess piece is inseparable from the material object. Only in combination with the word “knight” do we know about the meaning of this piece of wood or plastic, its identity and moves, which are defined by the rules of the game. Following the constructivist epistemology, language is part of the world and not a mirror of the world, as assumed by adherents of a positivist epistemology (Fierke, 2007, 175f).

There have always been doubts about constructivism of whether it is an approach or a theory. Interpretive constructivism with its social ontology and social or constructivist epistemology has been referred to as a metatheory. In that context interpretive constructivism would represent “a way of studying social relations” (Fierke, 2007, 174), in particular international relations, as opposed to the rationalist way of studying social sciences. In contrast, Wendt, who is probably one of the most famous constructivist international relations scholar, argues in his publication *Social Theory of International Relations*, published in 1999, that constructivism has the status of a substantive theory. Wendt, however, accepts tenets of the positivist methodology and epistemology and thereby could be put into the camp of conventional constructivism. Many proponents see conventional constructivism as a substantive theory of international relations (see Fierke, 2007; Chernoff, 2007). Others, like Phillips (2007, 67), however, argue against “constructivism's emergence as a commensurable peer competitor with established grand traditions”. Phillips substantiates his argumentation with two factors. First, constructivism is not grounded in a political philosophy like realism and liberalism are. It therefore lacks internal coherence. Second, constructivism is willing to ask questions about the processes through which entities are constituted and about the establishment of constitutive norms. Thus, putting constructivism on the same level with realism and liberalism would understate its effort in questioning the practices and institutions of traditional, rationalist mainstream theories (Phillips, 2007, 69f). Constructivism has often been criticized for not being falsifiable. This explains the small amount of specific substantive principles it has produced (Chernoff, 2007, 71).

4. Neoconservatism or Democratic Realism

Neoconservatism or democratic realism, as it is also called, has to be distinguished from the former three theoretical concepts in that it is neither a specific approach to foreign policy, nor a substantive theory of International Relations. It is more generally referred to as “a broader set of principles not specifically focused on IR [International Relations] or foreign policy” (Chernoff, 2007, 52). Probably because neoconservatism does not limit its purpose on

foreign policy when it comes to dealing with foreign policy topics, neoconservatives adopt realist principles as well as liberal and idealist principles. On the one hand, neoconservatives share with realists, for example, the emphasis on power in the international system, the skepticism concerning the capabilities of forums for international cooperation, or the focus on the state as a unit of analysis. On the other hand, however, neoconservatives support the liberal “democratic peace” thesis. In addition, similar to the idealist thought of the interwar period, neoconservatives add a moral component to their set of guidelines. They claim that the United States should act morally and will be successful in doing so (Chernoff, 2007, 53).

Ilan Peleg (2009, 51) identifies eight major ideas neoconservatism is based on: “(1) assertive nationalism (or patriotism); (2) radicalism (reflected in complete rejection of the status quo [of world politics in favor of the pursuit of global hegemony]); (3) militarism, especially in terms of switching from a defensive posture of deterrence and containment to an offensive posture of preemption and prevention; (4) exceptionalism⁴; (5) a mixture of optimism and Hobbesian pessimism; (6) imperial universalism in the name of two different but connected ideas, democratization and benevolent hegemony; (7) evangelism; and (8) unilateralism”. As their “*fundamental goals*” Peleg identifies the worldwide spread of democracy, especially to countries opposed to the U.S., the inducement of regime change in several but mostly countries hostile to the U.S., and the establishment of American global hegemony (ibid., 55).

There are several reasons why democratic realism or neoconservatism is not regarded as a “legitimate theoretical approach to IR” (Chernoff, 2007, 53). Neoconservatives have never published their views in any academic journal but instead used newspapers and popular journals as mediums to spread their thoughts. Moreover, democratic realism lacks definitive publications comparable to Morgenthau’s *Politics Among Nations*, Kant’s *Perpetual Peace*, Waltz’s *Theory of International Politics*, Keohane’s *After Hegemony*, or Wendt’s *Social Theory of*

⁴ “Exceptionalism is the belief that America is not merely special but truly unique and even superior to other nations of the world, because of its historical experience, inherent social values (such as equality), and political institutions (especially its vibrant democracy)” (Peleg, 2009, 57).

International Politics, which would allow for discussion and comparison with other approaches to International Relations theory. In addition, the way in which democratic realism is formulated, with its moral imperatives, does not allow for any testing. Even if neoconservatism were regarded as testable, it could only be tested by the single case of Iraq.

III. Analysis of the Transatlantic Relations by Scholars

The purpose of this chapter is to show how two scholars, each using different approaches of international relations theories, have analyzed the transatlantic relations between the U.S. and Europe. Robert Kagan, a scholar adhering to the neoconservative ideology, has applied on a double approach, mainly realist and partly idealist. Stephanie B. Anderson, a scholar with a background derived from the critical theory, has analyzed the transatlantic relations from a constructivist standpoint. Some criticism will be raised after a brief presentation of their works.

1. Robert Kagan: “Power and Weakness”

Robert Kagan's article “Power and Weakness” issued in 2002 in the scholarly journal *Policy Review* and published in 2003 as a book with the title “*Of Power and Paradise: America and Europe in the New World Order*” has become an almost indispensable piece of literature to observers of the transatlantic relations between the U.S. and Europe. Smith (2003, 863) even views it as “required reading for observers of relations between these traditional allies [U.S. and Europe]”. This is it not only because Kagan has triggered much discussion on both sides of the Atlantic but also because of “the essay's fabulous timing” (Bratspies, 2003, 898). By this Bratspies refers to the underlying “neoconservative vision” (ibid.) put forward at a time when a strongly neoconservative administration took office two years earlier, in 2001.

In his essay Kagan asserts that the U.S. and Europe would differ “on major strategic and international questions” (Kagan, 2002, 3) so much as if they lived in two different worlds. The European countries have turned away from power as a means of conducting their foreign policy and instead refer to negotiation, diplomacy, commercial ties, international laws, or seduction (ibid.). The U.S., however, still relies on the use of force, military capabilities, coercion or even unilateralism if necessary as means of conducting its foreign policy. As a

consequence Kagan suggests that “Americans are from Mars and Europeans are from Venus” (ibid., 3). His analysis of this “strategic chasm” (ibid., 11) is based on two argumentations. The first relates to the disparity in military power between the U.S. and Europe, which he refers to as the *power gap*. Since the end of the Cold War, the defense budgets of the European countries, and thus their military capabilities, have been steadily declining. The defense budget and the military capabilities of the U.S., however, have been rising since 1945. According to Kagan, a psychology of power and weakness is inherent in his so called *power gap*. Since Europe possesses only few military capabilities, it has no other choice but to live with the dangers of the world. In contrast, due to their military strength, Americans do not accept just living with problems but they want to solve them. Their great power, however, makes them the primary target of terrorist or other attacks, which is why Americans often refer to most of the dangers of the worlds as intolerable “threats”. Conversely, due to their military weakness Europeans regard most of the dangers in the world as “challenges” and those few that are experienced as threats are appraised as tolerable (ibid. 32ff).

The second argumentation of Kagan’s essay refers to the different experiences of the U.S. and Europe with history after the Second World War. By realizing the project of the European integration, Europeans made the so far unique experience that an establishment of peace is possible without the use of force but by setting up self-enforcing rules, by following bureaucratic processes and by obeying international (in this case European) law. It has been this particular historical experience of the peaceful project of the European integration, which Kagan views as the enemy of European military power and which made Europe become militarily weak. As a consequence the European countries adopted a strategic culture that assigns a less important role to power. The historical experience of the U.S. after 1945 was, however, to provide the security umbrella for the Europeans so that they could fully concentrate on their project of the European integration. Kagan even goes so far as to refer to the European integration and the European weakness as “the product of American foreign policy stretching back over the better part of nine decades” (ibid. 70). Thus, their historical experience rendered Americans a strategic culture that still assigns an important role to power. In order to demonstrate the strategic difference between

the U.S. and Europe, Kagan picks up a caricature and claims that “Europeans have stepped out of the Hobbesian world of anarchy into the Kantian world of perpetual peace” (ibid., 57). The U.S., however, must have remained in the Hobbesian world of anarchy in order to defend the Kantian paradise of perpetual peace for the Europeans against outside forces.

Kagan’s thesis, put forward in “Power and Weakness”, has ruffled feathers on both sides of the Atlantic and also caused a considerable amount of debate. Lothringen (2003, 979) essentially criticizes Kagan for generalizing about the European countries since “they vary in their weakness and they vary in their attitudes to war from case to case”. The lack of a “homogenized European strategic culture” (ibid.) has become particularly evident in the wake of the Iraq war. Bratspies criticizes Kagan for his generalization as well as for his simplification. His acceptance of military force as the one and only form of power leads to an “overly narrow conception of power”, which presents “a fundamental flaw” not only for Bratspies (2003, 894). Also, Henrikson (2003, 5f) regards Kagan’s unidimensional view of power as a point of critique since he thereby despises Europe’s capabilities. Bratspies also criticizes Kagan’s simplified depiction of weakness by maintaining that instead of just “a state of ‘unpower’” weakness “is a nuanced proposition” (ibid., 896). Additionally, she challenges the “*a priori* status” (ibid., 892) that the attributes ‘strong’ and ‘weak’ maintain in Kagan’s analysis. By this she refers to Kagan’s thesis that the dispositions of strong and weak “have *naturally* produced differing strategic judgements, differing assessments of threats and of the proper means of addressing threats” (Kagan, 2002, 6, emphasis added). Bratspies further criticizes Kagan for confusing cause and consequence. Whereas Kagan argues that Europe has a different strategic culture because it has few military capabilities, Bratspies contends that Europe adopted a specific set of values, and thereby a strategic culture that is different from the U.S. And, as a consequence, it has rejected the use of force and large weapon arsenals. Thus, the weak military capabilities resulted from a different foreign policy approach and not the foreign policy approach from the weak military capabilities, as Kagan would assert (Bratspies, 2003).

Smith (2003, 864) criticizes Kagan's exaggeration of the differences between the U.S. and Europe by maintaining that the "placement of Americans and Europeans in different worlds is literally absurd". Dilling (2003, 969) also criticizes Kagan for his "exaggeration of the role the American military power" was playing in post-war Europe. He rather views the presence of U.S. military power as a "latent structure" (ibid., 966) that might have kept order but as such is impossible to verify. Henrikson (2003, 4), however, has not only criticized Kagan for exaggerating the differences but also for polarizing them so much that the effect of his analysis "could prove to be exactly the opposite" of his intention. Paulus (2003, 871) shares Henrikson's concern by pointing out that "Kagan's work confirms rather than challenges the prejudices and stereotypes of both sides [the U.S. and Europe]".

In his analysis of the transatlantic relations Kagan uses a realist approach, which becomes immediately evident when reading the title of his essay. This further becomes evident by Kagan's continuous reference to power in order to explain the differences between the U.S. and Europe. In addition Henrikson claims that Kagan also uses an idealist and a constructivist argumentation and therefore criticizes him for his theoretical inconsistency. The idealist argumentation can be found in the part where Kagan writes about the historical experiences of the U.S. and Europe. The mix of realist and idealist argumentations creates the "neoconservative vision" (Bratspies, 2003, 898) that Kagan is trying to persuade his readers of. The constructivist argumentation is not elaborately developed, which, Henrikson suggests, might be the case because Kagan himself is not convinced of it.

2. Stephanie B. Anderson: *Crafting EU Security Policy*

In her book *Crafting EU Security Policy. In Pursuit of a European Identity* Stephanie Anderson explores the motivations behind the creation of the European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP) as well as its impacts on the U.S. and NATO, the European Union and the European nations domestically. Disproving realist arguments, Anderson argues that the ESDP has not been launched for the

purpose of defense or deterrence. Neither, she argues, has the ESDP been created in order to aid international actors or institutions to manage global problems and dangers. Thus, she also disproves an international institutionalist argumentation. Anderson further argues against an integrationist argumentation according to which the ESDP is the next stage in the evolution of the European integration. The thesis put forward in her book rather maintains that “the ESDP is a necessary nation-building tool” (Anderson, 2008, 8) that has been established in order to create a European identity. Accordingly, Anderson applies a constructivist approach to reveal the motivations behind the creation of the ESDP. In context of her thesis Anderson also addresses the transatlantic relations and the differences between the U.S. and Europe when she writes about “the role of the United States in the European integration process” (ibid., 7).

Her analysis of the U.S.-European relations draws on the “minimal group paradigm” (ibid., 68) as its theoretical basis. It alleges that identities are often created through inclusion and differentiation, which result in the foundation of an “in-group” and an “out-group”. The designation of an “other” minimizes the distinction between the members of the “in-group” and simultaneously maximizes their similarities. The U.S. presents itself as the best actor for designating an “other” because the “EU member states’ relationship with the United States is one of the most potent forces binding them together” (ibid., 70). Following this line of argumentation in their European political cooperation, the EU member states have been trying to apply policies different of those of the U.S. Hence, Anderson views the roots of the ESDP “in distinguishing itself from the policies of the United States, and not in defense per se” (ibid. 68). The European Security Strategy (ESS) was thereby created for the purpose of showing how different the European strategic culture was from that of the U.S. and “became a vital tool in creating a European identity” (ibid. 90).

Therefore, according to Anderson's thesis, the differences between the U.S. and Europe are a consequence of Europe's search for a European identity. In contrast, to Kagan's analysis, which is mainly driven by a realist and partly by an idealist argumentation, Anderson in her construction of a European identity follows a constructivist argumentation. The rift in the transatlantic relations is not

caused by a gap in the military capabilities of the U.S. and Europe or because of Europe's idealist "*mission civilisatrice*" (Kagan, 2002, 18) that sees the military power of the U.S. and its exercise as a threat to Europe's mission. The divergence between the U.S. and Europe is caused by the Europeans seeking to create a European identity by distancing themselves from the U.S.

Anderson's explanation for the transatlantic rift is not completely new. The argument that the achievement of the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) was motivated by the EU's desire to differentiate itself from the U.S. was also raised, for example, by Henrikson (2003, 6) five years earlier. Anderson's constructivist European identity thesis has not been as seriously debated as has Kagan's realistic "power equation" thesis (Kagan, 2002, 6). The reason for that might be that Anderson's analysis of the transatlantic relations is not only less provocative but also shared by other scholars. Nevertheless, there are also some flaws inherent in Anderson's analysis as will be explained below.

Again, one has to ask if cause and consequence have not been confused. Anderson argues that the establishment of the ESDP is the consequence of the need to create a European identity. The question may also be put if the opposite way is not more plausible, which would mean that the creation of a European identity is the consequence of the establishment of the ESDP. This would then contradict Anderson's constructivist argumentation of the motivations behind the establishment of the ESDP. A realist argumentation can be clearly excluded since the military capabilities of the ESDP are too few. However, it might be the case that Anderson was too quick in disproving an international institutionalist or an integrationist argumentation. The underlying reason for the creation of the ESDP might well be the EU's desire to be a global player in international politics, even if its assistance can only be a minor contribution due to its limited military capabilities. Furthermore, Anderson's argument that "adding a military dimension was a conscious decision to break with past images of the EU as a civilian power" (Anderson, 2008, 33) and not the next stage of European integration, is difficult to verify and seems to be her personal opinion. After all, the member states of the EU wanted to integrate their defense policies as early as in the 1950s.

The arguments presented above seem to be reasoned by preferences for different schools of international relations theory. What appears to be a real flaw, however, is that Anderson talks of a *European* identity when she refers to EU policy. The obvious problem is that European countries that are not members of the EU would not possess a European identity since they do not integrate their defense policies. Consequently, Switzerland or Norway, countries that share very similar values with the six founding countries of the European Union (before 1994 referred to as the European Community), would not possess a European identity. Bulgaria and Rumania, countries that probably share more common values with their neighboring non-EU countries Serbia and Macedonia than with the six founding countries, however, would possess a European identity only because they coordinate their defense policies.⁵ To counteract that flaw Anderson would have to talk of a *EU identity*.

Finally, Anderson sees the ESS as “a vital tool in creating a European identity” (ibid., 90) and therefore as a means by which Europe distances itself from the U.S. It is to be challenged, however, if the ESS is really that different from the National Security Strategy (NSS) of the U.S. in their pursuits of foreign policy goals. Even though the NSS does not mention multilateralism as explicitly as the ESS does, it still does not regard unilateralism as the basis for the achievement of its foreign policy goals.

⁵ At this point the six countries that founded the European Union are taken as guide of reference for EU identity since they from the beginning set up the value system necessary to establish any identity. Other applying countries had to orientate themselves to this value system in order to be admitted to the EU.

IV. The Transatlantic Relations from 2001-2008

This chapter unfolds the main part of the thesis, the analysis of the U.S.-German and U.S.-French relations in the years between 2001 and 2008. In the course of the analysis the main research question and thesis as well as its sub-questions and sub-theses will be addressed. The chapter is divided into two parts. The first part has the transatlantic split over the 2003 Iraq War as well as its make-up and time afterwards as subject. The second part addresses the transatlantic rapprochement that is argued to have been pursued by both the U.S. and its European allies during Bush's second term in the years from 2005 to 2008. In each of the two parts the constellation of the Bush administration and its approach to foreign policy, the events and developments in Iraq and Afghanistan, and the bilateral relations between the U.S. and Germany and the U.S. and France are analyzed.

1. The Transatlantic Split: George W. Bush's First Term

In order to assess the impact the 2003 Iraq crisis had on the transatlantic relationship between the U.S. and Germany on the one hand and France on the other hand, it is necessary to give a short overview of how the disagreements between these allies evolved. Starting with the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, a sketchy impression of the European reactions to the disaster that had happened to the U.S. is given. Following on that, a brief outline of the military engagements by the U.S. troops and by the troops of the international coalition in Afghanistan is presented. Furthermore, the diplomatic exchanges in the make-up of the Iraq War as well as the military engagements in Iraq are elucidated. Lastly, the time immediately after the 2003 split until the end of 2004 when the parties exchanged first signs of reconciliation is subject to this chapter.

1.1. The Foreign Policy of the Bush Administration in Its First Term

There has been a lot of discussion about the foreign policy pursued by the George W. Bush administration, in particular during its first term. Many scholars see Bush's foreign policy as being heavily influenced by neoconservative principles and have been very critical of the policies pursued by the Bush administration. However, others perceive Bush's approach to foreign policy as being largely guided by realist (IR theory) principles and do not see a big deviation from U.S. foreign policy tradition. They acknowledge that there were neoconservatives appointed though, however, none of them was in a leading position.

According to Peleg (2009, 1), adhering to the first group of scholars, American foreign policy during the George W. Bush administration was shaped by five important factors: "the personality of President George W. Bush, the foreign policy decision-making process established by his administration, the impact of the extremely traumatic events of September 11, 2001, the challenge to the United States' unipolar supremacy within an ever-changing international system, and the influence of a determined intellectual elite often referred to as Neoconservative". Peleg maintains that the combination of factors resulted in a unilateral, hegemonic, and militaristic foreign policy, adopted by the Bush Administration, which was based on ideology rather than on facts. Under the influence of the powerful neoconservative group of policy advisors in Bush's team, American foreign policy was adhering to Wilsonian idealistic principles such as the democratization of hostile regimes. However, it abandoned the Wilsonian multilateralism and did not recognize the legitimacy Wilsonians attribute to international organizations (Gärtner, 2009, 73f). In embracing this new foreign policy style, the Bush administration not only "deviated from accepted norms in American foreign policy and from the well-established, bipartisan Washington consensus, [...] some analysts have called liberal internationalism" (Peleg, 2009, 7). It also "accelerated and energized processes *unfavorable* to the United States and intensified worldwide anti-Americanism" (ibid.).

Neoconservatism as the Ideological Basis

The most important one of the five factors stated above was probably the influence that the neoconservative elite had on the foreign policy of the Bush administration. Peleg (2009, 45) claims that “[n]eoconservatism has been the basis of the foreign policy of the Bush administration”. Peleg’s argument can be supported by several elements of the Bush administration’s foreign policy, which indicate that it strongly leaned towards the neoconservative ideology. The pursuit of ‘fixing other countries’, especially Iraq’s, internal policies as well as democratizing them (ibid., 50) would relate to the imperial universalism identified by Peleg as one of the eight major ideas neoconservatism is based on (see Chapter II. 4.). The strong emphasis on military power and the preference of *hard power* over *soft power* were in accordance with neoconservatism’s tendency to stress the militaristic aspect of foreign policy. The perception of international politics as “a struggle between good and evil” (ibid.) drew from the evangelism (ibid., 68) that prevailed the administration, which was largely made up of born-again evangelicals. Also, moralization of the war policy and unilateral behavior were in the “*Neoconservative mode of thinking and argumentation*” (ibid., 50).

The Bush Doctrine of preemption, which was articulated in a speech at West Point in June 2002 and further advanced in the National Security Strategy (NSS) 2002, determined the U.S. foreign policy after 9/11. While Peleg holds that it was a predominantly neoconservative document, Renshon (2007, 3) maintains that the Doctrine’s “assumptions in some key respects are perfectly compatible with traditional ‘realism’”. In his argumentation he refers to and quotes Robert Jervis who writes, “[o]ffensive realism perhaps provides the best explanation for what the US is doing” (Jervis, 2003, 316 quoted in Renshon, 2007, 15). Alexander, publishing in the same book as Renshon, also argues against the radical departure of the Bush Doctrine from major schools of foreign policy thought. He claims that “the neoconservative foreign policy thinking embodied in the Doctrine is a variant of realism, specifically a variant of a variant of realism, “balance-of-threat” realism” (Alexander, 2007, 39f).

President George W. Bush's Personality

Among President Bush's most important characteristics Peleg (2009, 84) lists his Manichean worldview, referring to a tendency to divide the world into good versus evil forces, "his pessimistic and conflictual view of the world", "his closed-mindedness toward alternative views", and "his lack of flexibility in reexamining his own political positions" (ibid., 84). Lesch (2006, 233) adds Bush's "stubbornness, his sense of self-righteousness, and his apparently willful disregard of realities on the ground" to this enumeration. Furthermore Bush has also been criticized for his lack of knowledge of and interest in international politics, which made the President largely dependent on his policy advisors' counsel (Peleg, 2009, 84f). In this regard Renshon holds a different view of the President. While he admits that "when he entered the presidency, Mr. Bush was unschooled in foreign affairs" (Renshon, 2007, 8), he strongly argues against portraying Bush as a "dunce" who was unable to learn about foreign affairs during his time in office as President. While most scholars, including Peleg, maintain that Bush was not a neoconservative before he assumed the presidency, he "gradually moved in the idealistic, neoconservative direction and eventually adopted it completely as the overarching policy of his administration" (ibid., 83). Renshon and others, however, maintain that even if his policies were determined by the neoconservative thinking and argumentation, President Bush himself remained a realist.

Another point of discussion represented Bush's appointments, of which some were highly controversial. It seemed as if Bush did not make his appointments on the basis of a person's expertise but on their identification with the neoconservative principles, their loyalty to, and their interpersonal relationships with the President. As a consequence, not only was Bush not counseled in the best ways possible, but the administration was also at risk of falling prey to *groupthink*⁶ (Peleg, 2009, 76, 85, 101, 112). While some decisions, in particular the one concerning the invasion of Iraq, showed "*many characteristics of groupthink*" (ibid., 112), the split within Bush's Cabinet into a

⁶ The term *groupthink* can be defined as "a tendency to limit outside advice to those who already supported the administration's viewpoint and policy preferences (Hook & Spanier, 2007, 358).

neoconservative and a realist fraction hindered the establishment of classic groupthink though.

Several attempts have been made to classify or categorize President George W. Bush and to attribute a label to him. Two of those attempts are as follows. Gerard Magliocca (2009, 475) maintains “that the circumstances beyond his control forced him [George W. Bush] to act as an affiliated and as a reconstructive leader at the same time”. As an “affiliated leader” Bush adapted to existing structures rather than repudiating them (ibid., 479f). The events of September 11, however, created a situation in which Bush was able to challenge preexisting arrangements and to craft a new policy. This crisis rendered Bush a reconstructive leader (ibid., 483ff). Peleg (2009, 79) classified Bush as an “active-negative” President. Such Presidents “want to get power, keep it, and even expand it, but they do not really derive satisfaction from the job” (ibid.). Moreover, such Presidents are likely to have *split personalities*. On the one hand they achieve great accomplishments, but on the other hand they also disclose great failures.

The Decision-Making Unit (DMU)

The decision making process of the George W. Bush Administration primarily occurred in two circles of policy formation. The first and more important one was what Peleg (2009, 104) referred to as the “decision-making unit (DMU) within the White House”, essentially the Cabinet. The second circle consisted of the “foreign policy, defense, and intelligence bureaucracy” (ibid.). The DMU of the Bush Administration was characterized by its political homogeneity. Members of both, first-term and second-term, Cabinets were “politically conservative, ideologically consistent, and generally pro-life and pro-business” (Warshaw, 2006, 75). In his first-term Cabinet, twelve of the fourteen Administration officials belonged to the conservative wing of the Republican Party (ibid.). The other two officials were the Democratic holdover from the Clinton Cabinet, Norman Mineta, and the moderate Republican, Colin Powell. Moreover, most of them were Evangelical Christians; not a single non-Christian was taken on.

Like Ronald Reagan's Cabinet, Bush's first-term Administration consisted of some political ideologues⁷ (Warshaw, 2006, 68). They formed the bigger "hawkish in-group dominated by the Cheney-Rumsfeld axis" (Peleg, 2009, 105), which was in large part guided by neoconservative principles. The smaller "moderate, dovish, Realist out-group" (ibid.) was led by Secretary of State Colin Powell and also included Deputy Secretary of State Richard Armitage and Director of Policy Planning for the Department of State (DoS) Richard Haass. Thus, President Bush's split personality was reflected in the Cabinet, which was divided into a neoconservative and a realist fraction. While Bush had supported Powell's realist pragmatism before 9/11, the realist fraction was gradually marginalized following the terrorist attacks (ibid., 108). As a consequence, also the entire DoS was marginalized, which was mirrored in two ways: First, "Powell was systematically kept out of the president's 'loop'" and second, the Pentagon, rather than the DoS, was entrusted with the control of post-war Iraq (ibid., 117). The rift between the realist and neoconservative fractions in the Administration also represented the traditional struggle between the DoS and the Department of Defense (DoD), which is inherent in every Administration but exacerbated during Bush's first term.

However, the events of September 11, resulting in the adoption of a foreign policy that stressed the military aspect and therefore in a privilege of the DoD, were only part of the explanation for the treatment of the DoS in Bush's first term. Ideological differences and personal relations accounted more for the treatment of the DoS. From the beginning, members of the neoconservative camp, especially Rumsfeld and Cheney, sought to limit Powell's realist influence on the President. Also the relationship between Powell and Bush had never been in good shape. This circumstance proved to be disadvantageous for Powell since with President Bush "everything was personal" (ibid.). The importance of personal relations in the Bush Administration was demonstrated by the improvement of the relationship between the White House and the DoS when Condoleezza Rice became

⁷ The author is aware of the fact that the word 'ideologues' or 'ideology' can have a negative connotation and distances herself from this context. The description of some in the Bush administration's team as neoconservative 'ideologues' is widespread in the academic literature and has been used to indicate that those people identified with neoconservative principles more profoundly than others.

Secretary of State. Notwithstanding her realist foreign policy background, Rice was absorbed by the neoconservative thinking. However, she again adopted an increasingly realist foreign policy on international affairs when Rumsfeld was replaced by the realist Robert Gates in 2006.

In contrast to Peleg, Renshon (2007, 7) regards the existence of “a small, highly influential group of neoconservatives”, the so-called “Neoconservative Cabal” that dominated U.S. foreign policy under Bush, as a myth. Moreover, he also argues against classifying Powell, Cheney, Rice and Rumsfeld as neoconservatives. If anything, he analyzes, they were “conservative nationalists and maybe even “realists”, but not neoconservatives” (ibid., 8). While Powell is more associated with realism and Rice is often regarded as to have followed the predominant chorus of the Bush Administrations by switching between neoconservatism and realism, Rumsfeld and Cheney had close ties to neoconservatism. Together with I. Lewis Libby and Paul Wolfowitz Cheney oversaw the draft of the *Defense Planning Guidance*, which was written by the first two and is regarded as the neoconservative policy foundation of the Bush Doctrine. Moreover, Cheney and Rumsfeld were “charter signatories of the Project for the New American Century (PNAC), a pressure group tied to the neoconservative American Enterprise Institute (AEI) that was founded in the late 1990s to advocate hardline U.S. policies in the Middle East” (Institute for Policy Studies, 2009a, [online]). Thus, even while critical sources of Cheney and Rumsfeld acknowledge that they were not neoconservatives but “hardline nationalist” (ibid.), both had very close ties with the neoconservatives. Moreover, they were profoundly influenced by I. Lewis Libby, the Vice President’s former chief of staff, and Paul Wolfowitz, Deputy Secretary of Defense. Both are widely regarded as neoconservatives and Wolfowitz is even referred to as “[a] key intellectual figure associated with neoconservatism” (ibid., 2009b, [online]).

The September 11 Terrorist Attacks and the Unipolar Supremacy of the U.S.

The September 11 terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center had a considerable impact on the foreign policy of the George W. Bush Administration. According to Peleg (2009, 7), the “[a]ssertive, overly militaristic unilateralism became the preferred option” for foreign policy making. However, far more

substantial than an Administration acting “in an even more unilateral, hegemonic, and militaristic manner than before” September 11 (ibid., 7) was the “intimidation factor of 9/11” (ibid., 124). The Congress supported major foreign policy initiatives by the President and authorized the use of force in a bipartisan vote, as was the case for the Iraq invasion. This rather unusual behavior was justified by the Senators’ and Representatives’ fear of the public’s rage if they worked against the President’s proclaimed War on Terrorism. Moreover, in a fear of being judged as unpatriotic “the American media was exceptionally nonaggressive and nonprobing in questioning the administration’s decisions” (ibid.). It was only after the Iraq disaster and when the flaws about the invasion became clear that the media shifted to a more critical coverage of wars in Iraq and Afghanistan as well as of the Administration’s policies. Public excuses for their uncritical coverage were announced by famous journalists and reporters working at the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post* or at *CBS* (ibid.).

Even though the Bush Administration intensified its unilateral approach to foreign policy after 9/11, it “had already established a full-fledged unilateralist behavioral pattern” (ibid., 70) by the time the terrorist attacks happened. It denounced five multilateral initiatives in its first year: the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty, the International Criminal Court (ICC), the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), the Chemical and Biological Weapons Treaty, and the Kyoto Protocol⁸ on climate change. To be sure, unilateralism has always been part of American foreign policy, however, the extent to which the Bush Administration acted unilaterally was largely made possible by the “unipolar moment”⁹ that evolved after the Cold War. Yet, while the previous two Presidents of the post-Cold War period, George H. W. Bush and Bill Clinton, exercised a “restrained unipolarism” (ibid., 46), George W. Bush’s on the whole unreserved unilateral behavior was reasoned by the neoconservative thinking that for the most part determined his foreign policy.

⁸ However, in reference to the Kyoto Protocol it needs to be mentioned that the U.S. Senate voted against the multilateral treaty with a vote of 95:0 still in 1997 under President Bill Clinton. Thus, criticism of the Bush administration is only justified concerning its omission to revitalize the treaty but not for its denunciation.

⁹ The “unipolar moment” is an expression coined by Krauthammer (1991), which refers to a time-limited unipolar system. Beginning in 2003, the Iraq War is seen as to have ended that period.

Summing up, many scholars see in the *Bush revolution* a profound departure from traditional schools of foreign policy thought and the adherence to neoconservative principles in foreign policy making. They argue for a change in terms of the *means*, which includes unreserved unilateralism, the use of force rather than diplomacy, the Bush doctrine of preemption, and even a policy of prevention¹⁰. Furthermore, they argue for a change in terms of goals, which includes the spread of democracy (even with militaristic means if necessary), regime change in “rogue states” and in other regimes hostile to the U.S., and the sustaining America’s status as regional hegemon with global ambitions (Peleg, 2009, 55). Others, however, argue against a revolution in foreign policy making during the Bush Administrations and defend the Bush Doctrine as being in line with the realist school of foreign policy thought.

1.2. 9/11 and the War in Afghanistan

European Solidarity with the U.S.

The terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, triggered a wave of solidarity with the United States in Europe. The German Chancellor Gerhard Schröder, in his government statement of September 12, 2001, in the *Deutsche Bundestag* (the nationally elected chamber of the German parliament), claimed that the people of Germany stood by the United States and that the terrorist attacks represented a declaration of war against the entire civilized world. He assured the President of the United States of Germany’s “unlimited solidarity” and guaranteed the people of the United States all the help they would need:

¹⁰ Preemption is referring to the right to use force in face of an *imminent* threat (Gordon et al., 2004, 68). The Iraq War is generally referred to as a *preemptive war*. However, some analysts argue that the danger emanating from Iraq was not imminent but potential and therefore refer to the Iraq War as *preventive war*. Prevention refers to the use of force in face of a *potential* threat. The application of the policy of preemption on the Global War on Terror (GWOT), as Bush did, is troubling since it is almost impossible to foresee a terrorist act. This renders all threats emanating from terrorists to be *potential* threats. According to international law, however, the use of force is only justified if there is a manifest threat, which would deprive the GWOT of its legality. There has been much debate aroused around this issue.

“Meine Damen und Herren, ich habe dem amerikanischen Präsidenten das tief empfundene Beileid des gesamten deutschen Volkes ausgesprochen. Ich habe ihm auch die uneingeschränkte – ich betone: die uneingeschränkte – Solidarität Deutschlands zugesichert. ... Die Menschen in Deutschland stehen in dieser schweren Stunde fest an der Seite der Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika. ... Selbstverständlich bieten wir den Bürgern und Behörden der Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika jede gewünschte Hilfe an, ... Die gestrigen Anschläge in New York und Washington sind nicht nur ein Angriff auf die Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika; sie sind eine Kriegserklärung gegen die gesamte zivilisierte Welt.” (Deutscher Bundestag, Plenarprotokoll 14/186, 18293f)

His party colleague and then chairman of the *Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands (SPD)* Peter Struck became famous for his statement, “Today we are all Americans” (original: “Heute sind wir alle Amerikaner”; *ibid.*, 18294f) and asserted that, together with the government, the SPD would not abandon its American friends. The former chairman of the coalition partner *BÜNDNIS 90/DIE GRÜNEN*, Rezzo Schlauch, also confirmed Germany’s solidarity with the people, the President and the government of the United States (*ibid.*). So too did the former chairmen of the opposition parties, Friedrich Merz of the *Christlich Demokratische Union/Christlich-Soziale Union (CDU/CSU)*, Wolfgang Gerhardt of the *Freie Demokratische Partei (FDP)*, and Roland Claus of the former *Partei des Demokratischen Sozialismus (PDS)*, which since 2007 has called itself *DIE LINKE* and has usually been critical of the policies of the United States.

Statements of solidarity with the United States were also issued on the local level. The mayor of the city of Hamburg claimed, similarly to Peter Struck, “We are all Americans” (original: “Wir sind alle Amerikaner”; in: “Die ganze Stadt hält den Atem an”, 2001, September 13). Moreover, all parties adjourned their campaigns for the *Hamburger Bürgerschaft*, the state parliament of Hamburg, in order to express sympathy for the people of the United States (“Hamburg trauert – Parteien stoppen Wahlkampf”, 2001, September 12). The terrorist attacks of 9/11, however, did not only overshadow Germany’s politics but its media coverage as well. Articles expressing Germany’s solidarity with the U.S., its sympathy with the American people, and its dismay at the terrorist attacks dominated the news and press coverage of national journals such as *Die Welt*, *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* or *Süddeutsche Zeitung*.

Furthermore, the people of Germany themselves showed great sympathy for the United States and its people. In Hamburg, hundreds of people signed books of condolence and for days on end churches opened their doors days long for prayers and devotions (“Die ganze Stadt hält den Atem an”, 2001, September 13). In Berlin, thousands of people gathered in front of the embassy of the United States and lighted candles, laid down flowers or just stood there to express their commiseration (Bullion & Kammerer, 2001, September 13). At the Brandenburg Gate two hundred thousand people gathered spontaneously in order to show their solidarity (Pond, 2004, 10). In Washington, the German embassy organized a charity for the victims and survivors of the terrorist attacks with the prospect of attracting some tens of thousands of dollars. In the end the embassy was able to give USD 42 million in donations (ibid., 11).

In France, still on September 11, President Jacques Chirac stated that the French people were on the side of the American people and expressed France’s solidarity and amity with the Americans. He further assured President Bush of his “unreserved support”.

“Dans ces circonstances effroyables le peuple français – je tiens à le dire ici – tout entier, est aux côtés du peuple américain. Il lui exprime son amitié et sa solidarité dans cette tragédie. J’assure naturellement le Président George W. BUSH de mon soutien total.” (Intervention de M. Jacques Chirac, 2001, September 11)

On September 19, in an address in front of the French community in New York, Chirac claimed that since September 11 all French people had an American part in their hearts (Allocution de M. Jacques Chirac, New York, 2001, September 19). And on the same day, in an address to the French people in Washington D.C., he once again declared France’s solidarity with the United States and that the bond between France and the U.S. had always been the most solid one (original: “le lien unissant la France et les États-Unis s’est toujours montré le plus solide”; in: Allocution de M. Jacques Chirac, Washington, D.C., 2001, September 19). Also, the French Premier Ministre Lionel Jospin declared his profound solidarity with the American people in a statement on the terrorist attacks of September 11 (Déclaration suite aux attentats aux Etats-Unis, 2001, September 11). A day later, however, in an interview of an evening news program, Jospin

also made the U.S. aware of its responsibility (Intervention de Lionel Jospin, 2001, September 12). Moreover, there were announcements of solidarity in the French media. The French newspaper *Le Monde* became famous for its article written by Jean Marie Colombani with the heading “Nous sommes tous Américains”. The author alluded to John F. Kennedy’s famous statement proclaimed in 1962, “I am a Berliner”. Other acts of solidarity by the French people included, for example, laying flower bouquets in front of the American embassy in Paris (Moisi, 2001, September 13).

Also the European Union, in response to the terrorist attacks, issued several official documents in which it declared its solidarity with the United States. The heads of state and government of the European Union, the President of the European Parliament, the President of the European Commission, and the High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy “declared 14 September a day of mourning” in a joint declaration and urged all European citizens to take “a three-minute silence to express our sincere and deepest sympathy for the victims and their families” (Joint Declaration, 2001, September 14). They further assured the President of the U.S. and the American people of their “complete solidarity and full cooperation” (ibid.). The Council of the European Union emphasized “its complete solidarity with the government of the United States and the American people” (September 11 Attacks in the US, 2001, September 13). The President of the European Parliament, Nicole Fontaine, also assured President Bush „that the people of Europe stand shoulder to shoulder with the people of the United States at this time of tragedy“ (Terrorist Attacks in the United States, 2001, September 12).

This wave of overwhelming solidarity did not only overturn the rather negative pre-9/11 view of the United States held by Europeans. It also covered up the predestined clash between the neoconservative Administration in Washington and the center-left governments of Germany and France that would emerge two years later over the war in Iraq (Pond, 2004, 8 & 10). Yet, already in his government policy statement of September 19, 2001, German Chancellor Schröder remarked that the assistance Germany would provide for the United States in the war against terrorism would have to be in accordance with

Germany's constitution. Furthermore, he pointed out that Germany's responsibility as a NATO ally corresponded with its right on information and consultation. Schröder emphasized that Germany would be ready to take "risks in military engagements" but "it would not be ready for adventures". A sentence that Schröder would use repeatedly a year later in his campaign for the *Deutsche Bundestag* to show his disagreement with Bush's Iraq policy. He also indicated that fighting terrorism would not mean to fight one particular country.

"Um welche Form der Unterstützung wir auch gebeten werden: Es ist eine absolute Selbstverständlichkeit, dass wir bei den Entscheidungen das Grundgesetz und die Rechtssprechung des Bundesverfassungsgerichts – dabei insbesondere die Rechte dieses Hohen Hauses – strikt beachten. ... Mit der Bündnispflicht, die wir übernommen haben, korrespondiert ein Recht und dieses Recht heißt Information und Konsultation. ... Ich betone: Zu Risiken – auch im Militärischen – ist Deutschland bereit, aber nicht zu Abenteuern. ... Man kann es nicht oft genug betonen: Wir befinden uns nicht im Krieg gegen irgendeinen Staat." (Deutscher Bundestag, Plenarprotokoll 14/187, 18301ff)

The Architecture of the International Engagement in Afghanistan

Apart from European expressions of commiseration, also Russia, China, Pakistan and the majority of the Arab countries declared their solidarity with the United States. This led to the spontaneous development of an anti-terror alliance outside of institutionalized alliance patterns that the Bush Administration would be using in the war in Afghanistan (Krech, 2002, 27). The NATO countries declared solidarity with the U.S. as well and invoked Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty¹¹ for the first time in the alliance's history. Therefore the Bush Administration could also have decided to wage the war in Afghanistan through the institutionalized alliance pattern of the NATO the way the Clinton Administration did in the 1990s in the Balkan wars.

However, under no circumstances wanted the Bush Administration to follow the approach of the Clinton Administration. Bush and his team shared the view

¹¹ Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty says that "The Parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all and consequently they agree that [...] will assist the Party or Parties so attacked by taking [...] such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area." (The North Atlantic Treaty. Washington D.C. 4 April 1949)

that the Clinton Administration had been too sensitive to the concerns of its European allies. Clinton had delayed important foreign policy decisions because he sought to achieve transatlantic consensus. The Bush Administration desired to “distance itself from both the positions and the methods of its predecessor” (Gordon & Shapiro, 2004, 50). Despite the United States’ unique military capacity after the dissolution of the Soviet Union, Clinton had kept up the tradition of cooperation and consultation of the Cold War era. In contrast, the Bush Administration, in view of the United States’ unprecedented power, saw an opportunity to break with this tradition. What was needed in order to form a coalition was decisive U.S. leadership rather than the institutionalized patterns of consultation and cooperation that had been used in the past decades.

National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice urged the Administration in one of its National Security Council meetings to include the European allies in the military part of the mission in Afghanistan. However, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld did not want to integrate European units just for the sake of “cosmetic reasons” (Woodward, 2003, 202). He felt that they would only disturb the military mission. The Bush Administration saw no reason for including or consulting its European allies in greater detail either. It “was convinced that U.S. allies and partners would eventually follow the American lead while simultaneously allowing the United States to maintain its freedom of action” (Gordon et al., 2004, 50).

As early as the day after the terrorist attacks, in a meeting of the National Security Council, Secretary of State Colin Powell argued for a coalition of countries as broad as possible for the war in Afghanistan (Woodward, 2003, 65). Powell was of the opinion that the war in Afghanistan could only be fought together with partners, though this did not necessarily need to happen within the framework of NATO. Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, who was even more reluctant to use institutionalized alliance patterns or international organizations, stated that “[t]his war will not be waged by a grand alliance united for the single purpose of defeating an axis of hostile powers. Instead, it will involve floating coalitions of countries” (Clark, 2003, 121). The term “floating coalitions” became one of the slogans of the foreign policy approach of the Bush Administration. In one of the National Security Council meetings Rumsfeld said he neither wanted

the United Nations nor the NATO to participate in the war in Afghanistan. He rather preferred a coalition of countries under a common command, similar to a “coalition of the willing” (Woodward, 2003, 337) – another slogan was coined for Bush’s new way of engaging with other countries. Rumsfeld, however, probably became most famous for the following statement, which he uttered on several occasions, “The mission must determine the coalition, and the coalition must not determine the mission” (McGregor & Wolfe, 2002, quoted in Beard, 2007, 136). Rumsfeld believed that the U.S. could not allow the coalition partners to decide on the mission since then the mission would be accomplished only on minimal common agreements of the coalition partners (The White House Bulletin, quoted in Beard, 2007, 136).

The Conduct of Operation Enduring Freedom

The architecture of international engagement in Afghanistan was set up according to the above described approach on foreign policy by the Bush Administration, which put serious strain on the transatlantic partnership. Except for the United Kingdom, European or NATO allies were not included in any planning of the military part of the mission in Afghanistan. Operation Enduring Freedom-Afghanistan was a joint venture by the United States, the United Kingdom and indigenous Afghan opposition troops of the *Northern Alliance*. Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) was established by the U.S. in reaction to the terrorist attacks of September 11, as part of the global war on terrorism. It is based on the right of collective and individual self-defense granted in Article 51 of the UN-Charter (Luif, 2007, 373). Apart from OEF-Afghanistan, there are also some other smaller operations subsumed under the umbrella of OEF, such as Operation Enduring Freedom-Philippines, Operation Enduring Freedom-Horn of Africa, Operation Enduring Freedom-Trans Sahara, or Operation Enduring Freedom-Chad (GlobalSecurity.org, 2005 [online]; Auswärtiges Amt, 2009, [online]). OEF is a U.S.-led mission in which approximately 20 other nations take part (Auswärtiges Amt, 2009, [online]). Since OEF is mainly associated with the war in Afghanistan, however, OEF-Afghanistan will be referred to as only OEF throughout the thesis.

The Northern Alliance, the more common term for the *United Islamic Front for the Salvation of Afghanistan*, was a political and military coalition of anti-Taliban factions comprising of the ethnic groups of Tajiks, Hazara, Uzbeks, and Pashtuns. It included (Berger/Kläy/Stahel, 2002, 123):

- The *Islamic Party of Afghanistan (Jamiat-I Islami-yi Afghanistan)*, which consisted of Tajiks and was led by Burhanuddin Rabbani. Its military and more influential leaders were Ahmed Shah Massoud and, after his assassination, General Mohammed Fahim, who had about 15.000 combatants under his command.
- The National Islamic Movement of Afghanistan (*Junbish-I Milli-yi Afghanistan*), a national Uzbek movement led by Abdul Rashid Dostum, who was in command of about 10.000 combatants under his command.
- The Islamic Unity Party of Afghanistan (*Hizb-I Wahdat-I Islami-yi Afghanistan*), a union of Hazara tribes led by Karim Khalili.
- The Islamic Party (*Hezb-e Islami*), led by the Pashtun Gulbuddin Hekmatyar.
- The Islamic Movement of Afghanistan (*Harakat-i-Islami-yi Afghanistan*), a small Shiite party led by Tajik Ayatollah Muhammad Asif Muhsini.
- The Islamic Union for the Liberation of Afghanistan (*Ittihad-I Islami Bara-yi Azadi*), a small Sunni party made up of Pashtuns and led by the Wahabbite Abdul Rasul Sayyaf.

This coalition of anti-Taliban opposition factions was responsible for the fighting on the ground while the American and British forces conducted air strikes on preselected targets in and around Herat, Shindand, Shibarghan, Mazar-i-Sharif and Kandahar. During the combat operations, the U.S. allowed for only a limited number of ground forces consisting mainly of CIA agents and of Special Forces. They were infiltrated into the country before the official start of the operation in order to contact the Afghan opposition forces. OEF started on October 7, 2001, and on November 11, Mazar-i-Sharif became the first city to be liberated from the Taliban regime. In the following days Kabul (November 13), Jalalabad (November 14), and Kunduz (November 26) fell. On December 7, Kandahar, the last stronghold of the Taliban regime, fell. The combat operations then shifted to the mountains of Tora Bora and by December 17 the last cave complex was taken.

The day after, on December 18, the bombings came to a halt for the first time since the beginning of OEF two and a half months earlier (Lambeth, 2005, 73ff & 119ff).

Even though the U.K. “lobbied hard for the inclusion of additional European allies” (ibid., 117), the British and the Canadians remained the only two other countries materially involved in the mission in Afghanistan (ibid.). Furthermore, “Britain was the only NATO ally that took part in the missile attacks and the air strikes at the beginning of the campaign” (Kouzmanov, 2003, 33f). According to Kouzmanov (2003, 26ff), there were at least three considerations for the Bush Administration to favor a U.S.-led broad coalition over a NATO-led operation: first, international terrorism needed to be addressed by a broad coalition of partners that included both states and non-state actors; second, the U.S. did not want to have its freedom of action constrained by a NATO-led operation; third, the capabilities gap between the U.S. and its European allies seemed to be so big that it would only have impeded cooperation. The first consideration is comprehensible. However, a broad coalition of partners does not conflict with NATO-led combat operations. The second and the third considerations draw on the U.S. experiences with the NATO-led *Operation Allied Force* in Kosovo in 1999. The participation of some European allies in Operation Allied Force was affected by internal policies or military capability constraints. Moreover, the target approval process, in which the U.S. had to consider European concerns about possible targets, slowed down the entire operation and affected its effectiveness. The OEF strikes had to be carried out fast and unexpectedly as some of the targets were dynamic. The mission in Afghanistan required rapid decisions that the U.S. wanted to take without taking into account European concerns, which would have delayed important decisions. Moreover, since the military capabilities gap between the U.S. and the European allies was that substantial, “the burden for providing support to the allies would [have] be[en] much greater” (ibid., 31) than the advantage the U.S. would have taken of European assistance. “Only the British had the sealift and in-flight refueling capabilities to get troops to the region under their own steam and to keep them supplied once in place” (Walker, 2001/02, 4). It was more than a month after the start of the initial combat operations that the Bush Administration did accept “the allies’ offers of thousands

of combat and support troops, and then only in limited numbers and outside NATO's chain of command" (Valasek, 2001/02, 19).

The European allies were clearly disappointed with the way the Bush Administration pursued the mission in Afghanistan, especially when the U.S. spurned the offer of help by the NATO countries (Pond, 2004, 11). The retired U.S. General Wesley K. Clark, who had held the two positions of the *U.S. European Command* and the *Supreme Allied Commander Europe (SACEUR)* simultaneously during the Kosovo war in 1999, was probably most aware of the difficulties the U.S. would face with its European allies during Operation Enduring Freedom. He viewed the U.S. rejection of NATO's offer of assistance as "a strategic error" (Clark, 2003, 126). "[T]he few weeks after 9/11 constituted a unique window through which the international community, international law, and the firm commitments of our NATO allies could have been fully engaged" (ibid.). However, according to Clark, the U.S. "squandered the chance to create a strong international coalition that could address the problems of terrorism comprehensively, beyond the limits of sheer U.S. military power" (ibid.).

Recreating the State of Afghanistan

From November 28 until December 12, 2001, the United Nations hosted the Bonn Conference in Germany. This was a meeting of representatives of the Afghan opposition factions, neighboring and other major countries involved in the situation in Afghanistan, organized by the United Nations Security Council. At the end the *Agreement on Provisional Arrangements in Afghanistan Pending the Re-establishment of Permanent Government Institutions*, briefly the *Bonn Agreement*, was concluded. As a result of the Bonn Agreement the *Afghan Interim Authority*, chaired by Hamid Karzai (Annex IV), was set up and an International Security Force (Annex I) was established. This multinational force, which was meant to guarantee the security and protection of the interim Administration in Afghanistan, was officially authorized by the United Nations through the United Nations Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 1386, on December 20, 2001. Whereas in the Bonn Agreement the multinational force was mentioned as *International Security Force*, in the UNSCR 1386 "[t]he word 'assistance' was inserted into this force's official title at US insistence to underscore the limited nature of its

mandate” (Dobbins 2009, 143). The mandate of *International Security Assistance Force (ISAF)* was further limited to a period of six months and to the geographic region of Kabul and its surrounding areas. The United Nations,

„Authorizes, as envisaged in Annex 1 to the Bonn Agreement, the establishment for 6 months of an International Security Assistance Force to assist the Afghan Interim Authority in the maintenance of security in Kabul and its surrounding areas, so that the Afghan Interim Authority as well as the personnel of the United Nations can operate in a secure environment.“ (UNSCR 1386, 2001, 2)

A letter of the British Foreign Secretary Jack Straw was attached to the UNSCR 1386 as an appendix that arranged the cooperation of ISAF and U.S. troops, which were not deployed in ISAF at the beginning. The reason for that were French and German worries that ISAF troops could be attached to U.S. troops operating in OEF (Krech, 2002, 126). More than 40 countries have been contributing to ISAF. Great Britain was the first nation to command ISAF for a period of six months. In June 2002, Turkey assumed command and after another six months ISAF was led by a German/Dutch corporate command. On August 11, 2003, NATO assumed command of the ISAF operation, putting an end to the six-month national rotations. The assumption of ISAF command by NATO was a big relief since it ended the struggle to find new nations to lead the operation and to set up new headquarters every six months (ISAF – International Security Assistance Force, 2010, [online]).

The UN mandate of ISAF was extended for another six months beyond June 6, 2002, through UNSCR 1413, and then for a year beyond December 20, 2002, through UNSCR 1444. Each of the two resolutions, UNSCR 1510 of October 13, 2003, and UNSCR 1563 of September 17, 2004, extended the mandate for another year. In addition, UNSCR 1510 put an end to the geographic limitation as the United Nations authorized the expansion of the mandate of ISAF in order “to support the Afghan Transitional Authority and its successors in the maintenance of security in areas of Afghanistan outside of Kabul and its environs“. It was only after the Iraq war in the fall of 2003 that the U.S. voted for an expansion of ISAF beyond its regional limitations. In the previous years the U.S. had continuously blocked negotiations on regional expansion of ISAF. Furthermore, in UNSCR 1510 the United Nations for the first time stressed the

need for cooperation between ISAF and OEF,

“*Acting* for these reasons under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations,

2. *Calls upon* the International Security Assistance Force to continue to work in close consultation with the Afghan Transitional Authority and its successors and the Special Representative of the Secretary-General as well as with the Operation Enduring Freedom Coalition in the implementation of the force mandate, and to report to the Security Council on the implementation of the measures set out in paragraph 1.”
(UNSCR 1510, 2003, 2)

1.3. The 2003 Iraq Crisis

The Issue of Iraq in the Bush Administrations

Whereas moderate policy advisors in Bush’s team, such as Secretary of State Colin Powell and National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice, did not regard Iraq as constituting a serious threat, Iraq had continuously been an issue for the Bush Administration since the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001. Due to its alleged programs on biological and chemical Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) Iraq was assumed to threaten international security. However, as expressed by Powell, Iraq did not constitute an imminent threat (Gordon et al., 2004, 93f). Several resolutions by the UN Security Council had forced Iraq to allow the UN weapons inspectors’ return after they had been expelled in 1998, and to give up its WMD programs and to disarm. The Iraqi dictator, Saddam Hussein, however, had messed about with the international community by complying with the resolutions as much as to prevent the Security Council members from using force and as little as to keep them discontented with Iraq’s disarmament process. Thus, Saddam Hussein’s tyrant regime had been a thorn in the U.S. flesh for years.

The extent of the terrorist attacks on September 11 was so vast that the U.S. could not imagine that they were carried out only by Osama bin Laden’s terrorist network *al Qaeda* and suspected state sponsorship behind the attacks as well. Iraq was the first guess by many policy advisors in the Bush Administration. As the members of the *9/11 Commission Report* found, also “President Bush had wondered immediately after the attack whether Saddam Hussein’s regime might

have had a hand in it” (Kean et al., 2002, 334). Both Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld and his Deputy Secretary Paul Wolfowitz were strongly in favor of attacking Iraq. Wolfowitz “argued that Iraq was ultimately the source of the terrorist problem and should be therefore attacked” (ibid., 335). Secretary of State Colin Powell, however, was skeptical about striking Iraq because there was (and would be) no proof of a link between the 9/11 terrorist attacks and Iraq as assumed by some in the Administration. Also President Bush had strong reservations concerning an invasion of Iraq. He feared that some neoconservative policy advisors in his team, in particular Vice President Richard Cheney and Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz, who had been part of his father’s Administration wanted to settle old accounts of the first Gulf War by finishing with Saddam Hussein¹² (Woodward, 2003, 102). Even though the neoconservatives in the Bush Administration lobbied hard for striking Iraq, the President decided not to invade Iraq right after the 9/11 terrorist attacks (Kean et. al., 2002, 335). However, Bush asked Rumsfeld later on, in November 2001, to set up a war plan for attacking Iraq and was briefed on it in February 2002 (Szabo, 2004, 20f). Thus, “the momentum toward a policy of confronting Iraq grew steadily over the course of the winter and spring of 2002” (Gordon et al., 2004, 95). When the U.S. could neither prove that Iraq was connected to the 9/11 attacks nor that there existed a link between Iraq and al Qaeda, the American justification of a military invasion of Iraq was centered on Iraq’s alleged possession of WMDs. As it turned out, however, the ultimate motivation for the war in Iraq, anticipated by some hawks in the Administration, was regime change.

Powell, who adhered to the realist (IR theories) camp in the Bush Administration and was never fully convinced of the invasion of Iraq, believed that the Department of Defense overestimated U.S. capabilities if it believed that the U.S. was able to fight two wars simultaneously. He pointed out that the U.S. needed coalition partners for an invasion of Iraq and that such coalition partners

¹² The first Gulf War (1990-1991) ended when Iraq annulled its annexation of Kuwait and had its troops rolled back. For George H. W. Bush, who was following a realist approach on foreign policy, the goal to release Kuwait had been achieved and therefore the U.S. engagement ended. Neoconservatives in the Bush father administration, however, also had wanted to achieve regime change in Iraq by toppling the tyrant Saddam Hussein. When the 9/11 terrorist attacks occurred, they saw their chance to finish the, in their eyes, undone business.

needed to be convinced of the urgency of attacking Iraq. Powell further believed a unilateral war against Iraq would be a big mistake and tried to convince the Administration to seek international assistance. On the other hand, Rumsfeld, a proponent of the neoconservative camp in the Bush Administration, had always been convinced that the war against terrorism had to be pursued at more than just one front. He believed in the unique military capabilities of the U.S. and saw no need for international assistance, even if the U.S. was to fight two wars at the same time. He saw no reason to convince allies of the need to fight Iraq since they would follow if only the U.S. showed decisive leadership. In case the traditional allies did not follow the U.S. in its execution of the mission, the coalition needed to be altered in order to accomplish the mission (Woodward, 2003, 202).

European Reactions: German-American Relations

Already in late September 2001, when German Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer and Wolfowitz met, the Deputy Secretary of Defense indicated that “after the Taliban was removed, the next goal would be the elimination of Saddam Hussein” (Szabo, 2004, 16). In his State of the Union speech on January 31, 2002, President Bush declared Iraq, in addition to Iran and North Korea, to be part of the so-called “axis of evil”. When German Chancellor Schröder met with President Bush in Washington some days after Bush’s State of the Union address, in February 2002, Schröder put forward four prerequisites concerning any German involvement in a war in Iraq, which were never to be met (ibid.):

- First, the alliance against terrorism in Afghanistan should not be affected by a military engagement in Iraq;
- Second, a link between Iraq and al Qaeda had to be proved;
- Third, the U.S. had to provide for an exit strategy before it started a war;
- Fourth, the war had to be fought under U.N. mandate

Three months later, on May 22/23, 2002, a meeting between Schröder and Bush took place in Berlin, which has been regarded as the last friendly encounter between the two. At the meeting both explicitly agreed that neither would raise the issue of a war with Iraq before the German elections on September 22, 2002. President Bush furthermore assured the German Chancellor that he would consult him on any decisions he would take on Iraq and that nothing would happen before

the German elections. However, the prospects of a war in Iraq mounted over the summer of 2002. On August 26, Cheney spoke to a veterans' group in Nashville, Tennessee, leaving the impression "that there was indeed going to be a preventive war" (ibid., 24) against Iraq. Schröder rating badly at the polls with his party and the SPD-Green coalition, took a decisive step for his campaign strategy over the summer months by picking up the issue of Iraq. Shortly after Cheney's speech, Schröder told an audience in Berlin that a strike on Iraq "was exactly the type of 'adventure' that Germans should have no part of" (ibid., 27). In response to the 9/11 terrorist attacks, the German Chancellor had repeatedly stated that Germany showed solidarity with the U.S. and that it would be willing to take risks in military engagements but was not ready for any military adventures. By playing the "anti-American card", Schröder was able to shift attention away from the domestic and economic problems Germany was facing. In addition, the strong opposition to the American Iraq policy enabled him to mobilize important electorates: the SPD and Green constituencies and the pacifists and nationalists of eastern Germany (ibid., 28).

President Bush felt personally betrayed by Schröder since he had broken his agreement not to raise the issue of Iraq on the hustings. Schröder, for his part, however, referring to Cheney's speech, claimed that it was the U.S. that had not kept its promise. Bush had not kept Germany informed about the developments concerning the U.S. policy on Iraq as agreed, instead Schröder had learnt about them via the media. Moreover, he argued that the promise not to raise the Iraq issue in the election campaign "was based on the goal of controlling WMD and not on the goal of regime change" (ibid., 26). Cheney's indication of a preventive war against Iraq was, however, based on regime change. The icing on the cake occurred in the last week of the campaign, when German Minister of Justice Herta Däubler-Gmelin mentioned President Bush and Adolf Hitler simultaneously in her remarks on Bush's Iraq policy.

In the end Schröder won the election by 6,000 votes, but the personal relationship between him and Bush had been severely damaged. Due to Bush's "highly personalized approach to foreign policy" (ibid., 32), the damage was somewhat greater in Washington than in Berlin though. Due to the international

and domestic environments in which the dispute occurred, the clash between the two leaders was even more divisive. The conflict between Schröder and Bush was largely due to Schröder's exploitation of the Iraq issue for his election campaign. However, Schröder's strong opposition to Bush's Iraq policy rose, according to some scholars, only partly out of electoral opportunism, for the other part he acted on principle. Nevertheless, Bush and his Administration team were also responsible for the clash between the two allies. The foreign policy style of the Bush Administration created anger against the American President in many European countries. Steve Erlanger asserts that "the German government simply capitalized on anti-Bush feelings, which were created by the Bush people themselves" (Steve Erlanger, quoted in Szabo, 2004, 33).

While personalities matter, Szabo (2004, 9) claims that "the Bush-Schröder clash was part of a longer tradition of disagreement between Germany and the United States" that had already started still in the 1990s. Furthermore, Pond (2004, 61) contends that "[t]he frost was partly personal, partly a matter of policy, partly a reflection of historical modesty still expected of Berlin". By historical modesty Pond refers to Germany's solidarity to the U.S. that has its source in the American support of the German state and its people in the immediate post-World War II period and throughout the later years of the 20th century. As a consequence, Germany developed a strong transatlantic orientation and has been very supportive of U.S. policies throughout the second half of the 20th century. Thus, Schröder's vehement opposition of the U.S. policy on Iraq surprised many in the Bush Administration.

European Reactions: French-American Relations

The French reactions to Cheney's August 26 speech and the growing momentum of striking Iraq were less extreme than the German reactions. Like Schröder, French President Jacques Chirac was opposed to a war in Iraq but he felt that a "categorical opposition similar to Germany's would only lead the United States to act without even making an attempt to revive the UN weapons inspections process" (Gordon et al., 2004, 104). The French Foreign Minister Dominique de Villepin denounced Iraq for not complying with UN weapons inspections and with the international rules set up by the Security Council.

Therefore, France would have accepted the use of force if Saddam Hussein had further defied the UN weapons inspections, as long as the decision was taken in the UN Security Council. However, any unilateral measures taken by the U.S. were strongly opposed by France. The key element of the French position was Chirac's proposal for two Security Council Resolutions. The first one was to be set up in order to allow the weapons inspectors to resume their inspections on the suspicion that Iraq possessed any WMD. In case Saddam Hussein prevented the inspections to proceed, a second resolution was to determine "if there should be or not an intervention" ("THREATS AND RESPONSES: PERSPECTIVES/Jacques Chirac; French Leader Offers America Both Friendship and Criticism", 2002, September 9, [online]). The chance that France would eventually support the use of force and war in Iraq, helped to persuade Bush to seek a new U.N. Security Council resolution concerning the return of weapons inspectors (Gordon et al., 2004, 105). Many Americans perceived the French position as France playing its usual role "as a difficult and contentious ally, but in the end, it will not stop the concerted will of America and Britain" (Holbrooke, 2002, August 27, A15).

The Paris-Berlin-Moscow Axis

President Chirac and Chancellor Schröder, being both opposed to an invasion into Iraq, aligned with each other against Bush's war policy. As a result of the German-Franco alignment the question arose as to whether Germany's move toward Paris represented "a longer-term historical change in German foreign policy" (Szabo, 2004, 50). Instead of following the ever since pursued transatlantic orientation in German foreign policy, "Chancellor Schröder seem[ed] to have come to the view that Germany must help construct a Europe whose power can balance that of the United States" (ibid., 50). In this context Christian Hacke, argues "that this approach represent[ed] a shift from the continuity of an Atlanticist perspective to a new Carolingian one based on the Europe of Charlemagne, which rested on a Franco-German base" (ibid. quoted in Hacke, 2003, 13).

Furthermore, Russian President Vladimir Putin joined the German-Franco anti-war couple causing news headlines, which talked about the French-German-Russian alliance that aligned against the United States. The heads of government

further fueled the situation by arranging demonstrative mini-summits between their countries. The first of such summits took place in April 2003 when Putin invited Schröder and Chirac to St. Petersburg. It was followed by further summits taking place over the course of the following years. The “re-newed” alliance between France, Germany and Russia raised fears in Eastern European countries as they felt reminded of past alliances between these countries during the 19th and 20th century. The conditions for the Eastern European countries in such constellations were normally not beneficial as they were absorbed by or, as in the case of Poland, split between Germany and Russia.

Apart from cooperation with Russia, French President Chirac and German Chancellor Schröder also took into consideration to cooperate with China. However, it did not take long until Schröder and Chirac figured out that it was almost impossible to cooperate with Russia and China in the same way as they did with the United States. As former Director of Research at the “Center on the United States and Europe” at the Brookings Institution, Jeremy Shapiro, analyzed,

“It’s a totally different world and the Russians and Chinese were not interested in the French or the Germans, they weren’t, they did not have the same sort of frame of reference in terms of world order and legalism and, you know, support of the UN. They couldn’t have had that sort of a discussion. Whereas with the United States, even if they did not like the outcome of the discussion, but they could have had it.” (Shapiro, personal interview, August 4, 2009)

The struggle at the United Nations

On November 8, 2002, the U.N. Security Council passed UNSCR 1441 by a unanimous vote of 15-0 and achieved the return of weapons inspectors to Iraq. The language of the resolution, however, was a compromise of U.S.-British and French diplomatic exchanges that had happened over the course of the previous six weeks. It allowed for diverging interpretations by the Security Council members and did not represent a united international position on Iraq. The ambiguity of UNSCR 1441 was expressed by John Negroponte, the U.S. ambassador to the United Nations, when he explained, “If the Security Council fails to act decisively in the event of further Iraqi violations, this resolution does not constrain any member state from acting to defend itself against the threat

posed by Iraq or to enforce relevant United Nations resolutions and protect world peace and security” (“Diplomatic License”, 2002, November 9, [online]). According to the U.S. interpretation of UNSCR 1441, Iraq’s noncompliance with the resolution already authorized Washington to the use of force. In contrast, according to the French interpretation of UNSCR 1441, the use of force against Iraq could only be authorized by the Security Council, which would make its decision based on a report by the weapons inspectors. Thus, France did not accept the automaticity of the use of force if Iraq did not cooperate, which was inherent in the interpretation of the resolution by the U.S., and expected the Security Council to convene in case of Iraq’s noncompliance. As Gordon et al. (2004, 113f) stated, the resolution “provided a useful mechanism for dealing with the scenarios of either blatant noncompliance or full compliance”, but it “failed to establish an agreed mechanism if members of the Security Council disagreed over whether Saddam’s actions constituted compliance”. Thus, the members of the Security Council did not only disagree on the consequences of noncompliance, they also disagreed on what constituted noncompliance. The United States did not accept anything less than full compliance. On the contrary, the French “had never expected full cooperation” but considered “70 percent a reasonable [...] level of cooperation” to be expected by Saddam Hussein (ibid., 143). In addition, UNSCR 1441 did not contain any benchmarks by which to measure the level of compliance.

After Chirac’s diplomatic advisor, Maurice Gourdault-Montagne, had returned from a meeting with National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice, Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz and Deputy Secretary of State Richard Armitage in Washington on January 13/14, 2003, he told the French President that he now believed the U.S. would invade Iraq no matter what happened. Moreover, the massive troop deployment in the neighboring countries of Iraq, by mid-January the Pentagon had deployed more than 100,000 troops in that region (ibid., 124), indicated that war in Iraq had become inevitable. When by January 2003 the Europeans had given up all hope of avoiding war, the French opposition “had become a matter of principle – and of politics” (ibid., 146). Many Americans later accused France of never having considered the use of force against Iraq as a serious option. Even though the French favored the containment of Saddam

Hussein over toppling him by a military intervention, Gordon et al. (2004, 142) claim that it was probably not the case that Chirac opposed the military option from the beginning. On January 7, 2003, in his speech to the army the French President, mentioning UNSCR 1441, urged the French soldiers “to be ready for any eventuality” (Discours de M. Jacques Chirac, 2003, January 7). Moreover, Chirac had dispatched a general to Washington in order to discuss “a potential French contribution of some 15,000 troops, 100 airplanes, and use of significant naval assets, including an aircraft carrier group in case of French military participation in Iraq” (ibid.). Thus, France was ready to participate and support war in Iraq but only under certain conditions which included blatant noncompliance by Iraq. Since Saddam Hussein, however, pressured by UNSCR 1441, showed at least some cooperation with the weapons inspectors, the French opted for the policy of containment, which was also politically more popular in Europe (ibid.).

While the French were not the only ones skeptical if the U.S. would accept Iraqi compliance with UNSCR 1441, even if Iraq disarmed, the United States, on the other hand, was less willing to back away from its decision to invade Iraq. Regime change in Iraq, which had been the goal of the neoconservatives in the Bush Administration for more than a decade, was pursued no matter what the result of the report of the weapons inspections said. While this is impossible to be known for sure, some activities that “had begun even while the UN inspections were still under way” (Clark, 2003, 12), give strong indication of the immovable position of the U.S. The CIA, for example, had inserted teams of paramilitary operatives into Iraq in order to contact dissident groups and leaflets were dropped “long before the anticipated beginning of the military action” (ibid.). The more troops the U.S. deployed to the region around Iraq, the more costly it became to withdraw all those deployed forces. Moreover, the less possible it became for the U.S. to change from a policy of invasion to one of containment since it would put great harm to its credibility. In addition, the U.S. came under pressure to act if it wanted to go to war in Iraq and avoid fighting in the heat of the summer months.

The U.S. did not want to risk delaying the invasion of Iraq for several weeks by forging a second resolution at the U.N. Security Council. Apart from that, according to its interpretation of UNSCR 1441, the U.S. also viewed devising a

second resolution at the U.N. Security Council unnecessary. Nevertheless, for the war in Iraq, Bush needed the United Kingdom to come along. Tony Blair, however, needed a second U.N. resolution to support the war because in December 2002 he had promised his public to only go to war with U.N. approval. Thus, in February 2003, the U.S. began pursuing a second resolution to assist Blair's Great Britain to come along. The French, who had argued for a second resolution from the start, now lobbied hard against a second resolution. They were unwilling to retreat from their opposition to war but did not want to veto a U.S.-supported resolution either, which they had done for the last time in 1956 (Gordon et al., 2004, 148). The solution for Bush, Blair and Chirac, but also for the nonpermanent members of the Security Council, who had been lobbied hard by France and the U.S. to vote either against or for a second resolution, came on March 10. In a televised interview Jacques Chirac declared "that France would veto any new ultimatum to Iraq" (ibid., 152) no matter what the circumstances were. This enabled Blair to argue in front of the British public that it was impossible to achieve U.N. approval for the war against Iraq since France would bloc any new resolution. Only ten days after Chirac's interview the war in Iraq began.

The Conduct of Operation Iraqi Freedom

After the 48 hours-ultimatum on March 17 that President Bush gave the Iraqi dictator to go into exile had lapsed, the invasion of Iraq started in the morning of March 20, 2003. The war was fought without U.N. mandate, which raised serious legal questions not only about launching the war in Iraq but also about the Bush doctrine of preemptive war. In September 2004, this would lead former U.N. General Secretary Kofi Annan to regard the invasion of Iraq as illegal: "I have indicated it was not in conformity with the UN charter from our point of view, from the charter point of view, it was illegal" ("Iraq War Illegal, Says Annan", 2004, September 14). Annoyed by the struggle at the United Nations and upset about the Europeans' unwillingness to go to war with Iraq, the United States formed a "coalition of the willing". As in the war in Afghanistan, with the "coalition of the willing" the U.S. again ignored all other institutionalized patterns of coalition building. However, whereas the anti-terror alliance in the war in Afghanistan developed out of spontaneous acts of solidarity with the U.S., the ad-hoc coalition

for the war in Iraq was pursued by Bush's "divide and conquer" strategy. Six out of the EU-15 countries and 13 out of the EU-25 countries fought in the so-called "coalition of the willing". In comparison, all of the EU-15 countries and 23 out of the EU-25, excluding Malta and Cyprus, had been supporting the Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan. France, Germany, Belgium, Luxembourg, Sweden, Finland, Ireland, Greece and Austria (EU-15) and Slovenia (EU-25), all countries that had assisted the mission in Afghanistan in some way, were not in any way participating in the operations in Iraq (GlobalSecurity.org, 2009, [online]).

This split in support of the Iraq war was the consequence of Bush's disaggregation policy pursued toward Europe. Even though the Bush Administration could later claim to have been supported by the majority of the EU-25 countries, back in 2003 it was not able to convince half of the EU-15 member countries of the necessity of a war in Iraq. Furthermore, public opinion in almost all European countries, also in the ones that contributed to the "coalition of the willing", strongly opposed the war in Iraq. When, on April 11, Hussein's home town *Tikrit* fell, the invasion phase was assumed to have come to an end. On May 1, President Bush officially "declared an end to substantial combat activities" (Clark, 2003, 87). The brief period of combat operations, with the major objectives of the invasion having been achieved after three weeks, while simultaneously being engaged in another war in Afghanistan, convinced the United States of its unique capabilities of a lonely superpower. However, this impression was soon to change when the looming troubles of post-war reconstruction emerged. Even when combat operations had ended by summer 2003, the United States refused to cede significant authority to the United Nations or any other international institution. This, however, "was critical if governments in Europe were to provide forces and resources to assist postwar efforts" (ibid., 92). Thus, the antiwar coalition of Germany, France and Russia blocked any U.S. attempts at the U.N. to gain assistance for the postwar reconstruction efforts (Szabo, 2004, 47).

Whereas Germany publicly and officially opposed the war in Iraq vehemently, it indirectly assisted the United States in its operations in Iraq considerably. As Pond (2004, 74) found, referring to Spanish Prime Minister José María Aznar and to German Chancellor Gerhard Schröder, "[i]ronically, the

Spanish fan of Bush contributed far less to support the war than did the German opponent of Bush". Germany did not participate in the Iraq War but it fulfilled its NATO commitments at great length. The German government granted the United States the use of German airspace and the unconstrained use of U.S. bases in Germany while even providing security for American soldiers. German soldiers participated in AWACS surveillance flights in the Turkish region and 2,600 troops were assigned to guard American military installations in Germany in order to release American soldiers for the combat operations in Iraq. Germany further loaned Patriot antimissile systems and armored Fuchs biological and chemical weapons detectors and decontaminators to Israel in case Saddam Hussein would strike Israel in an act of revenge for the U.S.-led invasion of Iraq. It also left in place all the Fuchs weapons detectors and decontaminators in Kuwait that Schröder had threaten to withdraw. It sent Patriots to Turkey in case the combat operations would draw the NATO ally Turkey into the Iraq war. In addition, Germany increased its military role in Afghanistan and assumed command of ISAF forces in February 2003 (Pond, 2004, 65; Szabo, 2004, 44). Thus, "Germany's political and diplomatic opposition to the war did not impede its military cooperation in efforts outside Iraq" (Szabo, 2004, 44).

1.4. Postwar Reconciliation

Repairing the relations with Europe was not a priority issue for the Bush Administration at first. It actually had a very low ranking in Bush's hierarchy of concerns. The maxim of how to deal with the defected European allies was expressed by the famous slogan "punish France, ignore Germany, and forgive Russia" (Gordon, September/October 2007, [online]). This formula was reported to have been suggested in policymaking councils by National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice in spring 2003. As then-Senior Fellow at the Brookings Institution Philip H. Gordon analyzed, "Rice never officially acknowledged using these words, but they did seem to describe the Bush Administration's policies as it sought to deal with continental Europe's three major powers during the first Bush term" (ibid.).

German-American Reconciliation

To start with Germany, the Bush Administration not only ignored Germany for half a year after the outbreak of the Iraq war but had pursued this policy already since summer/fall of 2002. After Schröder had won the German national elections in September 2002, he wanted to repair the relations with the United States. However, the White House did not allow U.S. officials to respond to German signs of reconciliation. At the meeting of NATO defense ministers in Warsaw on September 24/25, 2002, U.S. Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld received orders from the White House not to talk to German Defense Minister Peter Struck. Also, the idea of having a private meeting of the American President and the German Chancellor at the NATO session in Prague two months later, in November, was instantly turned down. The German government, in its endeavor to try to repair the relationship, kept on with its efforts by taking command of ISAF in Afghanistan, by granting the U.S. the unrestricted use of German airbases in the event of war, and by supplying Israel with Patriot missiles. Nevertheless, it was only on September 24, 2003, a year after the German elections, when U.S.-German relations had become even more troubled, that the two heads of government met for a private conversation. The meeting, however, took place in the course of a session of the United Nations General Assembly and was the first mini-summit Bush and Schröder had had since their last meeting in May 2002. Thus, the two leaders had not talked privately to each other for more than a year. The talks lasted for forty minutes, ten minutes longer than originally intended, and “suggested a modulation in the White House maxim from ignoring the Germans to tolerating them” (Pond, 2004, 94).

When Bush finally welcomed Schröder at the White House on February 27, 2004, the crisis between the two leaders was regarded as formally settled. The diplomatic exchange produced a joint statement by the American President and the German Chancellor on “The German-American Alliance for the 21st Century”, in which the two leaders renewed their determination to work together. Bush, at the subsequent press conference, declared that “we have both committed to put the differences behind us and move forward. Germany is an important nation. [...] And it’s essential that America have good relations with Europe” (President Bush

Welcomes German Chancellor Schroeder to White House, 2004, February 27). He also acknowledged the German military presence in Afghanistan in his remarks.

Both meetings were, however, overshadowed by the deep and highly personal rift between the two heads of government. On June 8-10, 2004, in the course of the G8 Summit on Sea Island, in Georgia, another diplomatic exchange between Schröder and Bush took place, which was far more comfortable than the previous two. President Bush called the German Chancellor again by his first name. In a background briefing a senior administration official characterized the meeting as “a very good and positive exchange” and asserted that “the two leaders are clearly on a rapidly converging path with respect to Iraq” (Briefing on Meeting with German Chancellor Schroeder, 2004, June 8). The U.S. understood that German troops would not be going to Iraq and respected Germany’s position (*ibid.*). However, even though the U.S. official emphasized three times that it had been the warmest meeting between the two leaders since 2003 (*ibid.*), it was not until 2005 that the relations between these two allies really started recovering. The repair of the damage was started by Bush in 2004, when the situation in Iraq and Afghanistan deteriorated but because he faced presidential elections that fall, it became apparent only in 2005.

French-American Reconciliation

Concerning French-American relations, the Bush Administration sought to punish the French in several ways. In particular, the Pentagon took some actions to humiliate the French for their lack of loyalty to the U.S. It “banned high-level U.S. military participation in the annual Paris Air Show and lobbied defense industry executives not to attend the show” (Gordon et al., 2004, 172). Furthermore, it disinvited French officials from Red Flag, a major U.S. military exercise in which the French had participated for decades. Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld did not invite the chief of the French air staff to participate in a U.S.-hosted conference of air force commanders and prohibited U.S. officials from any telephone contacts with their French counterparts. In addition, in Congressional cafeterias French fries were renamed into “Freedom fries” and on board of Air Force One French toast was changed into “Freedom toast” (*ibid.*).

Secretary of State Colin Powell felt uncomfortable with the Defense Department's reactions and "wrote a memo saying that punishing the French was not U.S. policy" (Priest, 2005, July 3). While the State Department and the CIA lobbied against this aggressive policy toward France, Rumsfeld even a year later still prevented the French Air Force from participating in the Red Flag operation of 2004. Despite these humiliating acts by the Pentagon, relations between the intelligence services in France and the U.S. were not affected by the transatlantic dispute over Iraq since cooperation in this field was too vital to be risked by a diplomatic uneasiness of the heads of government (ibid.).

In contrast to Schröder, Bush and Chirac had a private meeting that took place in the course of the G8 Summit in Evian on June 2, 2003. In his remarks President Bush, in reference to the dispute over the Iraq war, claimed that he understood the French President's position. He furthermore emphasized that Chirac "made it [France's position about Iraq invasion] very clear to me in the very beginning" and that "[t]here was no question where Jacques Chirac stood" (President Bush Meets with French President Chirac, 2003). This was meant to be as a rebuke of German Chancellor Gerhard Schröder who failed to make his position clear to the American President from the beginning and then turned to categorical opposition against the U.S. Yet, in spite of the conversation between the two Presidents at the G8 Summit, similar to the German-American relationship, the repair of the relations between France and the United States was seriously pursued but became apparent only in 2005.

Russia

For the sake of completeness, only some brief comments on the policy towards Russia are to be given, as it is not part of the research outline of the thesis. Not only did President Bush take the trouble to travel to St. Petersburg for a private meeting with the Russian President, Vladimir Putin, on June 1, 2003, but he also invited Putin to a two-day reception at Camp David (Pond, 2004, 94). This special treatment stands in no relation to the 40 minutes' talk with German Chancellor Gerhard Schröder at the UN General Assembly in New York in 2003. Thus, the policy toward Russia was the softest of all Bush pursued toward the defected three of the Paris-Berlin-Moscow axis. Jim Hoagland, however, in a

column for the Washington Post urged Bush to “pause before absolving Vladimir Putin alone, especially after the Russian President's sarcastic attacks Friday on the U.S. war effort as ‘some new form of colonialism’” (Hoagland, 2003, April 13).

2. Transatlantic Rapprochement: George W. Bush's Second Term

When asked about the reasons for the rapprochement that occurred in the second term of the Bush administration, there were primarily two answers laid out in the interviews. One argumentation was that the elite opinion and the American public “were not with the administration” (Hamilton, p.i., 11/10/2009) on the way it pursued its policies. The American public, which is generally very multilateralist and “always favors strong relations with Europe” (Hamilton, p.i., 11/10/2009), wanted the U.S. to again work with its allies in the world and “turned against this idea that you could do things just on your own” (ibid.). In addition, “the Washington world” (ibid.), representing the academic elite opinion shaped by universities and think tanks, also largely turned against the neoconservative strategy of spreading democracy and freedom around the world by an assertive use of military force in a unilateral way. Thus, the elite and public opinion exerted pressure on the administration, which expressed itself in deteriorating approval ratings of the President and his administration. The other argumentation was that things in the world, especially in wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, were going badly (Shapiro, personal interview (p.i.), August 4, 2009, Hamilton, p.i., 11/10/2009, Goldgeier, p.i., 11/8/2009). U.S. President George W. Bush realized that “he needed to reach out [to the Europeans] in the second term” (Goldgeier, p.i., 11/8/2009) as the U.S. was not capable to manage the deteriorating situations by herself. As a consequence Europe and the U.S. “naturally looked to each other” (Shapiro, p.i., 8/4/2009).

These inputs gained in the exploratory interviews have been subject to an elaborated study pursued by an extensive literature review. The results will be presented in the following pages of this chapter. It is argued that both argumentations presented above resulted in a rearrangement of the personnel of the second Bush administration, its policies, and its style of the foreign policy and were the main reasons for the rapprochement pursued by the U.S. in the years from 2005 to 2008. Throughout the thesis, however, more attention is given to the

second argumentation as the paper focuses on the U.S.-German and U.S.-French relations in the field of foreign and security policy. Whereas it was the U.S. who initiated the rapprochement, it also needed the European disposition. Hence, it is further argued that there were also changes in the personnel of the German and French governments, their policies and their approaches to cooperate with the U.S. that had their share in the rapprochement.

2.1. U.S. Foreign Policy during the Bush Administration's Second Term

At his inaugural speech President Bush was overwhelmingly confident that he had enough political capital that his second-term would differ from the ones of preceding Presidents. Yet, in 2005, Bush experienced his probably worst year of his presidency with approval ratings reaching an unprecedented low. As a consequence, centrist policies and a toned down rhetoric ruled Bush's sixth year. In 2007, he even "reached out to the Democrats on domestic policy" (Greenstein, 2007, 60f). Thus, while pragmatism found its way back into American policy making and the Bush Administration in a way abandoned the hard-lined unilateral approach on foreign policy, it would be wrong to see a fundamental rearrangement of mindset in Bush's second term (Gärtner, 2009, 41). While "[i]deology is not dead [...], it is ideology without a military edge" (Sanger, 2007, 86). The overarching theme in U.S. foreign policy during Bush's second term was to learn "to live within the limits of American power" (Robbins, 2007, 91).

"Second Term Blues"

President's second terms are usually less successful than their first terms and the expression "Second Term Blues", used by Fortier & Ornstein as the title of their book, very well expresses the mood inherent in second terms. Fortier & Ornstein (2007, 2ff) list several characteristics that account for this phenomenon: hubris, lack of new ideas, scandals (even though most scandals began in the first term but were successfully covered up in order to enable reelection and leaked in the second term), party infighting, salvation abroad, and mid-term election losses.

Even though, at his inaugural speech, President Bush argued that he would use his “political capital” in order to pursue a second term different from the precedents of previous second-term Presidents, nearly all symptoms applied to his second term (ibid., 1). Bush’s confidence in winning reelection led to expectations that clearly exceeded the reality. In particular, when Bush turned to pursuing domestic policy issues, he largely overestimated his possibilities. As Magliocca (2009, 489f) analyzes, “the transformative freedom that Bush had in security matters probably spilled over into the domestic real”. Thus, Bush thought he could achieve Social Security reform or Immigration reform with similar support by the Congress and the American people as his foreign policy accomplishments in Afghanistan and Iraq. His failed domestic policy initiatives resulted in a blow to his leadership. Furthermore, the “perception of strength of leadership also waned because the president was not decisive in responding to Hurricane Katrina” (Frontier et al., 2007, 7). Katrina demolished large parts of support of Bush’s presidency in the second term. As Zaborowski (2006, 223) claims, “the inadequacy of the federal response and especially the failure to evacuate early the 20,000 people trapped in Louisiana Superdome have damaged the myth of the invincibility of American armed forces and of the President himself”. Zaborowski sees Iraq, Katrina, and a crisis of confidence as the three developments that mostly contributed to the transatlantic rapprochement on the U.S. side.

Like Reagan’s and Clinton’s, also George W. Bush’s second term was plagued by scandals. In October 2005, in the course of his investigations concerning the disclosure of CIA agent Valerie Plame, Special Prosecutor Patrick Fitzgerald indicted Vice President Cheney’s Chief of Staff, I. Lewis “Scooter” Libby, who resigned as a consequence. Libby’s indictment resulted in a serious image damage of Cheney’s office, which affected Cheney’s influence within the administration negatively. In addition, other scandals of Republican House members “proved terribly damaging politically in the midterm elections” (Balz, 2007, 24) in 2006. As expected, the Republican Party experienced terrible losses at these elections.

Party infighting also occurred in Bush's second term. Despite the uniformity and political homogeneity pursued by Bush, "[t]he Republican coalition fractured on immigration, spending, and social issues" (ibid., 18) and "cracks began to appear among the neoconservatives" (Pond, 2004, 95). In addition, the Democratic opposition regained its strength and was willing to challenge the President so that "[b]y early 2005 Democrats were ready for a fight" (Balz, 2007, 28). Moreover, not only were the Democrats criticizing Bush for the Iraq War, but also the Republicans exerted pressure on President Bush to redesign his Iraq policy. Calls from Republicans to withdraw U.S. troops from Iraq were cumulating in Bush's second term. Conversely to the first-term Congress that had followed Bush no matter what he did in foreign policy, during the second term the Republican Congress was willing "to oppose a president of its own" (Fortier et al., 2007, 11) and "to exert its power and authority" (Johnson et al., 2006, 11) again.

Concerning the "salvation abroad" as a characteristic of second terms, Bush did not follow the pattern normally pursued by U.S. Presidents. Unlike achieving domestic policy issues in the first term and sealing his legacy with foreign policy accomplishments in the second term (Fortier et al., 2007, 6), Bush's presidency proceeded in the opposite way. External events, in particular the September 11 terrorist attacks, resulted in a first-term agenda dominated by foreign policy where no space was left for domestic policy issues. The latter were pursued in the second term, resulting in a distraction from the foreign policy projects that had been started in first term. As a result, instead of achieving great success with his foreign policy initiatives, Bush received a lot of criticism as the conditions in the conflicts abroad deteriorated. Thus, his success was limited to the improvement of diplomatic relations, in particular with France, Germany and Russia.

In 2004, President George W. Bush's approval ratings were around 50% and he was thus "running for reelection with only a modest level of public support" (Greenstein, 2007, 54). Nevertheless, Bush won the 2004 presidential elections with 50.7% majority of the popular vote (ibid., 55). However, within weeks after his successful reelection his approval ratings slipped below 50%. Bush's decline in public support, which resulted in a drain on his power, did not only continue but

was also most visible in 2005. In June 2005, disapproval ratings of Bush's job performance exceeded his approval ratings (ibid., 57f). In October, his approval ratings reached a new low when they fell below 40% (Balz, 2007, 20). As a result of "the damage inflicted by Iraq, Social Security, gasoline prices, Katrina, the embarrassment of scuttled Supreme Court nomination Harriet Miers, and the CIA leak investigation" Bush's "approval ratings had plummeted into the 30s" (ibid., 35) by the end of 2005. For all the negative events that had happened and Bush's further decline in public support this first year of Bush's second term became known as *annus horribilis* (ibid., 18). The Bush Administration hit the rock bottom of its downslide at the midterm elections in 2006 when the Republicans lost 30 seats in the House of Representatives and six seats in the Senate to the Democrats.

Changes in the Personnel

Second terms represent a possibility for the President to change structures and personnel of his administration. As a consequence, within the first year of the second term, there normally appears something referred to as *shakeup*. Concerning the White House structure, President George W. Bush only "made minimal organizational changes" (Patterson, 2006, 54). Similarly, Bush did not attempt to "reorganize his personal White House staff [...] to any major extent" (ibid., 61). However, considerable changes occurred within his Cabinet personnel. Six cabinet officers announced their resignations within the first two weeks of Bush's reelection and three more did so in the following three weeks. Altogether the nine Cabinet members that resigned in 2004 produced the first major shake-up of the White House. The second major shake-up happened when Joshua Bolton succeeded Andrew Card, who had resigned as White House Chief of Staff at the end of March 2006. Bolton was expected to be the fresh face that should "get the beleaguered White House back on track" (Stolberg, 2006, June 19 [online]). Following Bolton's nomination, three heads of departments resigned and some other changes occurred. Thus, "[w]ithin the first eighteen months of Bush's second term there were to be twelve resignations of cabinet members" (Greenstein, 2007, 56). Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, one of the three remaining cabinet officers, followed many calls by the military and the public and resigned a day after the midterm elections on November 8, 2006. The other two

cabinet officers survived both White House shake-ups while, however, only one of them served throughout both terms from 2001 to 2009. Thus, compared with the Clinton administrations, a lot of changes took place and there was only little continuity from the first to the second term of the Bush administration.

Despite the numerous changes, no new faces were added to the decision-making unit. President Bush pursued the strategy of moving his White House advisers to the Cabinet “in order to tighten his control over the policy-making process” (Lesch, 2006, 221). The most noteworthy appointments were the following three:

- Former National Security Council Advisor, Condoleezza Rice, replaced Colin Powell as Secretary of State. Her appointment was to ease the conflict between the Department of State and the Department of Defense that had been exacerbated by the ideological differences of Rumsfeld and Powell. Rice’s Undersecretary became the former NSC Director, Robert Joseph, with whom three other members of the NSC staff were sent to the State Department.
- Former White House Counsel Alberto Gonzales followed John Ashcroft as Attorney General. Together with Gonzales three senior members of the Counsel’s staff moved to the Department of Justice.
- Former White House Domestic Policy Council chief Margaret Spellings became Secretary of Education, following Rod Paige (Patterson, 2006, 52).

Moving White House staff to the cabinet is not new; “there is clearly precedent in recent second-term administrations” (Warshaw, 2006, 75). However, moving *three* members of the White House senior staff into leadership positions of departments *at the same time* is quite exceptional. The motivation behind those recruitments is without doubt “that the president’s policies and positions are more certain to be incorporated into departmental perspectives” (Patterson, 2006, 52). Washington Post columnist David S. Broder expressed Patterson’s academic analysis more pointedly, “the president has assured himself that the lines of authority to the Oval Office will be unchallenged and that his wishes will be seen as commands” (Broder, 2004, December 15).

Most of the second-term appointments were from the conservative ranks of the Republican Party and, above all, loyal to the President. Thus, identical to the first-term cabinet, the building up strategy for the second term was to pursue uniformity and political homogeneity. One of the major differences between the two cabinets was “the absence of moderates in the [second] cabinet” (Warshaw, 2006, 77). With Colin Powell and Tom Ridge leaving, Democratic holdover Norman Mineta was the only exception in the conservative, loyalist, Republican cabinet team. It was only in 2006, when Robert Gates replaced Donald Rumsfeld as Secretary of Defense that a moderate Republican was again part of the President’s cabinet. While the failure to add new faces to the DMU shortened the administration’s learning curve (Johnson et al., 2006, 12), the increase of conservatives and loyalists in the second-term cabinet further narrowed the focus in the decision-making structures.

Furthermore, Bush’s restructuring process of the Cabinet caused quite a stir as he undertook some controversial appointments. Among them were Alberto Gonzales, who held a controversially narrow definition of torture, Condoleezza Rice, who had been criticized for her Iraq policy, Peter Goss, who had been appointed as Director of Intelligence and “ensured that the White House would tame the CIA” and “would receive only the information and conclusions that Bush wanted to hear” (Lesch, 2006, 224), John D. Negroponte as director of the new national intelligence office, who had been in charge of the Contra operations against the Sandinista government in Nicaragua in the 1980s, and John Bolton as Ambassador to the United Nations, who “had exacerbated tensions with North Korea” (ibid.). Another controversial appointment, though not within the administration, was Paul Wolfowitz’s nomination as President of the World Bank.

Notwithstanding the Bush administration’s failure to add new faces and its controversial appointments, it adopted a “modified approach to foreign policy” (Gordon, 2006, [online]) as many of those closely associated with the neoconservative ideology, amongst the most prominent Wolfowitz, Feith, and Bolton, were replaced by “pragmatists such as Deputy Secretary of State Robert Zoellick, Undersecretary of State Nicholas Burns, and North Korea negotiator Christopher Hill” (ibid.). In particular the replacement of Secretary of State Colin

Powell by Condoleezza Rice was a decisive factor for the repair of the relations between the U.S. and Europe (Lequesne, 2007, 10). This was not so much reasoned by Powell's ideology since he was regarded as one of the few moderates in Bush's first administration team. It was more that "Rice's travel schedule [...] indicated a greater effort to reach out to allies than that of the supposedly multilateralist Powell" (Gordon, 2006, [online]). Compared to Powell's 12 trips to 37 countries that he took in 2001, Rice took 19 trips to 49 countries in her first year and spent 70 percent of her time abroad in Europe (ibid.). Furthermore, Rice, again adopting a more realist approach to foreign policy in Bush's second term, was one of the driving forces of what Gordon describes as the "counterrevolution". By this term he refers to the modified approach to foreign policy in the years from 2005-2008, which was based on more realist principles and countered the neoconservative revolution of the first term. The new tone and style that characterized the foreign policy of Bush's second term was apparent in Rice's confirmation hearing as newly appointed Secretary of State when she stated that "the time for diplomacy is now" (ibid.). Thus, when Rice went to Paris even before Bush's visit of the institutions of the European Union on February 8, 2005, she won a decent hearing (Lewis, 2005, 21).

Changes in the Policies

However, President Bush did not only undertake personnel changes, he also altered his policies. The War on terrorism had prevented President Bush from pursuing his domestic policy agenda in the first term, which he wanted to catch up with in the second term. Since the situation in Iraq seemed to improve at the beginning of his second term, Bush decided to turn away from Iraq and to Social Security reform (Balz, 2007, 26). In addition to Social Security he ambitiously pursued other domestic policy issues, such as tax reform and immigration reform (Greenstein, 2007, 59). Yet, these domestic policy initiatives remained largely unsuccessful.

Furthermore, the U.S. administration also changed its foreign policy and reviewed its points of view towards Iran and North Korea. While in his State of the Union Address, in 2002, President Bush had called North Korea and Iran members of the "axis of evil", "the administration cautiously was backing

multilateral negotiations – while also pressing for Security Council sanctions – to try to roll back both countries' nuclear programs" (Robbins, 2007, 92). As Nye (2006, [online]) analyzes, "The shift has been more than rhetorical: Bush's diplomacy toward North Korea and Iran has recently been much more multilateral than it was during his first term". U.S. diplomats who had been prohibited to maintain any contacts in the first term, were then allowed to resume bi- and multilateral negotiations with these two countries. U.S. diplomat William Burns met with the EU High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, Javier Solana, and an Irani official in July 2008. Condoleezza Rice met with the North Korean Foreign Minister in the same month. And the U.S. joined the multilateral talks with North Korea and, against the opposition of the neoconservatives, negotiated an agreement on the dismantling of North Korea's nuclear weapons (Robbins, 2007, 92; Gärtner, 2009, 18f).

The shift in Bush's Iran and North Korea policies has, for a big part, been reasoned by the overstretched military of the United States, which will be dealt with in greater detail in the following chapters IV.2.2. and IV.2.3. In his second term, the Bush administration realized that Iran and North Korea represent far more dangerous nuclear threats than Iraq. However, being tied up in Iraq as well as in Afghanistan, "the United States could not risk a confrontation over North Korean [or Iranian] nuclear ambitions" (Sanger, 2007, 81). Of course, the political elites in Iran and North Korea realized that the U.S. had its hands tied and continued with their nuclear programs. Thus, the U.S. lost its "credible threat of coercion" (ibid., 82) against these two countries.

Resume

While some scholars argue for continuity in the Bush presidency, the above presented analysis of the Bush administration's second term offers support for notion of a change from the first term. Arguments for this thesis can be found in all three preceding sub-chapters. First, the typical second-term characteristics caught up with President George W. Bush and affected his way of governing. Scandals within the administration and of Republican Congressmen as well, party infighting and friction in Bush's coalition, a strengthened Democratic opposition, and the mishandling of hurricane Katrina had a negative impact on Bush's public

support. In a weakened leadership position, President Bush was unable to govern in the same way as he used to in his first term when his approval ratings ranked high. He had to make compromises and focus more on pragmatism.

Second, the personnel changes that President Bush undertook further impacted his governing style. The most important change in this respect was Condoleezza Rice, who, as Secretary of State, pursued an aggressive public diplomacy campaign. It is considered unlikely that she would have done the same, had she stayed in the National Security Council. Moreover, while Bush made controversial appointments, a lot of neoconservative ideologues, Paul Wolfowitz and I. Lewis “Scooter” Libby amongst the most prominent, were gone in the second term. The last hardliner, Donald Rumsfeld, was replaced in 2006 by the moderate Republican Robert Gates.

Third, the impacts of the characteristics of second terms and of the changes of personnel could be noticed in the shifts of the Bush administration’s foreign policy. The confrontational course with Iran and North Korea was replaced by the pursuit of diplomacy and multilateral negotiations. These impacts were also perceptible in Bush’s toned down rhetoric (Robbins, 2007, 108).

2.2. Developments in Afghanistan

The Rise of Insurgency Attacks in Afghanistan

While, in 2002, the U.S. troops were largely in control of Afghanistan’s security situation, circumstances began to deteriorate in 2003. Remnants of the Taliban units entrenched in the border region between Pakistan and Afghanistan. Over the course of the winter of 2002/03 they prepared for a summer offensive. In 2003, the first Taliban insurgencies, after their ouster in 2001, were reported. Several thousand Taliban were fighting under the command of Mullah Muhammad Omar, who in 2001 had managed to evade U.S. troops in the last minute. By the end of 2003, the Taliban regained control in four provinces at the Pakistani border (Krech, 2004, 39). Krech (2004, 39f) sees the main reason behind Afghanistan’s deteriorating security situation in the exclusion of Pashtun

and other tribal representatives from the government. As a consequence the Pashtuns Gulbuddin Hekmatyar and Abdul Rasul Sayyaf, the Tajik Burhanuddin Rabbani, and the Uzbek Rashid Dostum formed an opposition against President Hamid Karzai and isolated him politically. It is likely that they reached out to militant Afghani and recruited them for their paramilitary troops. Both the reorganization of the Taliban and the political opposition against President Karzai, were responsible for the escalating security situation in 2003. In these unsafe environments, the U.N. withdrew its aid organizations and only the United States was ready to install a Provincial Reconstruction Team (PRT). In 2004, the situation further destabilized, in particular in the south and north of Afghanistan.

After the international community had achieved some stability during the presidential and parliamentary elections in 2004 and 2005, “the Afghan Taliban stepped up its attacks on coalition forces” (Bruno & Kaplan, 2009, [online]) in the following years. In addition, the Human Rights Watch (2007, 2f) observed that “Taliban, Hezb-e Islami, and other armed groups in Afghanistan have carried out an increasing number of armed attacks” and that “[c]ivilian deaths from insurgent attacks skyrocketed in 2006”. In 2007, insurgent attacks on coalition forces and civilians continued. Suicide bombings even increased by 69 percent in the first eight months of 2007 compared to the same period in 2006 (Rhode, 2007, September 9, [online]). In addition, the Taliban took control of some territory in the north of the southern Helmand province (Bruno & Kaplan, 2009, [online]). In June 2008, BBC News announced a further deterioration of Afghanistan’s security situation (“Taleban ‘to boost Afghan attacks’”, 2008, June 27, [online]). As Rhode (2007, October 30, [online]) pointed out, the increasing number of insurgency attacks since 2006 was in part due to foreign combatants from Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Chechnya, and various Arab countries who were willing recruits for the Taliban’s insurgency. He analyzed that “[t]he foreign fighters are not only bolstering the ranks of the insurgency. They are more violent, uncontrollable and extreme than even their locally bred allies” (ibid.).

ISAF’s Expansion

In the years from 2004 to 2008, ISAF’s mandate was extended for 12 months each year by the UN Security Council Resolutions 1623, 1707, 1776, and

1833. In addition to its mandate, ISAF also expanded its geographic reach through the installation of Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRT) throughout the entire country. The commander of the Allied Joint Force Command Brunssum (in the Netherlands), which strategically operates ISAF, has four main components at his disposal in order to support the government of Afghanistan (Gauster, 2006, 32f):

1. The ISAF headquarters in Kabul, which is responsible for the strategic command of ISAF.
2. The Region Command Capital, previously called Kabul Multinational Brigade, consisting of troops that are responsible for the security in Kabul and its surroundings.
3. The Air Task Force, which is in charge of all operations of the ISAF air forces.
4. Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRT), which provide the main settings for operations by ISAF troops outside of Kabul in the northern, western, southern and eastern provinces of Afghanistan. Following the model of an institutionalized civil-military cooperation, military personnel and civil engineers work in close cooperation in groups of 50 to 500 people, in order to protect the local population and build up an infrastructure for them.

At the beginning of 2003, the first PRT was installed by the United States in the town of Gardez, in the east of Afghanistan. It was the result of a change of mind and strategy in Washington. President Bush, who had decidedly opposed nation building as a task for U.S. troops during his presidential campaign in 2000, realized that relying on exclusively military means would not lead the mission in Afghanistan to any major success. OEF was not only unable to achieve any major accomplishments by applying on conventional combat operations, it was also met with disapproval by the Afghan population (*ibid.*, 41ff). In the summer of 2003, Great Britain was the second nation to establish a PRT in the region of Mazar-e-Sharif. With the take-over of the US-led PRT Kunduz by German ISAF troops, the first ISAF PRT was established in October 2003. In the following twelve months ISAF took over four additional PRTs in the northern provinces of Afghanistan and by October 2004 the first stage of the expansion of ISAF's mission throughout the

country was completed. In its second stage ISAF expanded to the west, starting with its announcement in February 2005. In May and September of the same year, ISAF established four additional PRTs, two in each month. In July 2006, ISAF assumed command from US-led coalition forces in the south, marking the third stage of its expansion. ISAF was now responsible for six additional Afghan provinces and four additional PRTs, culminating in a total of 13 PRTs. Whereupon, in October 2006, ISAF implemented its fourth and final stage by expanding to the east of the country and taking over an additional 12 PRTs from the US-led Operation Enduring Freedom (ISAF – International Security Assistance Force, 2010a, [online]). With the completion of its last stage of ISAF's expansion 12,000 troops were transferred from OEF to ISAF, leaving 8,000 troops to remain in OEF, and the international security force assumed full responsibility for the entire country (Fiorenza, 2006b, 4). By December 2007, 19 PRTs were established under the command of ISAF. The number was increased to 26 PRTs by December 2008. Currently, as of April 2010, ISAF commands 27 PRTs, half of which are deployed under the Regional Command East (ISAF – International Security Assistance Force, 2010a, [online]).

U.S. and European Troop Deployments in Afghanistan

According to the announcement of ISAF's second stage of expansion in February 2005, there were 17,000 troops from various countries under the command of OEF and only 8,500 under the command of ISAF. By its completion in September 2005, there were 10,500 troops deployed under ISAF command. When ISAF had concluded its third stage of expansion, in July 2006, the multinational force counted 19,000 troops. In October of the same year, when the final stage of ISAF's expansion was accomplished, the proportion of troop deployments between OEF and ISAF had reverted: 31,000 troops were deployed under ISAF command and 8,000 troops under OEF command (Ministère de la defense, 2010, [online]). In January 2007, the total ISAF troop numbers amounted to 35,460 raised by 37 troop contributing nations. These numbers increased throughout the year to 41,741 troops supplied by 39 troop contributing nations in December 2007. One year later, in December 2008, there was a total of 51,350 troops placed at ISAF's disposal by 41 troop contributing nations (ISAF – International Security Assistance Force, 2010b, [online]).

In 2001, Germany's parliament, the *Deutsche Bundestag*, decided to participate in OEF and has annually renewed Germany's mandate at OEF ever since. In October 2008, the German parliament decided to prolong the mandate for participation in OEF, however, not for OEF-Afghanistan. Germany's mandate has since then been limited to the OEF at the Horn of Africa (OEF-HOA), where it, together with other nations, carries out the naval component of the mission as part of a multinational force (Auswärtiges Amt, 2009b, [online]). In 2007, the share of Germany, which had been the third largest troop contributing nation after the U.S. and the United Kingdom (UK) since NATO took over command of ISAF in 2003, amounted to roughly 8.5% and sank continuously to some 4.6% of all ISAF troop deployments until 2010. The respective figures for European ISAF troops deployments accounted to roughly 16.4% in 2007 and went down to some 13.3% until 2010 (ISAF – International Security Assistance Force, 2010b, [online]). However, the total number of German troops operating under ISAF command rose from 2,250 to currently 4,665 from October 2004 to April 2010. The largest step-up was undertaken in September 2005, still under German Chancellor Gerhard Schröder, when troop levels rose from 2,250 up to 3,000 (einsatz.bundeswehr.de, 2010, [online]).

In comparison to Germany, France had only made “minor” contributions at first. While from the beginning deploying in both, ISAF and OEF, France's contribution to ISAF amounted to 530 troops in January 2002 (Ministère de la defense, 2010, [online]). France more than tripled its troop levels in 2005 when the total number of French troops including both deployments, OEF and ISAF, increased to 1,800 (ibid.). Nevertheless, by January 2007, there were only 1,100 French troops operating under ISAF command rendering France only the sixth largest troop contributing nation, behind the US, the UK, Germany, the Netherlands, and Italy. In January 2007, President Jacques Chirac withdrew the French Special Forces from OEF but left the 1,100 serving with ISAF untouched (Ministère de la defense, 2010, [online]). Despite an increase of 292 troops throughout the year, France still ranked sixth. This only changed in 2008 when France more than doubled its deployment to 2,785 troops (December 2008) and overtook the Netherlands and Italy (ISAF – International Security Assistance Force, 2010b, [online]). While France's overall share of ISAF troops amounted to

some 3% and its share of European ISAF troops equaled some 5.5% in 2007, these numbers rose to 5.5% (overall ISAF) and 10% (European ISAF) in 2008. While the share of French troops in all ISAF troops decreased again to some 3.7% in 2010, the share of European ISAF troops slightly increased to some 10.7%. The surge of French troops that occurred in 2008 is to be traced back to the change of leadership in France. President Nicolas Sarkozy, who has been in office since May 16, 2007, sought to raise France's share in the coalition fighting in Afghanistan "as a proof of France's willingness to bear its full part of the NATO burden in Afghanistan" (Hammick & Lewis, 2008, 7). At the NATO summit, which took place in April 2008, in Bucharest, he announced to increase French troop levels and thereafter asked the parliament to raise French deployment in Afghanistan (novelobs.com, 2008, [online]).

Throughout the Bush presidency, European countries accounted for the majority of the coalition forces of the ISAF operations in Afghanistan. This did not even change after ISAF had taken over command of OEF-led PRTs, thereby transferring U.S. personnel from OEF to ISAF. From January 2007 to December 2008, the European share was in a range of 52% to 57% of all ISAF troops while the U.S. share ranged between 36% and 39.5%. Simultaneously, absolute troop numbers of both European countries and the U.S. were rising throughout those two years. From January 2007 to December 2008, U.S. troops deployed under ISAF command rose from 14,000 to 19,950, which made up for 5,950 additional troops. This accounted for only 20 troops more compared to the increase of troop levels by the EU-3 (Germany, France, UK), which amounted to 5,930 troops. Overall ISAF troop levels of all European countries rose by 9,030, from 18,340 in January 2007 to 27,370 in December 2008 (ISAF – International Security Assistance Force, 2010b, [online]). Thus, taking European and U.S. military capacities into account, the increase of American troops in ISAF was relatively minor compared to the increase of European contributions. However, one must not forget that while most European countries deployed their troops only in ISAF, the U.S. troops operated in both ISAF and OEF. In a report conducted by the Congressional Research Service O'Bryant & Waterhouse (2008, 4) found that of the 33,000 U.S. troops that were deployed in Afghanistan in April 2008, "60% of U.S. personnel serve[d] in the NATO-led peacekeeping force called the

‘International Security Assistance Force (ISAF),’”. The remaining 40% served in the U.S.-led Operation Enduring Freedom. “The U.S. forces under NATO command have served in that capacity since October 2006, when NATO/ISAF took over peacekeeping responsibility for all of Afghanistan” (ibid.).

Thus, despite the closer cooperation of OEF and ISAF, which eventually resulted in a fusion of the command structure of the two operations (see below), U.S. troop contributions in ISAF remained minor compared to its American military capacities as well as compared to European troop contributions in Afghanistan. Heightened attention attributed to the situation in Iraq, which eventually resulted in a surge of 30,000 U.S. military personnel in 2007, and neglect of the precarious security situation in Afghanistan can be mentioned as reasons for the U.S. restrained military engagement in Afghanistan during the Bush presidency. This changed only when the Obama administration came into office, which attributed more attention to the War in Afghanistan than to the War in Iraq. Still in 2009, the numbers of U.S. and European ISAF troop deployments roughly equaled and both accounted for a share of some 46% to 47%, however, in April 2010, U.S. troops deployments outnumbered European ones. While European ISAF troop numbers increased by 3,654 from October 2009 to April 2010, U.S. troop numbers doubled from 31,855 to 62,415 over the same period of time.

Table 1: Troop Deployments in Afghanistan, Total Numbers & Percentages

	Jan. 2007	Dec. 2007	Dec. 2008	Oct. 2009	April 2010
Total	35,560	41,741	51,350	67,700	102,554
U.S. ISAF	14,000	15,038	19,950	31,855	62,415
% of Total	39.48%	36.03%	38.85%	47.05%	60.86%
Europe ISAF	18,340	23,895	27,370	31,464	35,118
% of Total	51.72%	57.25%	53.30%	46.48%	34.24%
Germany	3,000	3,155	3,600	4,245	4,665
% of Total	8.46%	7.56%	7.01%	6.27%	4.55%
% of Europe	16.36%	13.20%	13.15%	13.49%	13.28%
France	1,000	1,292	2,785	3,070	3,750
% of Total	2.82%	3.1%	5.42%	4.53%	3.66%
% of Europe	5.45%	5.41%	10.18%	9.76%	10.68%

Source: ISAF – International Security Assistance Force (2010b). *ISAF Placemat Archives*. Retrieved from: <<http://www.isaf.nato.int/en/isaf-placemat-archives.html>>, May 23, 2010. Numbers of Troop Deployments prior to January 2007 are not displayed on the ISAF's Website. Percentage numbers are based on author's own calculations.

Cooperation between ISAF and OEF

While in 2003 the UN Security Council for the first time pointed out the importance of cooperation between ISAF and OEF in UNSCR 1510, only in 2006 first signs indicated that this recommendation was going to be implemented. Already at a NATO defense ministerial meeting in December 2003, U.S. Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld raised the suggestion “to consolidate NATO’s military operations with the U.S.-led Operation ‘Enduring Freedom’ (OEF) at some future date” (Hill, 2004, 5). This suggestion, however, was met with caution by European allies. Their reaction is for the most part reasoned by their strict differentiation between OEF and ISAF missions. OEF is seen as the anti-terror alliance, whose duty is to hunt down al-Qaeda terrorists and fight against the Taliban. Conversely, ISAF’s duties are to assist the Afghan interim government as well as to reconstruct the country. As can be read on the homepage of the German Foreign Ministry “mandate and organization of the peace troop ISAF are strictly to be separated [from OEF]” (Auswärtiges Amt, 2010, [online]; translated SP). Almost a year later, during the NATO defense ministers’ meeting on 13-14 October 2004, when US representatives formally proposed to merge OEF and ISAF, the German and French Defense Ministers “both declared that the merger of ISAF into OEF was not opportune since the two forces have distinct tasks in Afghanistan” (Tudor, 2004, 5). This strict separation between ISAF and OEF allows for interpretation of a dichotomy of *good versus bad*. If both operations were to merge, the good one would also carry out bad duties.

Yet, ISAF’s expansion to the south and east of Afghanistan has not only put the security force in charge of the entire country but also of operations such as fighting the Taliban and Al-Qaeda, which had so far been pursued by the U.S.-led Coalition Force Command – Afghanistan (Fiorenza, 2005, 6). Thus, since OEF and ISAF are in charge of similar duties, some nations expected that both operations were to merge. When the UK took over command of ISAF from May 2006 to February 2007, the British, being in favor of the merger, pushed ISAF to work more closely with the U.S.-led coalition. Together with the U.S. they laid out proposals for the unification of ISAF and OEF, which, however, were vetoed by

Spain, Germany and France (Ripley, 2005, 6). Yet, “new command arrangements [were] agreed between ISAF and Combined Forces Command-Afghanistan to ensure close cooperation” (ISAF – International Security Assistance Force, 2010, [online]).

The command structure was revised in a way that there would be “two distinct chains of command but a double-hatted commander at the head of both operations” (Skinner, 2005, 5). This commander, the so-called COMISAF (Commander ISAF), has the overall command responsibility over the entire ISAF mission in Afghanistan. In order to get the Germans and French to agree to the new arrangement, “a way was being sought that would allow France and Germany to permit the operation but not participate” (ibid.). In addition, on June 8, 2006, the first meeting of defense ministers of NATO and non-NATO ISAF contributing nations took place (ibid.). Gauster (2006, 40) talks of a “fusion of certain ISAF and OEF structures” in the years 2006 and 2007. In the course of this fusion the PRT concept of the US, which is different from the German and British PRT concept, was increasingly integrated in the PRTs operated by ISAF.

The next step was the establishment of a composite headquarters with a balanced proportion of U.S. and European representatives in leadership positions. Thus, after the UK’s mandate for command of ISAF expired in February 2007, a composite headquarters headed by U.S. General Dan K. McNeill took over with a mandate lasting for 12 months (compared to the UK’s 9-month mandate). Even though ISAF was expected “to be involved in more fighting after the spring thaw” (Fiorenza, 2007, 10), it primarily remained OEF’s duty “to search for Taliban and Al Qaeda members” (Fiorenza, 2006a, 5). Having served for 16 months, General McNeill was replaced by General David D. McKiernan, who served as COMISAF for one year as from June 2008 to June 2009. General McKiernan was followed by General Stanley A. McChrystal who had been in command of ISAF since June 2009. Most recently on July 4, 2010, General David H. Patreus had replaced General McChrystal, who had been deposed as a result of his unqualified comments about the Obama administration.

ISAF's New Upper Command Structure under the Obama Administration

In August 2009, the local upper command structure of ISAF in Afghanistan was adjusted. The adjustment “was motivated by a significant evolution of ISAF’s scope and scale of responsibility since 2006” (NATO – North Atlantic Treaty Organization, 2010, [online]). This includes the expansion of ISAF throughout the country by establishing PRTs or taking over U.S.-led PRTs, the increase of troops operating under ISAF command, the founding of NATO Training Mission-Afghanistan, “and the increased need for cooperation with Afghan authorities and other international partners” (ibid.). During the George W. Bush Administrations the ISAF command structure consisted of one operational headquarter, which was located in Kabul and led by a four star Commander, so called COMISAF (Commander ISAF). Under the new command structure the COMISAF will have command responsible to three intermediate headquarters, the ISAF Joint Command, the NATO Training Mission-Afghanistan, both headed by three star Generals, and the Special Operations Forces, headed by a one star General. This decision was motivated by the need to separate strategic and routine operations in order to enable the COMISAF to concentrate better on political-military aspects. The COMIJC (Commander ISAF Joint Command), who is exclusively a NATO Commander, “will be responsible for executing the full spectrum of tactical operations throughout the country, on a day-to-day basis” (ibid.). In contrast, the COMISAF is “dual-hatted as the Commander of ISAF and US Forces in Afghanistan” (ibid.). He thus coordinates ISAF and OEF operations and is responsible that the two do not conflict with each other. Also the Commander of the NATO Training Mission-Afghanistan will be dual hated “as NATO/ISAF Commander and Commander of the US-led Combined Security Transition Command – Afghanistan” (ibid.).

2.3. The Deteriorating Situation in Iraq

Iraq remained a very difficult issue during the second term of the Bush Administration. Germany, France and the U.S. came to terms that they had disagreements about the invasion in Iraq, but they also agreed that they would no longer allow having their relationships affected by these disagreements. This was

best pursued by not raising the Iraq issue, thus rendering it a taboo topic during most of the time from 2004 to 2008. Within the North Atlantic alliance the Iraq issue, however, continued to split its allies. French President Jacques Chirac and German Chancellor Gerhard Schröder strictly opposed any military involvement of NATO in Iraq. The alliance's duties were to be strictly limited to the training of Iraqi security forces and even this was not to take place within but outside Iraq. In this context Schröder got his position straight when he said "[...] We have made clear that we don't want to see German soldiers in Iraq" (Sariibrahimoglu, 2004, 5).

The Rise of Insurgency in Iraq

U.S. Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld insisted that "the Department of Defense (DoD) was granted lead responsibility for post-War planning and administration of Iraq in the immediate aftermath of the occupation" (Koch, 2006, 4). However, that planning and administration failed, which resulted in continuously deteriorating conditions within the country and led to a steadily growing insurgency. As a consequence "the security situation in Baghdad [and elsewhere] began to unravel at an ever-increasing pace over the past year" (ibid.). The fact that the DoD rather than the Department of State or other civilian agencies ran the larger strategy for the War on terror was in some ways preventing successes in Iraq and elsewhere. It "led to excessive focus on finding and killing or capturing individual terrorists at the expense of trying to combat the underlying causes of terrorism or formulating a coherent global strategy to do so" (ibid.).

In the summer of 2003, the insurgencies began to erupt in Iraq. Interestingly, "[t]he initial focus of insurgent attacks wasn't the U.S. military but allies of the U.S. effort, [...], that were perceived as legitimizing the occupation" (Ricks, 2007, 215). With a relatively low death toll during the second half of the year and throughout the winter of 2003-2004, it was only in spring 2004 when the full scale of the insurgency attacks became apparent. By then the U.S. and its coalition troops had realized that the real War in Iraq had just begun. Over the course of the year 2004, there were 26,496 insurgency attacks (ibid., 414). Despite exhaustive fighting against the insurgents, the insurgency intensified

resulting in a total of 34,131 insurgent attacks in 2005 (ibid.). The growing insurgency of 2005 is also reasoned by the election and appointment of the Iraqi government, which was strongly opposed by the insurgents. Many of the insurgents had been affiliated to the ousted government of Saddam Hussein, having been members of the Ba'ath Party or the Republican Guard. They had, thus, suffered the worst losses from the overthrow of the tyrannical regime of Saddam Hussein (Hook & Spanier, 2007, 352). By the time of the Iraqi election, in January 2005, 1,200 U.S. soldiers had died (ibid., 354). More than one year later, in March 2006, the U.S. death toll ranged at 2,300 U.S. soldiers (ibid.). In 2006, "the deterioration of the situation not only continued but accelerated" and "attacks recorded by U.S. military intelligence increased by 22 percent" (Ricks, 2007, 440).

In early 2007, as a result of the prevalent chaos and bloodshed in Iraq and of the "mounting political and popular pressure within the United States" (Nye, 2009, 195), the Bush administration decided to change its Iraq strategy. Against the counsel of the "Iraq Study Group", a commission headed by former US Secretary of State James Baker and former U.S. Democratic Representative Lee Hamilton, which had recommended to continuously withdraw all forces from Iraq by 2008, the Bush Administration decided to increase U.S. troop levels in Iraq. The 2007 'surge', a "steady increase in [U.S.] combat power" (Hodge, 2007, 7), began in January and culminated in June 2007. The additional 30,000 soldiers that were deployed eventually "led to some military improvement in countering the insurgency in 2008" (Nye, 2009, 195). However, the surge was "expected to be followed by some reduction in forces", which worried some officers "about whether the decrease in violence could be sustained beyond the surge" (Hodge, 2007, 7).

An article in Foreign Affairs by Biddle & O'Hanlon & Pollack (2008) shows that the so-called "Surge Strategy" (Nye, 2009, 195) proved successful. In the second half of 2008, the overall violence in Iraq decreased by 80% from the level of violence before the surge. Moreover, the monthly death toll was diminished from 70 U.S. soldiers in 2007 to 25 in 2008 (Biddle et al., 2008). Nevertheless, there are additional factors leading to the improvement of Iraq's security situation other than the surge. Apart from the increase of U.S. troop levels, Biddle et al.

(2008) also name the errors of al Qaeda in Iraq, referring to the destruction of the Shiite Askariya shrine in Samarra, the alienation of al Qaeda's Sunni allies, the rising capacities of the Iraqi Security Forces, as well as the consequences of the sum of developments for the Shiite militias. As a result of the improved security situation in Iraq, U.S. military presence was reduced during the last months of George W. Bush's second term. It was the reduction in forces in Iraq that eventually enabled the U.S. to increase its forces in Afghanistan, pursuing "what Bush described as a 'quiet surge'" (Hodge, 2008, 7).

The Crumbling Coalition

In addition to a generally deteriorating situation in post-War Iraq, nations kept continuously withdrawing their troops from the Multi-National Force – Iraq, which was responsible for Operation Iraqi Freedom. As early as in 2004, one year after the invasion, several countries pulled out of Iraq. Among the most prominent ones was Spain deciding to withdraw its 1,300 troops, but also Hungary, New Zealand and Iceland as well as two South-Asian and three Central American countries quit their involvement in Iraq. In 2005, the Netherlands, having more than 1,300 troops deployed, and Portugal retreated from the Multi-National Force – Iraq. These withdrawals were followed by decisions of the Italian, Norwegian and Japanese governments to pull out their troops in 2006. The Italian withdrawal, in particular, hit the coalition hard. Having had 3,200 troops deployed in the summer of 2005, Italy continuously pulled out some of its troops until the last soldiers left in autumn 2006. In 2007, Denmark and Slovakia quit their engagements in Iraq before, one year later the bulk of the coalition countries withdrew their troops. Among the most significant of the 2008 withdrawals were Poland, whose original contingent accounted for 2,500 troops, and Ukraine, which initially had 1,650 troops deployed. In 2009, the remaining five nations, Romania, Estonia, El Salvador, Australia and the United Kingdom, retreated from the multinational force. Australia and the UK were the last countries to withdraw, pulling out their troops in July 2009 (GlobalSecurity.org, 2009, [online]; Coalition of the Willing, 2009, [online]). As the withdrawals left the U.S. the last nation being deployed in the Multi-National Force – Iraq, it was reorganized into United States Forces – Iraq in January 2010.

2.4. Reaching Out to Europe

Even though there were already some meetings between the heads of government of Germany, France and the United States during Bush's first term, the majority of such meetings took place during international conferences, like at the UN General Assembly or the G8 Summit. Thus, despite some minor post-War reconciliation undertaken in 2003 and 2004, the repair of the damage done to the U.S.-German and U.S.-French relations was only actively pursued in Bush's second term. The rapprochement between the transatlantic allies was initiated by George W. Bush's symbolic visit to the institutions of the European Union on February 21-22, 2005. The President did not hesitate to emphasize at various press availabilities that his first trip abroad in his second term was to Europe and that he went for it already in his second month in office after his inauguration. When he met with German Chancellor Gerhard Schröder in Mainz on February 24, 2005, for example, he said, "an obvious decision was to come here [Europe] on my first trip since my inauguration" (President Bush and Chancellor Schröder Discuss Partnership, 2005).

Bush's visit to the institutions of the European Union was symbolic for two reasons. First, his trip to Europe did not take place within the framework of a bilateral meeting, as had been the case on his trip to Europe in 2001, when he had travelled to Poland, Spain, the UK, and Italy. Yet, on his trip in February 2005 Bush visited the European Union and the headquarters of NATO. He saw French President Chirac on his first day in Brussels, but this meeting took place in the course of his visit to the EU. He also met German Chancellor Schröder in Mainz, Germany, but this meeting occurred only after his EU visit. Second, George Bush became the first American President to visit the institutions of the European Union. There were at least three reasons for this outreach to the European Union by the United States. First, the Bush administration in particular reached out to the European Union because it had been accused of pursuing a policy of disaggregation in its first term and thus not supporting the European integration but working against it (Donfried, personal interview, September 2, 2009). Second, as former Director of Research at the "Center on the United States and Europe" at the Brookings Institution, Jeremy Shapiro, analyzed, "[...] part of the American

strategy was to outreach to the EU in order not to have to deal with the French and the Germans directly” (Shapiro, personal interview, August 4, 2009). Third, the Bush administration saw a chance that the EU would be able to deliver more than in the past once the Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe (also referred to as Constitutional Treaty) was passed. However, when the treaty was rejected in France and the Netherlands in May and June 2005, U.S. hopes of an empowerment of the EU vanished. Thus, “[a]t the end it was not – the EU part was not at all a success” (Shapiro, personal interview, August 4, 2009).

2.4.1. German-American Rapprochement

The Beginning of the Repair: Chancellor Gerhard Schröder

After President Bush’s visit to the EU institutions in Brussels on February 21-22, 2005, he headed on to see German Chancellor Gerhard Schröder in Mainz on February 24, 2005. This bilateral meeting between the two leaders is seen as the start of the rapprochement of the relations between Germany and the U.S. In a joint press conference after their talks, U.S. President Bush accentuated that “[a]fter all, Europe is America’s closest ally” and that “in order for us to have good relations with Europe, we must have good relations with Germany” (President Bush and Chancellor Schröder Discuss Partnership, 2005). Furthermore, he claimed to “understand the limitations of German contribution” (ibid.) in Iraq but declared them to be vital and important. The limitations concerning Germany’s training of Iraqi police and military on the territory of the United Arab Emirates had been raised by Schröder in his remarks before. Thus, the German Chancellor adhered to his statement pronounced in 2004 that no German soldier would put a foot on Iraqi soil. Schröder also emphasized that now that the U.S. had accepted what Germany was not going to do in Iraq, it was ready to assist the rebuilding of the country with civilian assistance. Both leaders underscored that they would leave past differences behind and by putting a stop to emphasizing their disagreements they would focus on where they did agree. However, when asked how he viewed Germany’s leadership role and its role as a partner for the U.S., the U.S. President answered only reluctantly, “I would call Germany a partner in peace and a partner in freedom and a partner of doing our duty” (President Bush

and Chancellor Schröder Discuss Partnership, 2005). He avoided calling Germany a partner in leadership. When Bush and Schröder exchanged toasts on the same day, Schröder, probably referring to Bush's answer, claimed that he and the U.S. President stood there "as equal partners, equal friends and real allies" (President and German Chancellor Schröder Exchange Toasts, 2005). Four months later, in June of the same year, Bush invited the German Chancellor to the White House. This was the last encounter of the two leaders before the German national elections in September 2005 made Angela Merkel the new Chancellor of Germany.

The Establishment of Good Personal Relations: Chancellor Angela Merkel

Even though the personal relationship between Schröder and Bush could not be healed, the formal repair of the relations between Germany and the U.S. had already begun before Angela Merkel came into office as new German Chancellor. The repair then accelerated once Merkel had become head of the German government. As Executive Vice President of the German Marshall Fund of the United States, Karen Donfried, analyzed, "[...] Merkel wins the election and is engaging Bush, is opening to Bush, is saying positive things to the U.S." (Donfried, personal interview, September 2, 2009). At their first meeting President Bush, in his remarks, confidently mentioned the "climate of openness" that existed between the two leaders as well as his "incredibly positive" first impressions of Chancellor Merkel (President Welcomes German Chancellor Merkel to the White House, 2006). Bush appreciated Merkel's frankness and her straightforward judgments and had the impression of Merkel being a smart and clear thinker (ibid.; President Bush Welcomes German Chancellor to the White House, 2006).

Merkel, for her part, was "sort of unemotional about this relationship" (Donfried, personal interview, September 2, 2009). What mattered for her was that the United States was important for Germany and therefore she was going to build up a stronger relationship with the U.S. than Schröder used to have. She has held a very strong pro-American position in international politics and according to her opinion, Germany's place was at the side of the United States. In 2003, in an article in the Washington Post, Merkel had criticized Schröder and his coalition for parting ways with the United States over Iraq. The article with the

provocative title “Schroeder Doesn’t Speak for All Germans” as well as her visit to the United States, during which she met with most of the political elite in Washington except for the President himself, ruffled domestic feathers not only in Germany but also rocked the boat in other European countries. However, Merkel was also criticized by Americans for her in some ways ill-considered pro-American position, especially in regards to the U.S. Iraq policy. In an interview in the *Berliner Zeitung*, on January 18, 2007, Richard Holbrooke, who had been U.S. Ambassador to Germany under Clinton, criticized Merkel for not confronting Bush with European criticism about his Iraq policy (“Bush hinterlässt ein furchtbares Erbe”, 2007, January 18). Merkel’s soft tone on Bush’s controversial policies was also acknowledged by then-Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice in an interview she gave the news magazine *Der Spiegel* during her trip to Germany in January 2007. When she was asked whether she was “confronted with any skepticism or criticism over the new American strategy in Iraq”, she replied “I found the German government quite understanding of what we are trying to do” (Aust et al., 2007, January 22, [online]).

However, Merkel’s soft tone on Bush’s War policy did not only have to do with the sort of unemotional intention to strengthen U.S.-German relations. Due to her past, Chancellor Merkel could better relate to President Bush’s intention to establish a free and democratic Iraq. Grown up in the German Democratic Republic (GDR), Merkel became politically active at a period of time when people began to talk about freedom and democracy and the communist regime in the GDR eventually collapsed (Rippert, 2007, [online]). Talks about freedom and democracy in connection with Iraq, but also with Merkel’s past experiences in the GDR, were often mentioned in the remarks of the two leaders, in particular during their first two meetings in the first half of 2006. At their first meeting President Bush mentioned that he had been “touched by hearing about her early life in communist Germany” (President Welcomes German Chancellor Merkel to the White House, January 13, 2006) and at their second meeting he claimed how important it is for him to talk to “a very sophisticated leader who knows what it’s like to live in a world that isn’t free” (President Bush Welcomes German Chancellor to the White House, May 3, 2006). Moreover, at the end of his remarks after their first meeting, President Bush, after paying compliments on Merkel’s

smartness and spirit, pointed out that “[s]he [Merkel] loves freedom” (President Welcomes German Chancellor Merkel to the White House, January 13, 2006).

Still in January 2006, at their first meeting, Bush confidentially claimed that “we’re [Bush and Merkel] going to have a very good relationship” (President Welcomes German Chancellor Merkel to the White House, January 13, 2006). Between this meeting and their second, thus, from January 13, 2006, to May 3, 2006, there were less than four months during which Merkel and Bush were on the phone six times, which was quite a lot (President Bush Welcomes German Chancellor to the White House, May 3, 2006). Hence, as a senior official at a press briefing observed, Bush and Merkel “are two people who are very comfortable with one another” (Press Briefing by National Security Advisor Hadley, 2007). This was especially important since not only was everything personal with Bush, but the personal relationships that he had with other politicians also influenced the bilateral political agenda with the respective country.

As a sign of their good understanding the political leaders invited each other to their private places. In July 2006, President Bush went to see Chancellor Merkel in the city of Stralsund, which is part of the constituency by which Merkel was first elected to the Bundestag. This visit to Merkel’s “home turf”, as Bush called it at a Roundtable Interview of the President by Foreign Print Media on July 10, 2006, some days before he headed to Germany, occurred only half a year after his first encounter with Merkel. In November 2007, President Bush invited Chancellor Merkel and her husband to stay with him and his wife at his ranch in Crawford, Texas, for some days.

2.4.2. French-American Rapprochement

The Beginning of the Repair: President Jacques Chirac

U.S. President George Bush met with French President Jacques Chirac on the evening of his first day of his two-day visit to the institutions of the European Union on February 21-22, 2005. It’s quite remarkable that Bush’s first bilateral

meeting with a European leader since his re-election was with the French President Chirac. Bush also explicitly emphasized this fact in his remarks in front of the press, "This is my first dinner since I've been re-elected on European soil, and it's with Jacques Chirac – and that ought to say something" (President and French President Chirac Discuss Common Values, Vision, February 21, 2005). As can be deduced from the headline for the meeting attributed by the Department of State, the encounter of the two Presidents was seriously focused on emphasizing common values and visions in order to divert the public's attention from their differences over the Iraq invasion. Besides, President Chirac claimed that the Iraq crisis had in no way affected "the bedrock of our relations, namely, our common values and our common vision" (ibid.).

When Bush changed his administration team in the first months after his re-election and neoconservative ideologues were partly replaced by realists, the relations between Bush and Chirac began to normalize. President Chirac did not believe in the neoconservative imperative of the spread of democracy throughout the world. He was convinced that anti-Western sentiments were too deeply rooted in the non-democratic countries of the developing world, making it impossible for those countries to accept the American model of democracy. Thus, when the administration gained a more realist outlook, Chirac again regarded the U.S. as a serious partner in international affairs.

Interestingly, the rapprochement between France and the U.S. took place in the same foreign policy field where the split had taken place in 2003: the Middle East. French President Jacques Chirac was determined not to leave this foreign policy field to the United States. Thus, defending Lebanon's sovereignty against Syria's interference became one of Chirac's prior foreign policy goals. France and the United States cooperated closely in order to enact UN Security Council Resolution 1559, which put pressure on Syria to withdraw its troops from Lebanon's territory. Apart from the UN Resolution, Lequesne (2007, 10) named two other incidents that had been supportive of a French-American rapprochement in the foreign policy field of the Middle East. In February 2005, the Lebanese Prime Minister, Rafik Hariri, who had been a good friend of Chirac's, was assassinated. As a consequence, the French President broke off the dialog

with the Syrian regime, which he thought had pulled the strings behind the assassination. One year later, in the summer of 2006, the Lebanese Hisbollah attacked Israel with missiles and the Israeli military intervened in the south of Lebanon. Chirac initially defended the Israeli intervention against the Shiite militias. Both of Chirac's reactions not only pleased President Bush but also supported the U.S. position in these matters (Lequesne, 2007, 10).

Summing up, the relationship between the U.S. and France had been "fully repaired" (Shapiro, personal interview, August 4, 2009) still under Jacques Chirac before Nicolas Sarkozy became President of France. Nevertheless, the personal relationship between Chirac and Bush was never really good. When Bush was asked if he would invite Chirac to his ranch in Texas, he answered evasively, "I'm looking for a good cowboy" (President and French President Chirac Discuss Common Values, Vision, February 21, 2005). However, during their more than six years being in office simultaneously, Bush never invited President Chirac to come to the White House either. Even though Sarkozy and Bush were simultaneously in office for only some one and a half years, their personal relationship was far better than that between Chirac and Bush.

Embracing the New French President Nicolas Sarkozy

Still as Minister of the Interior, Nicolas Sarkozy had already travelled to New York and Washington, D.C., on September 11-12, 2006, on time for the fifth anniversary of the 9/11 terrorist attacks of 2001. During his stay he met with U.S. President George W. Bush and had pictures taken of him posing next to the American President, which circulated around the French press and media. This PR campaign for presidential candidate Nicolas Sarkozy indicated a clear message: He was going to improve the relations with the United States once he was elected President of France. Yet, as Gordon (2007, 4) analyzed, Sarkozy took great risks "by paying a personal visit to President George W. Bush and praising the unpopular United States" during his campaign. The fact that he won the elections nonetheless might suggest "that French anti-Americanism is both overstated and more limited to Parisian elite circles than commonly believed" (ibid.). During his trip he also emphasized that his positions and politics were different from those of his predecessor when he criticized Jacques Chirac's

reaction to the Iraq War. Sarkozy claimed that Chirac's position on the invasion of Iraq had shown evidence of France's arrogance and had humiliated the U.S. as a superpower (Schmid, 2007, [online]).

In August 2007, as soon as three months after his election as President of France, Nicolas Sarkozy met with President Bush in the United States. However, the encounter took place on the French President's initiative as Sarkozy had spent his summer holidays in the U.S. In his remarks in front of the press Bush appreciated Sarkozy's frankness, "you know where he stands, he'll tell you exactly what he thinks" (President Bush Welcomes French President Sarkozy, August 11, 2007). President Sarkozy for his part expressed his admiration for the United States.

In November of the same year, when Bush invited Sarkozy to the White House in Washington, D.C., the first official meeting took place between the two Presidents. When they were exchanging toasts, Sarkozy not only made a sarcastic remark against former President Chirac by saying, "one can be a friend of America, and yet win elections in France" (President Bush and President Sarkozy of France Exchange Toasts, November 6, 2007), but also sent a very strong message in regards to his relationship with the U.S.,

"You know, I've come to Washington to bear a very simple, straightforward message, and I bear it on behalf of all French men and women: I wish to reconquer the heart of America, and I wish to reconquer the heart of America in a lasting fashion. I've come to say one simple thing: France and the United States are allies, have been allies and will continue to be allies, and have been so forever. [...] And I say the following words from the bottom of my heart: Long live Franco-American friendship."

(President Bush and President Sarkozy of France Exchange Toasts, November 6, 2007; as translated from French into English)

At a joint press availability the next day, President Bush thanked Sarkozy for sending his Foreign Minister Bernard Kouchner on a trip to Iraq. Kouchner had "announced that France was ready to play a role in international efforts to stabilize Iraq" (Gordon, 2007, 5). Whereas Kouchner's visit did not produce any major results, "that gesture helped turn the page on a relationship that had deeply soured but now is on the road to repair" (ibid.). The visit thus carried a lot of

political symbolism in it. Furthermore, President Sarkozy announced on Afghanistan that he would not withdraw the French troops “because what is at stake here is the solidity of our alliance” (President Bush Participates in a Joint Press Availability, November 7, 2007). President Bush closed the press briefing by referring to President Sarkozy as “somebody who has clear vision, basic values, who is willing to take tough positions to achieve peace” (ibid.) and as somebody he is comfortable with.

During his trip to Europe in the summer of 2008, President Bush also stopped in Paris for a meeting with President Sarkozy. The issue of Iran, its nuclear program and the sanctions against Iran’s regime played a central role in their talks. In their remarks in front of the press both presidents emphasized that, even though the relations between the U.S. and France had improved since 2003, it did not mean that they agreed on everything. However, they were now able to frankly talk about points of divergence and calmly discuss them. Furthermore, Sarkozy pointed out that if a relationship is strong, the leaders are able to accept differences (President Bush Participates in Joint Press Availability, June 14, 2008).

Sarkozy’s probably most profound step “toward a more trusting U.S.-French relationship” (Gordon, 2007, 5) was France’s return to NATO’s integrated military command, from which France had withdrawn in 1966. Gordon, however, did not so much see a transatlantic but a European motivation behind Sarkozy’s step. He maintains that “[t]he new French logic is that America and its Atlanticist allies in NATO will never trust or support European Union efforts to develop more defense autonomy unless France can show itself to be a loyal NATO ally and that EU and NATO defense efforts should both be strengthened” (ibid.). Director of Research at the “Center on the United States and Europe” at the Brookings Institution, Justin Vaisse, also pointed out that France’s return to NATO’s integrated military command included “the precondition of strengthening the European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP)” and cautioned against interpreting Sarkozy’s decision as an Atlanticist move (Vaisse, 2008, 6).

Moreover, despite all the publicity Sarkozy gained by taking this step, it was actually not such a big accomplishment as had been portrayed in the media. Already under President Jacques Chirac, who had also pursued France's return to NATO's integrated military command in 1995-97 but failed (*ibid.*), France had followed "a sort of creeping reintegration in the 90s and 2000s" (Vaisse, personal interview, August 13, 2009). Thus, by the time Sarkozy announced France's reintegration into NATO, the French were already provided with "an extensive presence in NATO structures" (Vaisse, 2008, 6). France had actually only been absent from the Defense Planning Committee and the Nuclear Planning Committee (*ibid.*). Thus, Vaisse claimed that France reintegration into NATO "amount[ed] to an important political symbol, but a modest reality" (*ibid.*) and "the concrete implications of that are not huge" (Vaisse, personal interview, August 13, 2009).

As always, when dealing with French foreign policy, there remains the question of how much it was guided by Gaullism. This is in particular the case since Sarkozy's very good (personal) relationship with U.S. President Bush had often been attributed to his being an Atlanticist versus President Chirac's being a Gaullist. Vaisse, taking a critical stance on this allegation, agreed that while "Sarkozy's personal style is definitively not Gaullist", "[m]any of his beliefs, however, can be described as Gaullist" (*ibid.*, 5). Thus, in contrast to de Gaulle's discretion and modesty, Sarkozy constantly exposes himself as well as his private life to the media. Additionally, his strong admiration of the Americans, his belief that success should be honored rather than resented, and the fact that he "has no qualms about 'helping the rich'" (Gordon, 2007, 3) stand in stark contrast to a Gaullist lifestyle. Nevertheless, like de Gaulle, Sarkozy is a pragmatist and, by seeing "the EU as 'reincarnation' for France" (Vaisse, 2008, 6), he seeks to expand France's influence on world politics. Thus, according to Vaisse, "Sarkozy has by no means moved French foreign policy in a more Atlanticist direction" (*ibid.*), instead there has been much continuity between Chirac and Sarkozy. Moreover, Vaisse also pointed out that now, under Sarkozy, there are even some issues on which Chirac agreed with Bush and Sarkozy does not as is the case with Turkey's entry into the EU. Yet, the perception that Sarkozy has been aligning himself more with Bush than Chirac did is widespread. One of the

reasons Vaisse indicated for this perception is that Jacques Chirac's foreign policy had been overshadowed by the 2003 Iraq crisis "while his wide-ranging 2004-07 rapprochement with America has been underestimated or ignored" (ibid., 7). Another reason was President Bush's strong embracement of the new French leader. It is questionable, if this can solely be attributed to "a Bush administration desperate for friends", as Vaisse (2008, 8) alleged. Sarkozy's lifestyle and his strong admiration for the U.S. have certainly also played a role. Lastly, it remains to be pointed out, as also Vaisse indicated as well, that, like Bush's relationship with Merkel, the media had blown up the issue.

V. CONCLUSION

In this chapter the findings of the preceding analysis of the transatlantic relations of the years between 2001 and 2008 are summarized and interpreted. Research questions and theses set up in the introduction are addressed with the results of the research carried out. Moreover, this chapter presents for a short resume of the study.

Short-Term Effects, but No Long-Term Effects

As has been shown on the preceding pages, in particular in the analysis of the Bush administration's first term, the crisis between Germany and France and the U.S. over the Iraq invasion had deeply affected the relations between these allies. France was *punished* in several ways for its acting at the United Nations when the U.S. attempted to achieve a UN resolution for the Iraq invasion. The French were excluded from participation in major U.S. military exercises and were not included in U.S.-hosted air force conferences; U.S. military officials were not allowed to participate in one of the most famous parades of the French military, the Paris Air Show; and French products were boycotted and renamed in Congressional cafeterias and on board of Air Force One. However, these punishments were run by the Department of Defense for the most part while the State Department lobbied against such measures. Moreover, these punishments did not spoil the relations between the political leaders of the U.S. and France as still in June 2003, three months after the outbreak of the Iraq invasion, Chirac and Bush enjoyed private talks. In addition, the French President was the first European leader that Bush visited during his trip to Europe in February 2005.

However, the relations between the American and the French Presidents had never been really close, which is largely due to the historical narrative of French-American relations in the second half of the 20th century. Since the end of the Second World War French Presidents have sought to assert French positions against the U.S. dominance in military and foreign affairs and to temper American power. This kind of acting was coined as *Gaullism* by President Charles de

Gaullies, who withdrew the French military from NATO in 1966 due to the American dominance of the alliance. French-American relations under President Jacques Chirac, who has been characterized as “arch-Gaullist” by Vaisse (2008, 6), largely followed Gaullist principles. When France did not cooperate with the U.S. on Iraq at the UN, the Americans were caught by surprise. However, since France held the image of a European rebel and relations between Chirac and Bush had not deepened a lot, it did not affect their relationship much. As Shapiro noted the repair of the U.S.-European relationship “was very easy with the French” (Shapiro, personal interview, August 4, 2009).

While the U.S. maxim concerning the treatment of Germany after the 2003 Iraq crisis, which was to *ignore* Germany, was somewhat “softer”, German-American relations were affected more by the crisis than were French-American relations. While Bush held talks with Chirac that same year of the outbreak of the Iraq War, he had not talked to German Chancellor Gerhard Schröder for one year, since the German national elections in September 2002. Moreover, U.S. Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld was ordered not to contact his German counterpart at a NATO defense ministers’ meeting in September 2002 and U.S. officials in general were not allowed to respond to German signs of reconciliation. When Bush and Schröder officially talked again to each other in September 2003, the talks took place in the course of a session of the UN General Assembly and lasted for only forty minutes. In addition, it took almost two years before Bush again welcomed Schröder to the White House in February 2004. This diplomatic encounter is regarded to have formally ended the crisis in the German-American relations but the personal relationship between Bush and Schröder was never again repaired.

Since Bush tended to personalize his relationships with other heads of government, the breach between him and Schröder, which had already happened well before the outbreak of the Iraq War, had a considerable impact on German-American relations. Bush felt betrayed by Schröder and “hated Schröder, did not trust him at all” (Shapiro, personal interview, August 4, 2009). Yet, apart from the relationship between the heads of government, there was also a kind of a breach with the historical narrative of Germany’s role in the U.S.-European transatlantic

relations and of its position vis-à-vis the U.S. This had greatly affected the German-American relations during the first term of the Bush Administration. Since the end of the Second World War Germany has obtained a middle stance between the American and French positions. On the one hand Germany upholds a very distinct transatlantic orientation and pursues very strong relations with the United States. This posture has its origin in the immediate post-World War II period when the Americans supported the recreation of the state of Germany, pursued re-education of its people and protected it from the Soviet Union. On the other hand, together with France, it has been the driving motor for the European integration. Unlike the UK, which has an almost exclusive transatlantic orientation in foreign and security policy, Germany also has a distinct European orientation. As a consequence of this setting, Germany has always seen itself as a sort of mediator between France, representing European interests, and the United States, representing American interests. However, in 2003, when the Germans aligned with the French against the United States, some scholars worried that Germany “now subordinated the Atlantic to the European circle [of policy making]” (Szabo, 2004, 49). Hence, it seemed as if Germany would break with its traditional role that it had played in international politics for decades. In addition, since 1945 no German Chancellor had dared to put the German-American relations at stake in the way that Schröder did. Thus, Germany’s alignment with France and Russia in opposition to the U.S. caught by surprise many in the Bush administration, who still expected “historical modesty” (Pond, 2004, 61) from Germany.

Notwithstanding the seemingly deeper rupture in German-American relations compared to the French-American relations, it still “was a pretty easy relationship to repair” (Shapiro, personal interview, August 4, 2009). As Shapiro analyzed, “The thing is that the German-U.S. relationship is so interwoven that it is actually hard for its leaders – I’m not sure about the extent to which Schröder tried or tried not that hard, but he had tried – it is very hard to sort of disentangle it” (ibid.). This has been proven by the various examples of German assistance in the Iraq War, ranging from based security to intelligence support that happened in spite of Schröder’s pronounced opposition to the war. Hence, even though the 2003 Iraq crisis resulted in some non-negligible short-term effects on the

transatlantic relationship between the U.S. and Germany and France, the analysis of the transatlantic relations in the years between 2004 and 2008 clearly indicates that by latest 2005 a rapprochement, initiated by the U.S., was pursued. Hence, making the case against the thesis of an estrangement in the transatlantic relationship due to the 2003 Iraq crisis, the crisis did not have any long-term effects on the transatlantic relations between the U.S. and Germany and France.

Thus, it was the complexity of the German-American and French-American relations that saved the transatlantic relationship between Europe and the U.S. from suffering any long-term effects. In particular the intelligence cooperation between Germany, France and the U.S. was much too vital to be put at risk by some uneasiness of the political leaders. The CIA was one of the most active agencies in the Bush administration that lobbied against any deeper rupture with the Europeans and wanted to repair the bruised relations. Less so for the French-American but more so for the German-American relations, it was also the military integration that avoided any long-term effects in the transatlantic relationship. In addition, the economic relations between Europe and the U.S., which have been excluded from the thesis, were even more important than the intelligence or military cooperation. Due to their high importance, the economic relations remained almost completely untouched by the Iraq crisis. Furthermore, there was also the American public opinion, which did not like to see the image of the United States deteriorating due to the dispute over the Iraq crisis and the way the Administration handled the transatlantic relationship. Hence, there were all those different groups, ranging from intelligence and military corporations to business elites and the American public that had an interest in avoiding a split in the transatlantic relations.

Influencing Factors behind the Rapprochement

The analysis of the transatlantic relations during the years from 2001 to 2008 indicates several factors which were responsible for the rapprochement in the relations between the U.S. and Germany and France. These factors can be split into external factors, in particular the deteriorating situation in the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, and domestic factors on both the U.S. and the European sides of the transatlantic relations. In Afghanistan, the security situation escalated

during the summer of 2003 as remnants of the Taliban together with foreign combatants of neighboring countries reorganized and pursued a vast insurgency. By the end of the year the Taliban had regained control in four Afghan provinces, located at the border to Pakistan. After achieving some stability with the help of the international community during the years of 2004 and 2005, death tolls of the coalition forces skyrocketed in 2006 and further increased in 2007 and 2008.

The situation was not any different in Iraq, where the insurgency began to erupt in the summer of 2003. In the following years insurgents' attacks and death tolls of primarily the U.S. troops but to some degree also of the coalition forces increased. Not only did the deterioration of the situation in Iraq continue, it also greatly accelerated by 2006. What was believed to be possible during in the first term, fighting two wars at the same time, resulted in an overextension of the U.S. military. Neither for Afghanistan nor for Iraq, sufficient U.S. military resources were available in order to keep the situation under control. Realizing the limits of American power and the need for cooperation with allies, the Bush administration started to reach out to Europe. This became evident in the diplomatic exchanges the U.S. had with European leaders. Bush was the first U.S. President to visit the institutions of the European Union. In addition, he undertook more trips abroad and invited his European counterparts more often to the White House, which became readily apparent in the diplomatic exchanges with German Chancellor Angela Merkel. However, the Bush administration's effort to reach out to its European allies also became evident in the military cooperation in Afghanistan. It was only after the Iraq invasion that the U.S. agreed to expand ISAF's mission in Afghanistan and to allow for closer cooperation between OEF and ISAF.

However, there were additional factors on the U.S. side influencing the rapprochement in the transatlantic relations between Europe and the U.S. This has been shown in the analysis of the thesis and summarized very pointedly by Gordon (2006, [online]), "global realities and resource constraints [...] force[d] the administration toward pragmatism, modesty and cooperation with allies". As a consequence of these realities and the rising pressure from elite and public opinion, the Bush administration again pursued close cooperation with Europe and altered its approach to foreign policy. As pursuing neoconservative principles

had not worked very well, the administration switched to a more realist approach in foreign policy. This included a change in the personnel and policies of the second Bush administration. Concerning the changes in personnel, people very closely associated with the neoconservative ideology, such as Paul Wolfowitz and I. Lewis Libby, left Bush's team, which decreased the neoconservative influence on the administration. In turn pragmatists, such as Robert Zoellick, Nicolas Burns or Christopher Hill, were taken into the administration. In particular the replacement of Secretary of State Colin Powell by Condoleezza Rice was a decisive factor for the repair of the relations between the U.S. and Europe. Rice undertook more travels abroad, which indicated a greater effort to reach out to allies, and she was one of the driving forces of the "counterrevolution" against the neoconservative revolution of the first-term government. Moreover, when the realist Robert Gates replaced Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, a person closely associated with the disaster of the Iraq War left the administration. Concerning the changes in policies, the Bush administration reviewed its standpoints towards Iran and North Korea. While during his first term the two countries were regarded as members of the "axis of evil", which had to be fought by the use of force, during his second term Bush backed multilateral negotiations and allowed U.S. diplomats to engage with these countries. In addition, the administration also changed its foreign policy style. In particular President Bush and Secretary of State Rice toned down their wartime rhetoric. The new tone and style that characterized the foreign policy of Bush's second term was apparent in Rice's confirmation hearing as newly appointed Secretary of State, when she stated that "the time for diplomacy is now" (Gordon, 2005, [online]).

Lastly, there were factors on the European side of the transatlantic relationship, especially in Germany and France that were influencing the rapprochement. Like on the U.S. side, there had also been changes in personnel and policies on the European side. In Germany, the national elections in 2005 were crucial for the rapprochement with the U.S. A change in leadership occurred as newly elected German Chancellor Angela Merkel replaced Gerhard Schröder. While the reconciliation had already started with Schröder, the rapprochement accelerated with Angela Merkel. Moreover, the German government changed from an SPD/Green coalition to a so-called "Grand Coalition" of the SPD and

CDU/CSU, which the U.S. found easier to embrace than the left-wing coalition of Chancellor Gerhard Schröder. In general, the change in personnel proved more crucial for German-American relations than for French-American relations. One reason for this was the fact that there had not been a breach in the personal relationship between Chirac and Bush as there had been between Schröder and Bush. Another reason was that Nicolas Sarkozy was elected as French President only at the end of Bush's presidency.

Concerning the changes in policies, a contrasting picture to the one of the changes in personnel presents itself. Since Germany did not pursue any major changes in her policies, it did only play a negligible factor for the rapprochement with the U.S. However, French President Jacques Chirac's Middle East policy, which he pursued after 2003, contributed considerably to the rapprochement. Regardless of Merkel's election, there was a continuation of Germany's Afghanistan and Iraq policies. Germany remained committed in Afghanistan and steadily increased its deployment of troops. Moreover, although Merkel appeared herself very appreciative of Bush's Iraq policy, she did not increase Germany's involvement in Iraq. The training of the Iraqi police force by Germany continued to be conducted in the United Arab Emirates and still no German soldier entered Iraq. Merkel probably could not alter Germany's Iraq policy because her hands were tied since she was in a coalition with the SPD, who has strictly refused any German involvement in Iraq.

President Chirac saw no need to change his policies neither for Afghanistan, where France remained ranked sixth at troop deployments, nor for Iraq, where France continued to be uninvolved. It was only under President Sarkozy that the French Foreign Minister Bernard Kouchner was sent to Iraq and troop levels in Afghanistan were considerably increased. Chirac's Middle East policy, which he pursued in the years after 2003, met with approval in the United States, though. Breaking off the dialogue with Syria as well as defending an Israeli intervention against Shiite militias was in line with the Bush administration's policy. Regarding Syria, the U.S. and France even cooperated closely in order to push through a UNSC Resolution putting pressure on Syria to withdraw its troops

from Lebanon. Yet, it needs to be mentioned that Chirac's Middle East policy was not motivated by a rapprochement with the U.S.

The Change of Leadership in Europe

The personalities in office as heads of government in the years from 2001 to 2005 (Germany), 2007 (France) and 2008 (U.S.) played a significant role in the dispute over the Iraq invasion. This in particular was the case because the relationships between these political leaders were not based on a realistic (IR theory) approach, where the interests of countries matter, but on good personal relations. In the case of the German-American relationship, Szabo (2004, 135) analyzed, "Both Schröder and Bush were responsible for the personalization of the problem". However, due to "the greater weight of the United States and the responsibilities that go with leadership of a great alliance" and because of Bush's "general tendency to overpersonalize his approach to foreign policy" (ibid.) he attributed more of the responsibility to the American President. Instead of viewing the Iraq crisis as a difference of the interests of countries, Bush took Germany's defiance and Schröder's anti-war rhetoric personal. He felt betrayed by Schröder and did not trust him anymore. Even though the personal relations between Bush and Schröder were never repaired, a rapprochement in German-American relations started in a limited way while Schröder was still in office as German Chancellor.

Hence, the change in leadership in Germany considerably affected the German-American relationship because Bush did not have to deal with Schröder anymore. In addition, Angela Merkel's particular personality had a significant impact on the rapprochement in the relations. Merkel regarded the U.S. as a strategic and important player in international politics and concluded that consequently Germany needed to have good relations with the U.S. no matter if the German people liked the American President or not. However, her past was more important for the good relationship that she enjoyed with George W. Bush than her sort of unemotional, realist approach to foreign policy. Grown up under a communist regime in the GDR, Merkel could relate to Bush's fervor for the establishment of democracy and freedom in other countries. Moreover, already in 2003 Merkel publicly militated against Schröder's Iraq policy in the German

parliament as well as during her trip to the United States. This was motivated by both her realist consideration that good relations with the U.S. were essential as well as her admiration for the U.S., which might have evolved as a counter reaction to her negative experiences under the communist regime in the GDR. Thus, under German Chancellor Merkel, the rapprochement in the German-American relations not only accelerated but her personal relationship with President Bush was even as good that he invited her to his ranch in Texas.

In the case of the French-American relationship, the personalities in office as heads of government also played a considerable role. In the pursuit of a Gaullist foreign policy Chirac was substantially responsible for the split in the transatlantic relations over the Iraq invasion. However, there was no real breach in the personal relationship between President Bush and President Chirac, which found its reason in the fact that there had not been a close relationship between the two. While meetings between Chirac and Bush occurred in roughly the same frequency before and after the Iraq War, the occurrence of meetings between Bush and Schröder decreased already in the run-up to the Iraq War in the summer of 2002. Moreover, the fact that Bush held talks with Chirac at the G8 Summit only three months after the Iraq invasion while he avoided talking to Schröder, provides another evidence that there had not been any deep rupture in the personal relationship between the French and the American Presidents.

As a consequence, the change from Chirac to Sarkozy did not have such a big impact on the relations between France and the U.S., which had in large part been restored even under Chirac. With the rapprochement in French-American relations under way, the relationship was better at the end of Chirac's presidency than it had been at the end of Clinton's presidency. Besides, Bush and Sarkozy only spent roughly one and a half years together in office. Nevertheless, the particular personality of Nicolas Sarkozy played a considerable role in the transatlantic relations between Europe and the U.S. during Bush's final eighteen months in office. Sarkozy pursued a strong Atlanticist orientation in French foreign policy, which was largely due to his personality. His admiration of the United States, his belief in the financial reward of success and effort, and the constant exposure of his private life to media contradict a Gaullist lifestyle and show more

parallels with the American way of life. Like German Chancellor Merkel, Sarkozy was opening up to the United States and contributed to improving the negative image of the U.S. in Europe. In addition, President Bush was eager to embrace Sarkozy.

The Transatlantic Military Cooperation in Iraq and Afghanistan

The analysis of coalition efforts in the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq of chapter IV has shown that the 2003 Iraq crisis had a substantial impact on the military cooperation between Europe and the U.S. in the Iraq War. As a result of the disputes, two of the EU-3 countries, Germany and France, and some smaller European countries did not participate in the combat operations in Iraq. Furthermore, France was largely responsible for preventing a UN Security Council Resolution legitimizing the Iraq invasion of the U.S. and British forces. No traditional military alliance, such as NATO, was involved in the Iraq War either. This was partly due to the U.S. preference of ad-hoc coalitions, but also to France and Germany preventing such participation. Hence, the U.S. was fighting together with European as well as other countries in a sort of a loose ad-hoc coalition. In the years from 2004 to 2008 more and more participating nations withdrew their troops from Iraq, which was easier to do as part of a loose ad-hoc coalition than would have been the case when fighting in a traditionally set up military alliance. By the end of Bush's second term the U.S. and the UK together with four other nations remained the only ones involved in Iraq. Thus, during Bush's second term the dynamics of the Iraq War resulted in a sort of *crumbling coalition*. Iraq remained a taboo topic for the rapprochement in the German-American and French-American relations and, while contributing to civilian assistance neither the Germans nor the French deployed any troops in Iraq. Moreover, also NATO's contribution to assistance in the Iraq War remained limited to training, which was largely due to French and German interventions. Thus, it can be concluded that the 2003 Iraq crisis had negative effects on the military cooperation in Iraq.

Meanwhile in Afghanistan, realizing the limits of an overstretched U.S. military by two wars, the U.S. reached out to its European allies on the battleground. It agreed to the extension of ISAF's mission in Afghanistan, thus to an enhanced involvement of Europe in this war, and, in accordance with the U.S.,

NATO took command of ISAF in 2003. This signaled a change in the Bush administration's approach to coalition building, shifting from ad-hoc coalitions to more traditional coalitions and to a renewed significance that the U.S. was attributing to NATO. With the extension of ISAF's mandate in the course of four phases in the years from 2004 to 2006, it took over several PRTs from the U.S.-led coalition OEF. When the UK took command of ISAF from May 2006 to February 2007, the British pushed ISAF to work even more closely together with OEF. In the following months ISAF's upper command structure was revised and new command arrangements between ISAF and U.S. Combined Forces Command-Afghanistan were agreed. The purpose of the fusion of certain ISAF and OEF structures was to further support the cooperation between the U.S. and European/ISAF troops. After the UK the United States, which had not been involved in ISAF so far, took command of the international security force. Furthermore, a composite headquarters with a balanced proportion of U.S. and European representatives in leadership positions was established.

Thus, it can be said that the 2003 Iraq crisis affected the military cooperation between the U.S. and its European allies in Afghanistan in a positive way. While the U.S. sought to strictly separate OEF's combat operations and ISAF's civilian mission and was not interested in any cooperation during Bush's first term, the U.S. actively sought to cooperate with the European nations within the framework of ISAF during Bush's second term. Hence, the rapprochement in the transatlantic relations between Europe and the U.S. was also pursued on the battleground in Afghanistan. The rapprochement in the diplomatic relations between Europe and the U.S., as well as global realities and resources were responsible for the rapprochement in the military relationship.

VI. PROSPECTS

The purpose of the final chapter is to give some prospects for the transatlantic partnership under the presidency of U.S. President Barack Obama. Furthermore, the crisis in the transatlantic relationship in 2003 and its subsequent period of rapprochement in the years from 2004 to 2008 are put into the larger context of the transatlantic relations as they had evolved in the second half of the 20th century. On the basis of this framework some prospects of the transatlantic relations in the following years are anticipated.

Prospects for the Transatlantic Relations during the Obama Presidency

The general acknowledgment laid out in the interviews about the significance of the transatlantic relations was that they are very important for U.S. President Barack Obama. The esteem that Obama attributes to Europe became evident already during his campaign when he went to London, Paris and Berlin in the summer of 2003. This was quite extraordinary and had not been done by any U.S. President before as campaign trips were normally limited to travels within the U.S. However, Obama's trips to Europe were "part of Obama's campaign promise to the American electorate to restore America's standing in the world" (Shapiro, p.i., August 4, 2009). Even though Obama emphasized the U.S. standing in the *world*, he undertook only trips to European countries, which was reasoned by the fact that America's image in the world primarily depends on the European public opinion. The popularity and legitimacy of the U.S. is not evaluated by reactions in Beijing or Moscow but by reactions in London, Paris or Berlin. In that sense "world opinion" has always referred to "European opinion" (ibid.). Hence, pursuing good transatlantic relations with the Europeans is part of Obama's pledge to the American people and therefore also part of his domestic policy. As Shapiro analyzed, "So, he [Obama] has a huge stake in that the Europeans like him, that atmospherics of the transatlantic relationship is good, which translates directly into his domestic political porch" (ibid.). Obama's interest in good transatlantic relations became also evident from the three trips to Europe that he undertook in his first six months in office as well as from his attendance of the EU-USA Summit

in Prague on April 5, 2009, and of the NATO Summit in France and Germany on April 3-4, 2009.

However, while Vaisse agrees with the argument that it is important for Obama to reestablish good transatlantic relations, he remains cautious about the significance that Europe has for the U.S. President, "It depends how you define important; important as an ally or important as an issue or subject" (Vaisse, p.i., August 10, 2009). Europe is still *the* most important ally for the U.S. because "that's where naturally he [Obama] can find help" (ibid.), but as an issue in U.S. foreign policy Europe is not important anymore. Other countries, such as Afghanistan, Iran, Iraq or Russia and subjects such as nuclear weapons treaties, terrorism or climate change are more important to the Obama administration than Europe. Thus, as with regards foreign policy issues U.S.-Russian, relations are more important than are U.S.-European relations.

Like with the new leaders in France and Germany, the question remains as to how much of the change in the transatlantic relationship can be attributed to Barack Obama as the newly elected U.S. President. In this regard Karen Donfried mentioned the debate among political scientists, which is about whether the change in the transatlantic relationship is a cyclical change having to do with a particular U.S. President or whether it is a structural change having to do with fundamental differences in the world (Donfried, p.i., September 2, 2009). Donfried believes that both argumentations are important and explanatory for the change in the transatlantic relations over the last eight to ten years. She thus analyzed, "I think what you are seeing with Obama is you have an American President whose person is very popular in Europe but we are realizing that there are also these deeper structural issues. Sort of in a sense that cyclical change masked a deeper structural change" (ibid.).

Apart from the question of how Barack Obama has affected the transatlantic relations between Europe and the U.S. in general, there is also the question of how much he has influenced the German-American and French-American relations in particular. Since his election as U.S. President the media have frequently been addressing the relationship between Merkel and Obama.

The general perception has been that Merkel seemed to have enjoyed a better personal relationship with President George W. Bush than with his successor. The same applies to the personal relationship between Sarkozy and Obama. However, the academic opinion is, as laid out in the interviews, that this view taken in the media is not true. There is some truth in that Bush was enjoying very good personal relations with Merkel and Sarkozy as they were opening up to him and he was eager to embrace them as well as to be embraced by them. With Obama that personal level of relations with Germany and France fell apart because he pursues a pragmatist and realist foreign policy in which the sole interest of the state counts. Thus, they might not seem as cordial as with Bush. Moreover, while Merkel and Sarkozy could “shine” in their relationships with Bush, they have been “sort of eclipsed by Obama” who arrives as that big star in January 2009 (Vaisse, p.i., August 10, 2009). However, this does not indicate that the relations between Obama and Merkel or Sarkozy are worse than they used to be with Bush.

While the change in U.S. leadership from Bush to Obama “has improved the atmospherics of the U.S.-European relations well in the substance” (Shapiro, p.i., August 4, 2009), the issues have remained the same. There is still the problem of Afghanistan, which made the U.S. turn to the Europeans for help. During the Bush administration it was easy for the Europeans to bloc requests for an increase in troop levels as they could count on the unpopularity of President Bush and his policies. With Obama the case is different because he is more popular with the European people than are their own politicians. Thus, the Europeans find themselves in a difficult situation since they want to cooperate with Obama but do not want to pursue his unpopular policies like, for example, increasing troop levels in the war in Afghanistan. So far Obama has not received a lot from his European allies concerning the Afghanistan issue and from the efforts he has put into the transatlantic relationship. As the Europeans failed to deliver, Obama decided to do it on his own and has pursued a huge increase in U.S. troop levels in Afghanistan.

In contrast to the Bush administration’s highly unpopular, unilateral approach to foreign policy, the Obama administration has been pursuing a more

multilateral and globalist approach. Rather than defining the international system by the number of poles, as have U.S. administrations done throughout the 20th century and at the beginning of the 21st century, the Obama administration follows the idea of a *multipartner world*. In this multipartner international system the transatlantic relations, though important, might only account for one strand of Barack Obama's globalist foreign policy. If Europe fails to deliver on issues of cooperation with the United States, the Obama administration might turn to cooperating with other partners who are willing and able to deliver. Thus, if Europe wants to remain relevant for the U.S., it will also have to reward Obama for his engagement with his European allies.

Prospect for the Wider Context of the Transatlantic Relations

In order to give some prospects on how the relations between Europe and the U.S. might evolve under U.S. President Barack Obama in the coming years, a sketchy overview of the history of the transatlantic relations highlighting the role of identity is given. Eichler (2006, 253ff) identifies four phases of the history of transatlantic relations.

1. In the late 1940s and 1950s, an Atlantic identity, also referred to as *the West*, was constructed in opposition to the Soviet threat "through the overemphasis on commonalities between Europe and the U.S." (ibid., 254). However, from the very beginning there were tensions inherent in the relationship, which were suppressed by Europe's dependence on American economic assistance and military protection.
2. A "weakening of [the] Atlantic identity" (ibid., 255) was the consequence of the rise of Western Europe's economic position in the world and of the decline of U.S. hegemony in the 1960s and 1970s.
3. The 1980s brought about a "further divergence of transatlantic identities" (ibid., 256), when the European integration became closer and "most importantly, the economic basis for a shared identity had disappeared" (ibid., 257).
4. In the 1990s, with the end of the Cold War, "a period of self-reflection" (ibid., 258) and the search for an identity for both the U.S. and Europe set in. An overemphasis of the differences between Europe and the U.S. seemed to be an adequate response to the question of identity.

While such differences in the U.S.-European relations had always been present, they were over-exaggerated in a way that reached its climax in the dispute over the Iraq invasion in 2003 marking the end of the fourth phase.

Today Eichler would have to add a fifth phase in the transatlantic relations, which started after the Iraq War in 2004 and was marked by a cautious reconciliation between the major parties of the conflict, Germany, France and the U.S. While some scholars maintain that the repair of the damage was already accomplished during Bush's second term, others make clear that it started only with Barack Obama's election as U.S. President. In any case the second half of the first decade of the 21st century has been characterized by a period of rapprochement between Europe and the U.S. However, the assumed Cold War harmony in transatlantic relations has never again been established. Instead, the prospects for this fifth phase in the transatlantic relations, beginning from the mid-to late-2000s to the 2010s, might indicate a period of *normalization* in the transatlantic relations with the rapprochement only being part of it. While the U.S.-European relations would still figure very prominently in U.S. foreign policy, relations to other countries might become equally important as alternative channels of cooperation. There might also occur a specialization on certain issues in the various relationships the U.S. pursues with its allies around the world. This, however, would assume that no unexpected event occurred that fundamentally altered the international system.

It will be interesting to see how the transatlantic relations between Europe and the U.S. are going to evolve in the 21st century. A multitude of questions arises when giving some prospects about the future of the transatlantic relationship. What will develop out of the rapprochement between Europe and the U.S.; which influence will the Obama administration have on this relationship; how will Europe contribute to and influence the relations; in what way will a success or failure of the coalition efforts in the war in Afghanistan affect the partnership; and how will the cooperation between the U.S. and its European allies develop in other important policy fields that have not been addressed in the thesis, such as climate change, nuclear proliferation, the worldwide economic recession, or the

establishment of social equation between the developing and the developed world? Questions such as these need to be subject to further observation and study of the transatlantic relations between Europe and the U.S.

VII. Bibliography

Books and Journals

- Alexander, Gerard. (2007). International Relations Theory Meets World Politics. In: Renshon, Stanley A. & Suedfeld, Peter (Eds.). *Understanding the Bush Doctrine: Psychology and Strategy in an Age of Terrorism*. New York: Routledge. 39-64.
- Anderson, Stephanie B. (2008). *Crafting EU Security Policy. In Pursuit of a European Identity*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc.
- Aust, Stefan et al. "We Feel We Have a Responsibility to the World". SPIEGEL Interview with Condoleezza Rice. *Der Spiegel* [online]. January 22, 2007. Retrieved from: <<http://www.spiegel.de/international/spiegel/0,1518,461247,00.html>>, June 7, 2010.
- Balz, Dan. (2007). Bush's Ambitious Second-Term Agenda Hits Reality. In: Fortier, John C. & Ornstein, Norman J. (Ed.). *Second-Term Blues. How George W. Bush Has Governed*. Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution Press. 17-38.
- Beard, Jack M. (2007). The Presidency and Building a Coalition to Wage a War on Al Qaeda and the Taliban Regime. In: Watson, Robert W. (Ed.). *White House Studies Compendium*. Volume 4. New York: Nova Science Publishers, Inc.
- Berger, Silvia/Kläy, Dieter/Stahel, Albert A. (2002). *Afghanistan – ein Land am Scheideweg. Im Spiegel der aktuellen Ereignisse*. Zürich: vdf Hochschulverlag.
- Biddle, Stephen & O'Hanlon, Michael & Pollack, Kenneth. (2008). How To Leave a Stable Iraq: Building on Progress in Iraq. In: *Foreign Affairs*, 87:5, 40-57.
- Bratspies, Rebecca M. (2003). This Too Shall Pass: A Response to Kagan's *Power and Weakness*. In: *German Law Journal*, 4:9, 889-899.
- Broder, David S. "Tight Little Cabinet." *The Washington Post*. December 15, 2004. A 33.
- Bruno, Greg & Kaplan, Eben. (2009). "Backgrounder: The Taliban In Afghanistan." Publication by the Council on Foreign Relations. Updated: 2009, August 3. Retrieved from: <<http://www.cfr.org/publication/10551/#p2>>, May 19, 2010.
- Bullion, Constanze v. & Kammerer, Steffi. "Freunde in der Not." *Süddeutsche Zeitung* [online]. September 13, 2001.

- “‘Bush hinterlässt ein furchtbares Erbe’; Richard Holbrooke: Merkel sollte die Irak-Politik Washingtons frei heraus kritisieren.” *Berliner Zeitung* [online]. January 18, 2007.
- Chernoff, Fred. (2007). *Theory and Metatheory in International Relations. Concepts and Contending Accounts*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Clark, Wesley K. (2003). *Winning Modern Wars. Iraq, Terrorism, and the American Empire*. New York: PublicAffairs.
- Colombani, Jean Marie. “Nous Sommes Tous Américains.” *Le Monde* [online]. September 13, 2001.
- “Die ganze Stadt hält den Atem an.” *Die Welt* [online]. September 13, 2001. Retrieved from <http://www.welt.de/print-welt/article475691/Die_ganze_Stadt_haelt_den_Atem_an.html>, March 12, 2010.
- Dilling, Olaf. (2003). If I had a Hammer: A Review of Kagan’s “Power and Weakness”. In: *German Law Journal*, 4:9, 965-969.
- “Diplomatic License. U.N. Resolution on Iraq Passes Unanimously.” [Televised news]. Aired by *Cable News Network (CNN)* [online] on November 9, 2002. Transcript retrieved from <http://cgi.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/0211/09/i_dl.00.html>, April 2, 2010.
- Dobbins, James. (2009). Obama’s Af/Pak Strategy. In: Zaborowski, Marcin & Vasconcelos, Álvaro de (Ed.). *The Obama Moment. European and American Perspectives*. Paris: EU Institute for Security Studies. 139-151.
- Doyle, Michael W. (1986). Liberalism and World Politics. In: *American Political Science Review*, 80:3, 1151-1169.
- Eichler, Maya. (2006). The Role of Identity in European-U.S. Relations. In: Gustenau, Gustav E. & Höll Otmar & Novotny Thomas (Eds.). *Europe-USA: Diverging Partners*. Baden-Baden: Nomos. 245-267.
- Elman, Colin. (2007). Realism. In: Griffiths, Martin (Ed.). *International Relations Theory for the Twenty-First Century*. New York: Routledge. 11-20.
- Fierke, K. M. (2007). Constructivism. In: Dunne, Time, & Kurki, Milja, & Smith, Steve (Eds.). *International Relations Theories. Discipline and Diversity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 166-184.
- Fiorenza, Nicholas. (2006a). ISAF to take full control of Afghanistan. In: *Jane’s Defence Weekly*. October 4, 2006. p. 5.
- Fiorenza, Nicholas. (2006b). ISAF covers all Afghanistan. In: *Jane’s Defence Weekly*. October 11, 2006. p. 4.

- Fiorenza, Nicholas. (2005). ISAF to expand throughout Afghanistan. In: *Jane's Defence Weekly*. August 17, 2005. p. 6.
- Fortier, John C. & Ornstein, Norman J. (2007). Introduction. In: Fortier, John C. & Ornstein, Norman J. (Ed.). *Second-Term Blues. How George W. Bush Has Governed*. Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution Press. 1-15.
- Gärtner, Heinz. (2009). *Obama – Weltmacht auf neuen Wegen*. Wien: LIT Verlag.
- Gauster, Markus. (2006). *Provincial Reconstruction Teams in Afghanistan. Ein innovatives Instrument des internationalen Krisenmanagements auf dem Prüfstand*. Wein: Schriftenreihe der Landesverteidigungsakademie.
- Gordon, Philip H. (November/December 2007). *The Hyperpresident*. Retrieved from <<http://www.brookings.edu/articles/2007/11france.aspx>>, June 18, 2010.
- Gordon, Philip H. (September/October 2007). *'Punish France, Ignore Germany, Forgive Russia' No Longer Fits*. Retrieved from <http://www.brookings.edu/opinions/2007/09europe_gordon.aspx>, April 6, 2010.
- Gordon, Philip H. (2006). The End of the Bush Revolution. In: *Foreign Affairs*. Vol. 85, Issue 4, 75-86.
- Gordon, Philip H. & Shapiro, Jeremy. (2004). *Allies at War: America, Europe and the Crisis over Iraq*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Greenstein, Fred I. (2007). George W. Bush: The Man and His Leadership. In: Fortier, John C. & Ornstein, Norman J. (Ed.). *Second-Term Blues. How George W. Bush Has Governed*. Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution Press. 39-69.
- Grieco, Joseph M. (1995). Anarchy and the Limits of Cooperation: A Realist Critique of the Newest Liberal Institutionalism. In: Kegley, Charles W. Jr. (Ed.). *Controversies in International Relations Theory. Realism and the Neoliberal Challenge*. New York: St. Martin's Press. 151-171.
- Hacke, Christian. (2003). Deutschland, Europa und der Irakkonflikt. In: *Beilage Das Parlament*, B 24-25/2003, 10.6.2003
- "Hamburg trauert – Parteien stoppen Wahlkampf." *Die Welt* [online]. September 12, 2001. Retrieved from <http://www.welt.de/print-welt/article475478/Hamburg_trauert_Parteien_stoppen_Wahlkampf.html>, March 12, 2010.
- Hammick, Denise & Lewis Jac. (2008). Sarkozy promise to boost French military presence in Afghanistan. In: *Jane's Defence Weekly*. April 2, 2008. p. 7.

- Henrikson, Alan K. (2003). Why the United States and Europe See the World Differently: An Atlanticist's Rejoinder to the Kagan Thesis. In: *EUSA Review*, 16:3, 1-10.
- Hill, Luke. (2004). Plan to rebuild Afghanistan tops new NATO Agenda. In: *Jane's Defence Weekly*. January 14, 2004. p. 5.
- Hoagland, Jim. "Three Miscreants." *The Washington Post* [online]. April 13, 2003.
- Hodge, Nathan. (2008). Bush announces drawdown of US troops from Iraq. In: *Jane's Defence Weekly*. p. 7.
- Hodge, Nathan. (2007). US commanders in Iraq cautious over fall in IED attacks. In: *Jane's Defence Weekly*. November 14, 2007. p. 7.
- Holsti, Ole R. (1995). Theories of International relations and Foreign Policy: Realism and Its Challengers. In: Kegley, Charles W. Jr. (Ed.). *Controversies in International Relations Theory. Realism and the Neoliberal Challenge*. New York: St. Martin's Press. 35-66.
- Hook, Steven W. & Spanier, John. (2007). *American Foreign Policy Since World War II* (17th Edition). Washington D.C.: CQ Press.
- Hoolbroke, Richard C. "Take It to the Security Council." *The Washington Post*. August 27, 2002. p. A 15.
- Human Rights Watch. (April 2007). *The Human Cost. The Consequences of Insurgent Attacks in Afghanistan*. Vol. 19, No. 6(C).
- Hume, David. (1963). Of the Balance of Power. In: Hume, David. (Ed.). *Essays: Moral, Political, and Literary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- "Iraq War Illegal, Says Annan." *British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC)* [online], September 16, 2004. Retrieved from <<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/3661134.stm>>, April 4, 2010.
- Jervis, Robert. (2003). The Confrontation between Iraq and the US: Implications for the Theory and Practice of Deterrence. In: *European Journal of International Relations*.
- Jervis, Robert. (2002). Theories of War in an Era of Leading-Power Peace: "Presidential Address, American Political Science Association, 2001". In: *American Political Science Review*, 96:1, 1-14.
- Kagan, Robert L. (2002). Power and Weakness. In: *Policy Review*, 113, 3-28.
- Kagan, Robert L. (2003). *Of Power and Paradise: America and Europe in the New World Order*. New York: Knopf. 9(2). 315-337.

- Kean, Thomas H. & Hamilton, Lee H. et al. (2002). *The 9/11 Commission Report. Final Report of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks upon the United States*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Kegley, Charles W. Jr. (1995). The Neoliberal Challenge to Realist Theories of World Politics: An Introduction. In: Kegley, Charles W. Jr. (Ed.). *Controversies in International Relations Theory. Realism and the Neoliberal Challenge*. New York: St. Martin's Press. 1-24.
- Krauthammer, Charles. (1991). The Unipolar Moment. In: *Foreign Affairs*, 70:1, 22-33.
- Krech, Hans. (2004). *Der Afghanistan-Konflikt (2002-2004). Fallstudie eines asymmetrischen Konflikts. Ein Handbuch*. Berlin: Dr. Köster Verlag.
- Krech, Hans. (2002). *Der Afghanistan-Konflikt 2001. Ein Handbuch*. Berlin: Dr. Köster Verlag.
- Koch, Andrew. (2006). Rumsfeld leaves troubled legacy. In: *Jane's Defence Weekly*. November 15, 2006. p. 4.
- Kouzmanov, Krassi. (2003). *NATO's Response to the 11 September 2001 Terrorism: Lessons Learned*. Unpublished Master's thesis, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, California.
- Kurki, Milja & Wight, Colin. (2007). International Relations and Social Science. In: Dunne, Time, & Kurki, Milja, & Smith, Steve (Ed.). *International Relations Theories. Discipline and Diversity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 13-33.
- Lambeth, Benjamin S. (2005). *Air Power Against Terror. America's Conduct of Operation Enduring Freedom*. Santa Monica: RAND Corporation.
- Lebow, Richard N. (2007). Classical Realism. In: Dunne, Time, & Kurki, Milja, & Smith, Steve (Ed.). *International Relations Theories. Discipline and Diversity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 52-70.
- Lesch, Ann M. (2006). Problematic Policies Toward the Middle East. In: Maranto, Robert & Brattebo, Douglas M. & Lansford, Tom (Ed.). *The Second Term of George W. Bush: Prospects and Perils*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. 221-236.
- Lequesne, Christian. (2007). *Die Außenpolitik von Jacques Chirac oder: Frankreich ohne Überraschungen*. In: Forschungsinstitut der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Auswärtige Politik (GDAP) (Hg.). DGAPanalyse Frankreich, Oktober 2007, Nr. 2, 13 Seiten.
- Lewis, J. A. C. (2005). Full Power Ahead. In: *Jane's Defence Weekly*. April 6, 2005. p. 21-28.

- Lotherington, John. (2003). Caricatures and Political Purposes: A Comment on Robert Kagan's *Of Paradise and Power*. In: *German Law Journal*, 4:9, 977-984.
- Luif, Paul. 2007. Die Neutralität: Taugliche sicherheitspolitische Maxime? In: Hummer, Waldemar (Hg.). *Staatsvertrag und immerwährende Neutralität Österreichs. Eine juristische Analyse*. Wien: Verlag Österreich. 363-389.
- MacMillan, John. (2007). Liberal Internationalism. In: Griffiths, Martin (Ed.). *International Relations Theory for the Twenty-First Century*. New York: Routledge. 21-34.
- Magliocca, Gerard N. (2009). George W. Bush in Political Time: The Janus Presidency. In: *Law and Social Inquiry*, 34:2, 473-493.
- McGregor, Richard & Wolfe, Richard. *The Financial Times* (London). Friday London Edition 2. February 1, 2002. The Americas Section. p. 7.
- Mearsheimer, John J. (2007). Structural Realism. In: Dunne, Time, & Kurki, Milja, & Smith, Steve. (Ed.). *International Relations Theories. Discipline and Diversity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 71-88.
- Merkel, Angela. "Schroeder Doesn't Speak for All Germans." *The Washington Post* [online]. February 20, 2003. Retrieved via LexisNexis Database.
- Moisi, Dominique. "Welcome to the New, New World Order." *Financial Times* [online]. September 13, 2001.
- Novelobs.com. (December, 17, 2008). *Chronologie: La présence française en Afghanistan*. Retrieved from: <<http://tempsreel.nouvelobs.com/actualite/societe/20081216.OBS5804/chronologie-la-presence-francaise-en-afghanistan.html>>, May 23, 2010.
- Nye, Joseph S. (2009). *Understanding International Conflicts. An Introduction to Theory and History* (7th Edition). New York: Pearson/Longman.
- Nye, Joseph S. (2006). Transformational Leadership and U.S. Grand Strategy. In: *Foreign Affairs*, 85:4, 139-149. Online version via ProQuest.
- Patterson Bradley H. (2006). The Bush White House Staff in the Second Term: New Structures? New Faces? New Processe? In: Maranto, Rober & Brattebo, Douglas M. & Lansford, Tom (Ed.). *The Second Term of George W. Bush: Prospects and Perils*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. 47-62.
- Paulus, Andreas. (2003). Antinomies of Power and Law: A Comment on Robert Kagan. In: *German Law Journal*, 4:9, 871-888.
- Peleg, Ilan. (2009). *The Legacy of George W. Bush's Foreign Policy. Moving Beyond Neoconservatism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

- Phillips, Andrew B. (2007). Constructivism. In: Griffiths, Martin (Ed.). *International Relations Theory for the Twenty-First Century*. New York: Routledge. 60-74.
- Pond, Elizabeth. (2004). *Friendly Fire. The Near-Death of the Transatlantic Alliance*. Pittsburgh: European Union Studies Association.
- Priest, Dana. "Help From France Key in Covert Operations. Paris's Alliance Base Targets Terrorists." *The Washington Post* [online]. July 3, 2005.
- Renshon, Stanley A. (2007). The Bush Doctrine Considered. In: Renshon, Stanley A. & Suedfeld, Peter (Eds.). *Understanding the Bush Doctrine: Psychology and Strategy in an Age of Terrorism*. New York: Routledge. 1-37.
- Rhode, David. "Foreign Fighters of Harsher Bent Bolster Taliban." *The New York Times* [online]. October 30, 2010. Retrieved from: <http://www.nytimes.com/2007/10/30/world/asia/30afghan.html?_r=1&n=Top/News/World/Countries%20and%20Territories/Pakistan>, May 19, 2010.
- Rhode, David. "Afghan Suicide Attacks Rising, Report Shows." *The New York Times* [online]. September 9, 2007. Retrieved from: <<http://www.nytimes.com/2007/09/09/world/asia/09afghan.html>>, May 19, 2010.
- Rick, Thomas E. (2007). *Fiasco. The American Military Adventure in Iraq*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Ripley, Tim. (2005). UK pushes to form multinational combat brigade. In: *Jane's Defence Weekly*. October 12, 2005. p. 6.
- Rippert, Ulrich. (January 24, 2007). "Merkel sagt Bush "breite Unterstützung" zu." Retrieved from <<http://www.wsws.org/de/2007/jan2007/merk-j24.shtml>>, June 7, 2010.
- Robbins, Carla Anna (2007). Bush Foreign Policy: Grand Vision and Its Application. In: Fortier, John C. & Ornstein, Norman J. (Ed.). *Second-Term Blues. How George W. Bush Has Governed*. Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution Press. 89-108.
- Sanger, David E. (2007). Bush Foreign Policy: First-Term Choices, Second-Term Consequences. In: Fortier, John C. & Ornstein, Norman J. (Ed.). *Second-Term Blues. How George W. Bush Has Governed*. Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution Press. 71-87.
- Sariibrahimoglu, Lale (2004). NATO to expand Afghan duty, end Bosnia mission. In: *Jane's Defence Weekly*. July 7, 2004. p. 5.

- Schumpeter, Joseph. (1955). The Sociology of Imperialism. In: *Imperialism and Social Classes*. Cleveland: World Publishing Co. (Essay originally published in 1919.)
- Skinner, Tony. (2005). UK pushes ISAF to work with US. In: *Jane's Defence Weekly*. November 9, 2005. p. 5.
- Schmid, Bernard. (2007). *Sarkozy vollzieht Wende gegenüber der Bush-Regierung*. [online] Retrieved from <<http://www.heise.de/tp/r4/artikel/25/25956/1.html>>; June 18, 2010.
- Smith, Craig. (2003). New Transatlantic Tension and the Kagan Phenomenon: A Primer. In: *German Law Journal*, 4:9, 863-869.
- Stolberg, Sheryl Gay. "An Eye for Detail and the Resolve to Push Change." *The New York Times* [online]. June 19, 2006. Retried from <http://www.nytimes.com/2006/06/19/washington/19bolten.html?_r=2&oref=slogin>, May 10, 2010.
- Szabo, Stephen F. (2004). *Parting Ways. The Crisis in German-American Relations*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.
- "Taleban 'to boost Afghan attacks'." *British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC)* [online], June 27, 2008. Retrieved from <<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/Americas/7478513.stm>>, May 19, 2010.
- "THREATS AND RESPONSES: PERSPECTIVES/Jacques Chirac; French Leader Offers America Both Friendship and Criticism." *The New York Times* [online]. September 9, 2002. Retrieved from <<http://www.nytimes.com/2002/09/09/world/threats-responses-perspectives-jacques-chirac-french-leader-offers-america-both.html?scp=1&sq=French%20leader%20offers%20america%20both%20friendship%20and%20criticism&st=cse&pagewanted=1>>, March 31, 2010.
- Tudor, Radu. (2004). NATO still divided over Afghanistan and Iraq. *Jane's Defence Weekly*. October 20, 2004.
- Vaisse, Justin. (2008). A Gaullist By Any Other Name. In: *Survival*, 50(3), 5-10.
- Valasek, Tomas. (2001/02). The Fight Against Terrorism: Where's NATO? In: *World Policy Journal*, 18:4, 19-25.
- Walker, Martin. (2001/02). Post 9/11: The European Dimension. In: *World Policy Journal*, 18:4, 1-10.
- Waltz, Kenneth N. (1995). Realist Thought and Neorealist Theory. In: Kegley, Charles W. Jr. (Ed.). *Controversies in International Relations Theory. Realism and the Neoliberal Challenge*. New York: St. Martin's Press. 67-82.

Waltz, Kenneth N. (1979). *Theory of International Politics*. Reading MA: Addison-Wesley.

Warshaw, Shirley Anne. (2006). Choices for the President: Structuring the Second-Term Cabinet of President George W. Bush. In: Maranto, Robert & Brattebo, Douglas M. & Lansford, Tom (Ed.). *The Second Term of George W. Bush: Prospects and Perils*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. 63-78.

Woodward, Bob. (2003). *Bush at War. Amerika im Krieg*. Stuttgart/München: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt.

Zaborowski, Marcin. (2006). Friends Reunited? Recalibrating Transatlantic Relations in the 21st Century. In: Zaborowski, Marcin. (Ed.). *Friends Again? EU-US Relations After the Crisis*. Paris: Institute for Security Studies. 213-230.

Zacher, Mark W., & Matthew, Richard A. (1995). Liberal International Theory: Common Threads, Divergent Strands. In: Kegley, Charles W. Jr. (Ed.). *Controversies in International Relations Theory. Realism and the Neoliberal Challenge*. New York: St. Martin's Press. 107-150.

Government and Other Official Documents

Allocution de Monsieur Jacques Chirac, Président de la République devant la communauté française. New York, Etats-Unis. September 19, 2001.

Allocution de Monsieur Jacques Chirac, Président de la République devant la communauté française à Washington. Washington D.C., Etats-Unis. September 19, 2001.

Briefing on Meeting with German Chancellor Schroeder. Background Briefing by a Senior Administration Official on the President's Meeting with German Chancellor Schroeder. Sea Islands, Goergia, G8 Meeting. June 8, 2004.

Déclaration suite aux attentats aux Etats-Unis, Lionel Jospin. September 11, 2001.

Deutscher Bundestag, 14. Wahlperiode, 186. Sitzung vom 12.9.2001, Stenographischer Bericht (Plenarprotokoll 14/186).

Deutscher Bundestag, 14. Wahlperiode, 187. Sitzung vom 19.9.2001, Stenographischer Bericht (Plenarprotokoll 14/187).

Discours de Monsieur Jacques Chirac, Président de la République, en réponse aux vœux des armées. Palais de l'Elysée, Paris. January 7, 2003.

Intervention de Lionel Jospin, Premier ministre au journal 20 heures sur France 2. Mercredi 12 septembre 2001.

Intervention de Monsieur Jacques Chirac, Président de la République à la suite des attentats ayant frappé les Etats-Unis. Faculté des métiers, Ker Lann, Rennes. September 11, 2001.

Joint Declaration by the Heads of State and Government of the European Union, the President of the European Parliament, the President of the European Commission, and the High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy. Brussels. September 14, 2001. Retrieved from: <http://www.europa-eu-un.org/articles/en/article_46_en.htm>, May 4, 2010.

O'Bryant, JoAnne & Waterhouse, Michael. *U.S. Forces in Afghanistan*. CRS Report for Congress. Congressional Research Service. Updated May 9, 2008.

President Bush Participates in Joint Press Availability with President Sarkozy of France. Elysée Palace, Paris, France. June 14, 2008.

President Bush Participates in Joint Press Availability with President Sarkozy of France. Mount Vernon Estate, Mount Vernon, Virginia. November 7, 2007.

President Bush and President Sarkozy of France Exchange Toasts. White House, Washington D.C. November 6, 2007.

President Bush Welcomes French President Sarkozy to Walker's Point. Kennebunkport, Maine. August 11, 2007.

President Bush Welcomes German Chancellor to the White House. Oval Office, Washington, D.C. May 3, 2006.

President Bush Welcomes German Chancellor Merkel to the White House. The East Room, Washington, D.C. January 13, 2006.

President Bush and Chancellor Schröder Discuss Partnership. Electoral Palace, Mainz, Germany. February 24, 2005.

President and German Chancellor Schröder Exchange Toasts. Grosser Saal Lobby, Electoral Palace, Mainz, Germany. February 24, 2005.

President and French President Chirac Discuss Common Values, Vision. Ambassador's Residence, United States Embassy, Brussels, Belgium. February 21, 2005.

President Bush Welcomes German Chancellor Schroeder to White House. Remarks by President Bush and German Chancellor Schroeder in a Photo Opportunity. Washington, D.C. February 27, 2004.

President Bush Meets with French President Chirac. Remarks by the President in Courtesy Call with President Chirac. Hotel Royal Evian, France. June 2, 2003.

September 11 Attacks in the US. Summary: September 13, 2001: Conseil Permanent N° 352 du 13 Septembre 2001. Intervention de l'Union européenne sur les attentats commis contre les Etats-Unis le 11 septembre 2001. Brussels. September 13, 2001. Retrieved from: <http://www.europa-eu-un.org/articles/en/article_54_en.htm>, May 4, 2010.

Terrorist Attacks in the United States. Statement by Mrs. Nicole Fontaine at the Opening of the Conference of Presidents' Meeting, Open to All Members of the European Parliament. Brussels. September 12, 2001. Retrieved from : <<http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do;jsessionid=2EFA7E398CBB30818EE4090588768DE4.node1?language=EN&pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+PRESS +DN-20010912-1+0+DOC+XML+V0//EN#SECTION1>>; May 4, 2010.

The North Atlantic Treaty. Washington D.C. 4 April 1949. Retrieved from: <http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_17120.htm>, May 4, 2010.

The White House Bulletin. In the White House and Around Town Section. "Rumsfeld Outlines Plans for Transforming Military". January 31, 2002.

United Nations Security Council. (2001). Resolution 1368. Adopted by the Security Council at its 4370th meeting, on 12 September 2001.

United Nations Security Council. (2002). Resolution 1413. Adopted by the Security Council at its 4541st meeting, on 23 May 2002.

United Nations Security Council (2003), Resolution 1441. Adopted by the Security Council at its 4651st meeting, on 27 November 2002.abvo

United Nations Security Council. (2002). Resolution 1444. Adopted by the Security Council at its 4651st meeting, on 27 November 2002.

United Nations Security Council. (2003). Resolution 1510. Adopted by the Security Council at its 4840th meeting, on 13 October 2003.

United Nations Security Council. (2004). Resolution 1563. Adopted by the Security Council at its 5038th meeting, on 17 September 2004.

Webpages

Auswärtiges Amt. (2010). *Einsatz der Bundeswehr in Afghanistan (ISAF)*. Retrieved from <http://www.einsatz.bundeswehr.de/portal/a/einsatzbw/kcxml/04_Sj9Spykssy0xPLMnMz0vM0Y_QjzKLN_SJdw0OBMIB2EGu-pFw0aCUVH1fj_zcVH1v_QD9gtylckdHRUUASERp7Q!!/delta/base64xml/L2dJQSEvUUt3QS80SVVFLzZfMUxfRVQ1?yw_contentURL=%2FC1256F1D0022A5C2%2FW2698P6Q728INFODE%2Fcontent.jsp>, May 29, 2010.

- Auswärtiges Amt. (2009a). *Operation Enduring Freedom*. Retrieved from <<http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/diplo/de/Aussenpolitik/RegionaleSchwerpunkte/AfghanistanZentralasien/OEF.html>>, March 22, 2010.
- Auswärtiges Amt. (2009b). *Hintergrund: Mandat für den Militäreinsatz in Afghanistan*. Retrieved from <<http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/diplo/de/Aussenpolitik/RegionaleSchwerpunkte/AfghanistanZentralasien/Mandate.html>>, May 29, 2010.
- Coalition of the Willing Web site. (2009). *The Coalition of the Willing: Numbers and News*. Last Updated: August 12, 2009. Retrieved from: <<http://www.coalitionnumbers.com/#withdrawals>>.
- einsatz.bundeswehr.de. (2010). *Chronologie des Einsatzes in Afghanistan (ISAF)*. Retrieved from <http://www.einsatz.bundeswehr.de/portal/a/einsatzbw/kcxml/04_Sj9SPykssy0xPLMnMz0vM0Y_QjzKLN_SJdw0OBMIB2EGu-pFw0aCUVH1fj_zcVH1v_QD9gtylckdHRUUASerP7Q!!/delta/base64xml/L2dJQSEvUUt3QS80SVVFLzZfMUxfRVQ3?yw_contentURL=%2FC1256F1D0022A5C2%2FW2698QP3402INFODE%2Fcontent.jsp>, May 23, 2010.
- GlobalSecurity.org. (2009). *Iraq Coalition Troops. Non-US Forces in Iraq – February 2007*. Retrieved from <http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/ops/iraq_orbat_coalition.htm>, April 4, 2010.
- GlobalSecurity.org. (2005). *Operation Enduring Freedom Philippines [OEF-PI]*. Retrieved from <<http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/ops/enduring-freedom-philippines.htm>>, March 22, 2010.
- Institute for Policy Studies. (2009a). *Richard Cheney “Dick”*. Retrieved from <http://www.rightweb.irc-online.org/profile/Cheney_Dick>, June 28, 2010.
- Institute for Policy Studies. (2009b). *Paul Wolfowitz*. Retrieved from <http://www.rightweb.irc-online.org/profile/Wolfowitz_Paul>, June 28, 2010.
- ISAF – International Security Assistance Force. *History*. (2010a). Retrieved from <<http://www.isaf.nato.int/history.html>>, March 28, 2010.
- ISAF – International Security Assistance Force (2010b). *ISAF Placemat Archives*. Retrieved from: <<http://www.isaf.nato.int/en/isaf-placemat-archives.html>>, May 23, 2010.
- Ministère de la Défense. (2010). *Afghanistan: Chronologie et repères historiques*. Retrieved from: <http://www.defense.gouv.fr/ema/operations_exterieures/afghanistan/dossier_de_reference/afghanistan_chronologie_et_reperes_historiques>, May 23, 2010.

NATO – North Atlantic Treaty Organization. (2010). *ISAF Command Structure*. Retrieved from: <<http://www.nato.int/isaf/structure/comstruc/index.html>>, May 26, 2010.

VIII. APPENDIX

A. Interviews

Transcript of the Interview with Jeremy Shapiro, M.A., conducted on August 4th, 2009.

Ms. Psihoda: So, how do you see the transatlantic relationship from 2005 onwards? Do you think that there has been a rapprochement? If so, how did this play out during the second Bush presidency?

Mr. Shapiro: Yeah, I think there was a rapprochement; I probably would not have used that word.

Ms. Psihoda: Which other word would you then have used to describe it?

Mr. Shapiro: I would simply say that they moved to repair the damage that they did. I think that there was a very simple reason for it on both sides. Things got bad in the world, essentially, for both parties and they naturally looked to each other. There was the sort of incident... You know the European foreign policy establishment was very uncomfortable with what has happened in the year 2003 because in their world view the United States was very critical for their security and they felt some of their leaders, particularly Chirac and Schröder, had quite fasten loose with the important relationship or an issue which was important, but actually not as important. This sort of European pattern in situations like that had always been like: Well, if you do not agree with what the United States is doing, you do not have to go along, but you should not obstruct. And Chirac especially actually broke that pattern in 2003 a lot. Even people in the French foreign ministry, the French sort of foreign policy establishment, were very upset about that. Because they were worried about the damage that he had done to the US relationship. So there was an obvious loader back, let's say on the European side. Chirac and Schröder went to, after the Iraq incident, they went to Moscow and Beijing to sort of talk about or talk with them about, you know, what a new multipolar world would be like or something like that. I think like ten minutes in these conversations they realized that they did not want to do it. They hated Bush and they did not like a lot of what the United States had become but once you actually start talking to Russians and Chinese you realize that sort of the narcissism with small differences – to quote an Austrian. And you know, I guess, the phrase I use is that *it may be true that the Americans are from Mars and Europeans are from Venus but if that's the case then the Chinese are from Alpha Centory*. It's a totally different world and the Russians and Chinese were not interested in the French or the Germans, they weren't, they did not have the same sort of frame of reference in terms of world order and legalism and, you know,

support of the UN. They couldn't have had that sort of a discussion. Whereas with the United States, even if they did not like the outcome of the discussion, but they could have had it. So it was absurd and it did not take them very long to figure that out.

On the US side it is a little bit more complicated in the sense that in terms of the initial event there was a lot less, at least on the part of the government, a lot less trouble. They were not very troubled about what had happened because it was their world view that the Europeans did not really matter. They did not like that it happened but it was not deeply troubling like it was on the European side. But then by the middle of 2004, so for the first year it was not much of an issue, but by the middle of 2004 or end of 2004 an important thing started to happen, which was we started to lose the war in Iraq and things started to look rather desperate on that front as well as others and they started to look very desperate for help of all sorts, in Iraq but also elsewhere because Iraq was draining the resources to do anything. So, they went back to the Europeans essentially, they sensed that opening with the Europeans and you know, again they had... in a similar way... the Bush administration did not like the French, hated the Germans, hated Schröder, did not trust him at all. But, again, in a similar matter as the Europeans, had not other possibility. So there was a big effort at rapprochement. As I said the conditions were best on the European side as the Americans rapidly started it, because they [Europeans] did not want to ask them [USA] to do so. And it was [inaudible] to the end to the year of 2004. But because of the dynamics of the US election, I would say it did not really get, it did get beyond the sort of internal, you know, lower levels, internal stages between the governments until 2005. I mean the most symbolic aspect of this was the Bush visit to Brussels in February of 2005. You know, it is interesting; it is only a month into his or less than a month into his new term. It was part of the American strategy... was to outreach to the EU in order not to have to deal with the French and the Germans directly. It was the idea, okay what the EU was trying to say is that, you know, "Look come to us and you won't have to have...". You know, it had been... the dividing counter/conquer strategy within Europe had been a sort of resort of American presidents for a long time. Not because they did not like European integration, but because it was always easier for any given issue and, of course, the Bush people had used it a lot in 2003, and it had not exactly worked. It had not worked as well as it usually did and they did get... it is important to remember this if you are writing this paper... They did get 14 EU countries to go along with them to Iraq out of 25. So, in that sense it worked and these countries were, you know, four of the big six ones. I guess Austria was not one of them. But in any case, so in that sense it worked, but because the French and the Germans had refused to stand aside, they did not do what they were usually able to do, which was sort of a newer criticism as well as dividing. So it had not worked as well as it usually did. And the EU people were saying to them, you know, that was the best strategy if you come to us, we can, we can make help you to make deals with the

Europeans in general. We won't stop for shopping, it will be a negotiation with us, but we are a lot more reasonable than the French. This was roughly the necessary airing and they thought they'd give it a try, I guess. At the end it was not... The EU part of it was not at all a success. In large because the EU, as usual, cannot deliver, could not deliver its member states. And if you recall this period it was, part of the reason they were able to make this case was because they were about to get the Lisbon treaty. And the Lisbon treaty would empower them but in May the French and the Dutch voted against the Lisbon treaty and it fell apart and it entered into periodic Euro-pessimism. So that's why it fell apart but they just went the normal bilateral route. And frankly because it was something both side wanted to do, it was actually pretty easy on all accounts. The only country that it was... So they got on bilaterally basically. It was very easy with the French and, in fact, after Sarkozy's election but even before they had fully repaired that. By the end of the Bush administration US-French relations were better than they were at the end of the Clinton administration. So they had literally recovered by 2008. It was not terribly hard because the relationships are very, very deep. There are the business communities, their inter-connections, it's pretty easy to repair those things if the conditions are right. The exception, I think, was mostly Spain, which, I think, has to do more with the particularities of the Spanish government. Because Spain was not one of the those that they had a problem with in 2003, but they had a huge problem in 2004 and they never repaired that problem.

Ms. Psihoda: And Germany?

Mr. Shapiro: Germany, yes, they never repaired the relationship between Bush and Schröder, but this was not really that important. So, in that sense there was a distance between. But, you know, when was Merkel elected? In 2005 in October, so that ended that problem and Merkel and Bush got on very well. And, but, you know, the repair had begun, this was under the table even before that, in fact, oddly although the breach of policy was very big, the breach between the governments was never that big. This is one of the big scandals, of course, of German politics, is that the government apparatus never ceased to cooperate with the United States. And you've seen bunches of scandals about it with targeting information in Bagdad. Actually, the most significant thing is that the Germans filled in for based security. The Germans are allowed based movement out of the US bases into Iraq, which arguably is the single biggest European country mission to the Iraq war. Now because it is huge, if they had not done that, how would we have done the war. But the Germans could have stopped the war with that one seat. Now stopped the war, I do not know if that is true. But that would have been a dramatic step, that would have seriously affected the US capacity to fight that war. They never considered it. Not only that they never considered that, but they actually filled in for based security when the Americans deployed, so they were guarding those bases for the Americans, which was also a huge contribution

to the Iraq war. They did targeting, they did intelligence, some of these scandals have come out, I think that there is actually a lot more that they did and has not come out. The thing is that the German-US relationship is so interwoven that it is actually hard for its leaders – I'm not sure about the extent to which Schröder tried or tried not that hard, but he had tried – it is very hard to sort of disentangle it. But that certainly did not happen. US and France is not totally dissimilar but because of the lack of a military integration it's not quite the same level. So, the French did not really have to participate as much in the Iraq war although they probably did. So, yeah, it was a pretty easy relationship to repair, especially after Schröder left.

Ms. Psihoda: So, do you think that there was a big role of the leaders for the repair or was it more like the circumstances?

Mr. Shapiro: Yeah, I think it was more of the circumstances. The circumstances and, let's say, the sort of government apparatuses, which, you know, continue to cooperate even despite what the leaders said. The leaders were not against or for it, certainly Chirac, Schröder and Bush, and obviously, Blair was for it. But as I said Schröder and Chirac went to Moscow and Beijing. Bush, you know, in the first year after the Iraq war just thought, okay let them go, but circumstances drew them together again, which is some sort of classic story of transatlantic relationship. And I mean, they could have, you know, just sort of set their face in front of them and say, you know, I do not care, I do not care how stupid this is but I am not going to do it. Now they did not do that. Not even Bush did do that. I guess, actually, it was easy for Bush because he was very angry with Schröder, he did not really care that much. So, they did not really oppose it but I would say that it was not their first choice.

Ms. Psihoda: And with the new European leaders in France and Great Britain and Germany was it even easier to do it or did it actually not matter?

Mr. Shapiro: No, it did not matter too much. In the case of France and Germany it made it marginally easier. But, as I said, it started before they left. What the new leaders did, especially in Germany, was allow it, you know just get out of the way, the personal animosity that meant that it was no longer hard to go to the White House and chat. But, frankly, all of these guys are professional politicians. They stab people in the back one day and kiss on the other day. They have done that their whole career. It's not much of a big deal for them. Bush is a fairly personal politician but even for him, if he thinks it's important he can do it. And I would say, by the time that most of those leaders left, certainly by the time Chirac left, and definitely by the time Blair left, it was already done. And it was well begun by the time Schröder left.

Ms. Psihoda: And now talking about the change to the Obama presidency: Is there any different perception of the relationship to the EU or has the agenda changed?

Mr. Shapiro: Oh, a little. Not so much in the ways that we've been talking about. The main important change has been the change vis-à-vis Russia, now that has affected US-European relations. We saw the letter from the CEE, so the Central European countries, which Austria used to be in, but now I think it's in Western Europe. So, the Obama administration definitely takes a different view of Russia than the Bush administration did, a different approach to dealing with Russia's relationship. And that has a big effect on how it relates to Europe simply because Russia is an issue which deeply divides Europe, particularly divides the European Union. Sort of East/West, but not just East/West because the UK is very West. In any case it divides them and interestingly on this issue the United States, if you were sort of charting a view of how people view Russia and Europe and then you put the United States on it, you could actually find the United States more in the middle. And so what happened is that it moved slightly from one camp to another but not dramatic, but it is a good way of understanding that problem. This has had two effects in Europe. We've seen the effect on the Eastern Europeans, they were very nervous that the United States is selling them out to Russia. On the Western European side, even though the United States has moved closer to the Western European view of French and Germans and Italians, they are also very worried that the United States is decided to essentially conduct Russia policy over their head. And this whole sort of notion, which is very appealing to the Russians, which is why the Americans sort of present it that way. It's odd to have arms control talks as we used to, and go to Geneva and there will be a lot of press coverage. And, you know, we are the two superpowers and the other countries are just going to be not so important. And Russia and the US is just going to hang out in this club of two. This is what the Russians really wanted... There was something from the United States perspective, which was kind of easy to give. But from the European perspective it's a little bit troubling because they want to be an important player and this is just as true of the Germans as it is of the Poles who want to be an important player. They think they have a special conduct and they fear that they get screwed up by the way the US is handling Russia. So they are not quite happy with that aspect, but this is all quite early days, but in any case I think it is one of the basic messages. It is the change in Russia policy that has upset some of the transatlantic dynamics. From the Bush administration [to now] there is not any direct change in the way that the US approaches NATO or even Afghanistan or any of the particular bilateral relationships. Yeah, the missile defense thing is important, but I would put in the overall context of the change of policy toward Russia. Even though it is the US line that has to do with it.

Ms. Psihoda: And apart from Russia are there any other issues that have changed or that Obama has a different stand on?

Mr. Shapiro: Yeah, climate change. That is obviously an important and substantial change. I do not think it is kind of fundamentally alter the dynamics of transatlantic relations, really. It makes things easier for the Europeans in the way

that Obama has generally made things easier for the Europeans. Even though US-European relations were broadly repaired by 2008, Bush was still slightly less popular in Europe... something like 7% popularity rate, it is incredible. He was not very popular here... but it is still more popular than that. And it made it difficult for the Europeans to cooperate with the United States. I would say that climate change more than any other issue was the symbol of that. Iraq too, but... And so, Obama in general just by being who he is and being not Bush had lessen that problem and the climate change stance is an important element of that. You know, obviously, it is going to be difficult for the Americans to deliver, frankly, it's difficult for the Europeans as well. But it has improved the atmospherics of the US-European relations well in the substance.

And, in fact, now the Europeans somewhat of the opposite problem, which they used to have, which, you know, you see in the German elections that Obama is the most popular politician in Germany. So, now it puts the German politicians in this weird place where they need to be seen as close to Obama. But, in fact, Obama's policies since they are not very different from Bush's on the issues that matter for Europeans, with the exception for climate change, but the policies are not any more popular than they ever were. You know, the Iraq war, the Afghanistan war, these things are not popular in Germany. And so it puts the German politicians in this weird place, where they need to be close to Obama but they can't be close to his policies. And you can see that in their careful way the Germans treat Obama. You know, during the Merkel visits... When she comes [she] has all sort of good... But she is still willing to sort of stand up in the press conference for some specific policies. And they are all just very, very worried about, you know, whether Obama will smile or not go over and touch Steinmeier's shoulder. I mean it's really on that level of [inaudible]. But this is with German politics particularly because of the elections coming up. Well, exclusively because of the elections coming up, for that you hear a lot about the atmospherics of Obama. He is, I would not say that he has played on that... not all that much, maybe a little. But he is wise, I think, not to try to leverage that too much because that would get him into trouble and so he is sort of, you know, he tries to have a steady neutrality, which is interesting because in German politics it's assumed that he prefers Steinmeier and that is actually false. He prefers Merkel, the American government prefers Merkel but that's a matter sure of how successful he has been and trying to be neutral in that, which is, you know, I mean it's hard because as I have said there matters every glance and blink.

Ms. Psihoda: And do you think that the transatlantic relationship or the relationship to the European Union is more important for Obama than for Bush. Or is it just...?

Mr. Shapiro: I think they have broadly the same view. I mean, as I said, in the early Bush days there was what you might call ideological opposition to the European Union, but that disappeared before the end of the first term. And the

entire second term was characterized by the sort of [inaudible] with the European Union. I say in a way that... there is a famous quote. Someone said to Ghandi, "What do you think of Western civilization?" and he said, "It would be nice". And this is the way they felt about the European Union "it would be nice". There is broad agreement in the American political establishment democratic and republican at this point. But they would like a more powerful European Union that was capable of forging a coherent foreign policy and capable of being part of the United States on a variety of global problems. This was not a consensus in the 1990s. So this is a change from ten years ago, but it is not an Obama/Bush change. The reason for the change is because in 1990s it was possible to think that the European Union was the greatest threat to America and Germany. And in 2009 that is an absurdity. There is about ten more pressing threats to America and Germany. And frankly, the European Union has been so slow and so that the idea that it would ever gather enough power is so far off in the future. Even if you believe that there is push in that direction it is just so distant that no one is really nervous about it. Frankly, even in the 1990s, I think, it took an amazing feed of imagination to be nervous by the Americans but some achieved it. Americans weren't kind of long-term thinkers with this kind of thing. So, yeah, there is a broad consensus that it would be great, broad consensus in the second Bush term, broad consensus in the Obama term, but, you know, it's not there. It's not, I do not think, it's the American view that they have a lot of capacity to bring that about. So, you are not seeing a broad effort, again by either Bush or Obama, to create European integration. For the American perspective it's a European problem, they are broadly supportive but not actively supportive on the details. So, yeah, you see on Lisbon treaty, you know, Americans would like the Lisbon treaty to pass but they are not willing to devote any political vocabulary to weigh into that. The exception of this is, of course, is Turkey: Turkey enlargement, which has more to do with the specific American problem with Turkey than the European Union. And again because, I would say broadly that Americans do not expect the European Union to ever be a geopolitical actor, they do not worry about screwing it up by admitting Turkey because there is nothing to screw up.

Ms. Psihoda: Why does the US want Turkey to be part of the European Union? Why do they care so much?

Mr. Shapiro: Because they are very, very worried about the internal dynamics of Turkey. And Turkey is a very critical country for US interest in a bunch of places: in Israel, in Iran, in Iraq, in the Caucasus, and everywhere. On a certain level Turkey sort of the crossroads to every geopolitical problem, in fact. And, you know, it's the American experience from Eastern Europe that, and of course the experience of the European Union, that the European Union is the most effective democratization strategy in the world. It's also a very expensive democratization strategy... expensive in every sense of the word, it's expensive monetarily, it's expensive culturally, it's expensive institutionally, it's expensive politically, but

almost all of those expenses were born by Europe and not by the United States. So, actually, it's sort of a no-brainer, you know, unfair but frankly that the European Union taking in everybody because it's easy for me, easy for the American side. But we understand that frankly that it's a lot more of a difficult issue but really from the American perspective that is a no-brainer. Just the European Union accession process has been very, very good for the internal development of Turkey, for its democratization, for its stability, for its economy, which is something that Turks understand very well. And the sort of Western orientation of Turkey is definitely at risk to a large degree because that European Union accession process is so radically uncertain. And the Turks are beginning to, not more than just beginning, to disbelieve that they are ever going to be admitted. There is a joke that they tell: The Romanians, the Bulgarians, and the Turks go to the European Union accession committee and first they interview the Romanians and say, "Okay, what year did World War One start?" and the Romanians say "1914" and the European Union says, "That's great, you're in". Then they bring up the Bulgarians and they say, "What year did World War One end?" and the Bulgarians say "in 1918" – "That's great, you're in". And then they bring up the Turks, who think, "That's easy, we are not going to have any problem at all" and they say to the Turks, "Please list the names and addresses of everyone who died in World War One". That's the Turkish view of the European Union accession, that it's weighted against them that they'll never... that they are going through the emotions but they never intend to get them in. And that there is a double standard, that the Croatians, and the Macedonians, and the Bosnians will pass them. And, you know, there is still in Turkey a government, which recognizes that economic advantages of the process is in conflict with its own military, which means that it needs the European Union for that conflict. But it's not at all clear that this consensus is going to hold much longer, it's very, very gravely weakened. You know, twenty years ago, this was absolutely what everybody in Turkey wanted and now it's a much more [inaudible] thing. And the US-Turkish relationship has deteriorated a lot as well for different reasons. It was very, very strained by the Iraq war, much more deeply and permanently strained than the US-European. It has improved a little bit in the last two years because of improved cooperation with the PKK, which was the main issue but frankly the United States is very, very unpopular in Turkey. The United States does not have a lot of economic leverage with Turkey. They do not have much of an economic relationship with them, that's the European Union. So, we need the European Union as it needs the European Union to root Turkey in the West and that's a very important geostrategic interest.

Ms. Psihoda: How important is the transatlantic relationship now? I mean, is Asia or Africa more important to the Obama administration?

Mr. Shapiro: Ahm, well, not Africa. It's [the transatlantic relationship] important... arguably it's more important than it should be and the reason is, I think, in part

because of the sort of history, density of ties, and in part because of the fact of who these countries are and the fact that they are democracies roughly think alike. So, they are clearly the best partners that the United States is ever going to get anywhere. That has been demonstrated time and time again, but we are not ideal partners even in terms of their power or in terms of their outlook. But they are far better than anybody else. Also, interestingly there is a sort of important cultural dimension to all of this. When the candidates were out on the, the US presidential candidates, Obama, McCain and the others, were out on the campaign trail, they heard from the population what I think was a surprising message to them, which is that it mattered very greatly to the US population that they were becoming hated in the world. This is not something, frankly, that had had much political resonance in the United States prior to this election. But, and the polls showed this too, but maybe even more importantly they heard this directly from voters, "We don't like that people hate us, we don't like being ashamed of being Americans when we go abroad". And this was not actually, in its phrasing it was not a reference to Europe but if you dug deeper into how they understood that they were liked or hated, they were judging that by reactions in London and Paris. They were not judging it by reactions in Beijing and Moscow, in fact, did not care. I mean, they always said "world opinion" but they always meant "European opinion". And that's just a result of how the United States understands "world opinion". I mean... I think, it's totally sort of historical Westigio culture but they actually do not look... understand themselves in the eyes of others... they don't look to Africa, they don't look to Asia, they look to Europe. And the presidential candidates understood it. And this is what helps you to understand why Obama did this extraordinary thing during campaign when he went to London, and Paris, and Berlin. I mean, why did he do that? First of all, you know, why did he go abroad at all? That has never been done before really, not like that. But secondly, why would he go to these places? That should actually be an even more difficult question. And I think this is the reason. And that plays out in the policy. It is part of Obama's campaign promise to the American electorate to restore America's standing in the world. And that's the way they usually put, to restore America's popularity and legitimacy in the world after the damage that the Bush administration did. That is principally going to be evaluated to European eyes. So, he has a huge stake in that the Europeans like him, that atmospherics of the transatlantic relationship is good, which translates directly into his domestic political porch. Now, you know, of course, it's not making too much out of this. He has a lot of other factors, you know, health care is going to be a lot more important than that. But the presidents get elected because they worry about all of these different aspects and that is one. So, that makes Europe important. And, you know, on the more prosaic level, as I said, they are the best partners. So, they are the place where you look to first for all these global problems. Most of transatlantic relations now is not about, you know, the Lisbon treaty or even EU enlargement. It's mostly about how the US and Europe can work together to set some problem outside of Europe: Afghanistan, Iran, Iraq, global climate change,

international financial regulation. These are global problems or at least extra-regional problems for generally not more than the US and Europe. But Europe is the place where the US looks first, first partners, first of agreement. There is a sort of informal US-Europe caucus on most of these problems in the sense that they tie and coordinate the positions first. Climate change is maybe a challenge to that, we'll see. So, in that sense, it's quite important and a lot, none of that can be captured by looking at GDP shifts, or population shifts, or the rise of China, or even like that.

Ms. Psihoda: So, Hillary's first trip abroad to Asia is not a sign that Asia is more important than Europe?

Mr. Shapiro: No, I mean, Obama grew up in Asia and yet went to Europe three times before he went to Asia. He went to Europe three times in his first six months. I think in that sense the Hillary trip was compensatory. You know, all of these areas are important and this sort of... You know, in every administration since I have been alive there is always this sort of European prediction of "Okay, now the US is going to start to look to the Pacific, wants to become more a pacific power". This has been going on as long as I can remember and it has never been quite right. I mean, it has always been partially right. I mean, first, clearly it's sort of a shift of power but it underestimates, I think, systematically this stickiness of institutions, this stickiness of relationships. And so, you have seen, you know, obviously some shift and move in the intention of the US but dramatically less than is justified by the changes in the world. And frankly, to the extent that there is a shift, it's not what the US wants, it's actually what Europe dictates by refusing to become involved in some of these areas in the world. At this point, you know, the United States would love to have sort of European help in dealing with the geopolitical challenge of China but Europeans are not interested in dealing with the geopolitical challenge of China. They are not interested in being a geopolitical player in the Pacific. They trade obviously, so they have that interest, but they don't want to be involved in that part of the world. So, actually, the more classic understanding, at least from my perspective, is the US trying to draw Europe out into the world. Not because it loves Europe but because it needs the help, and not being terribly successful, being a little bit successful in places like Afghanistan and the Middle East, but not at all in the Pacific.

Ms. Psihoda: Do you think that the EU is more taking a look more beyond its borders and trying to think more globally or are they still preoccupied...

Mr. Shapiro: The EU or Europe?

Ms. Psihoda: It depends on how you define the transatlantic relationship, which is another question: Is it for Obama more a US-EU relationship or a US-Europe relationship?

Mr. Shapiro: Yeah, definitely US-European. The EU is an important part of that but probably not the most important part. And as I said that is not a US choice, it's the way it is. But from the US perspective there is just absolutely no way deal with the EU as a primary actor. You have to deal with France, Germany, UK, and Spain, Poland. There is absolutely no alternative. And, you know, on trade issues, the EU is quite primary but on these sort of geopolitical issues that I have been talking about mostly it does not relate to the EU. The primary interlock of this part is frankly the big 3 but on specific issues other countries beyond that but almost never the EU.

Ms. Psihoda: So, do you think that the Europeans are more looking beyond their borders and are trying to think globally?

Mr. Shapiro: Some of them but by large they are not. Certainly the EU is not, you know, various thinkers within the EU would like to but in terms of actually acting the EU is really not. You see, they want to think of Afghanistan, what actually happens in Afghanistan in terms of the EU, it's pitiful. And most of the European countries really have actually no interest in thinking this way. Certainly the Austrians, they think that beyond their borders there is Spain, really. It's basically their neighbor countries, they are just not interested in anything, which is not attached to them. And that is actually quite typically for the small European countries. Sorry, but it's true. I think, you know, the British and the French have a global vocation or at least an extra-regional vocation, which they attempt to satisfy themselves, they attempt to get the EU to work on but they don't succeed very much occasionally. I would say that none of the other countries really did. I mean, there is a spectrum but, you know, some live in even more isolation but others, but say broadly beyond those two, they other are not really interested in that much. The Germany are particularly striking in this regard. Because as the largest country and potentially the most powerful country, you would think that would be the first interested and actually they are very uninterested. They are almost a small country in this regard. I would say that they are less interested in these things than the Dutch are, which is extraordinary. And this has to do with the particularities of German history, the particularities of the German constitution, and the parliamentary... and frankly this weird cultural pacifism and idealism, which dominates German politics. In my view, the German political culture is in Neverland, I mean, they live in a world, which sounds lovely. I would love to visit it but it's just not remotely like the world that I actually have to live in. And, I think, the Germans are particularly extreme to have a look like this but this is not uncommon on the ponds of Europe. You know, the Easterners are more sort of... are less able to dream because the Russians keep waking them up in the middle of the night. And the French and the British have another experience of the world and interest in the world.

Ms. Psihoda: And from your perspective...

Mr. Shapiro: In my view the EU can't because the EU certainly needs British, French and German agreements to do anything geopolitically.

Ms. Psihoda: And what do you think that the EU has to do in order to become a more global and a more important actor in the world?

Mr. Shapiro: Well, the first thing that they will have to do is want to. Right, I mean, that's the principal impediment but as long as it does not want to...

Ms. Psihoda: So, that's more of an ideological reason, not of processes?

Mr. Shapiro: There's a lot of processes and problems that you could point to but as a certain point you've got to ask, "G, people did point out a lot these process flaws and these implementation flaws for decades. So, why did it not get fixed?" And so you come down to because they don't want to fix them. So, the first issue is political will, which frankly I don't see changing, not soon. I think that in general European politicians are aware of what's at stake but for a variety of reasons, many of them, enough of them, it took a long progress to walk change, which is it might not be progress. And they had decided that this is the way they want to go. And even if they did, in a year, frankly, the principal impediment is, and this is a very different analysis than you usually hear, is the Germans. Because the Germans don't want Europe, they don't want to be a global power, they don't want Europe to be a global power. Even if the Germans were to go through a machine that made them French tomorrow, which would be good for their cuisine but for usually nothing else, there would still be a lot of impediments. But then we...

Ms. Psihoda: And why do the Germans not want Europe to be a global power? I mean, obviously, they must see that alone they cannot do a lot. And – at least I have the perception from the standpoint of Austria – Austria can never do anything. So its better to support the European Union and the European project. So, I assumed that it must be the same for the Germans.

Mr. Shapiro: It is and, of course, in a lot of areas they do support the European Union specifically for that reason. But what we are talking about now is sort of being a global power, they don't, you know, speaking as the German political system, not necessarily any given individual, they don't think that being a global power is necessary for security and things that they want. They think that it creates all sorts of wars and problems in their politics that they just don't want. I mean, they see 130.000 American troops in Iraq and they think this could be us. They don't want that. You know, this is strange, when we think of countries having a will to power and, of course, the Germans have a long history of that, but they have an extraordinary history of putting that will of power to... and of speaking of the world of power is something very damaging to the world society. They are almost unique in the world of doing this. It's something, which is very, very hard to understand and at a certain level I admire it tremendously and, you know, the world in which the Germans acquire power is not the bad world at all, I can say,

given, you know, where we came from. But still, I think it's strange, it's unusual and it's a problem for the European Union and it therefore it's a problem for the transatlantic relations. There is another aspect to it, which is some of less [inaudible], which they will never express but it's largely that there is a sort of free-riding problem, which extends beyond the Germans but it's particularly true in case of the Germany, which is that they don't want to do these things because they [these things] are hard and they have all these negative influence. They also do these things off because the Americans will do it if they don't. And that is their history of the last sixty years.

For the French and to a certain degree for the British, they don't want the Americans to do it. Everybody else is broadly comfortable with the Americans to do it, you know, "*sauf*" the Americans. And, you know, so why I have said that apple card and so my prediction would be that the only way to get Europe to step up is for America to step down. But that's a very dangerous game, which we don't really feel to do it that way, I would not even recommend it. But it may happen for reasons of the American domestic politics. You know, you could argue that it is happening but I don't really think so. But certainly at the moment the Europeans have a pretty good deal. I think, you know, what it is to be European, you spend less than 2% or 1.5% of your GDP on defense, the United States spend 5%. You are the richest countries in the world, broadly speaking, very, very high quality of life. You are surrounded by neighbors who live in misery and they don't attack you. I mean that's strange, right? How is it that a country like Austria can even exist? The history of the world would tell you that there could no country like Austria because one of its neighbors look at it and they go, "G, there is a defenseless rich country, let's go attack it." And they will attack it and it ceases to be rich and probably ceases to be defenseless, eventually. You know, that's how history has generally worked. The last fifty years it has not worked that way, which is great for the Europe. I mean, you know, it's the sort of Switzerland option. And, you know, in Switzerland the streets are clean, chocolate flows to the streets. So, I think, broadly, people are satisfied with that, I would be, it's just... The question is really, can it continue? How much responsibility can they push off? So that's the game and that has actually been the game for the last twenty years.

Ms. Psihoda: Do you think that it will continue? Because actually the Europeans were expecting Obama to ask more from European countries, more troops for Afghanistan, help in Iraq. But so far, I have not seen anything.

Mr. Shapiro: Well, he has asked but, you know, quietly. Yeah, I think that it will continue. I don't think that they... The dynamic in the second Bush terms was... Americans were always asking for Europeans to get involved and Europeans said "no"; giving a little but trying to get involved as little as possible in all of these problems. I think that the essential dynamic will continue but the terms of the deal, how much exactly they give, that may change because Obama may be better at this than Bush. But the essential push-pull is the same.

Ms. Psihoda: And then, on issues like the Middle East, Iraq, Iran, how important is the transatlantic partnership? If it is important at all?

Mr. Shapiro: It's important. I mean it varies from issue to issue but what's consistent is that the US would like it to be even more important. You know, on Iran, for the last several years it has been very important but it seems to be becoming less important. On Iraq it's really not very important at all because the Europeans have really not been... You know, because of its particular symbolic importance in European politics, which to my mind has been a huge problem to transatlantic relations. You know, basically the US, during the second Bush administration, the US and Europe agreed to sort of disagree on Iraq because they took it off the table. The US agreed not to ask the Europeans to do anything and the Europeans agreed not to do anything. Worked for both sides but it was odd because, of course, for the transatlantic alliance – and it's an alliance – to be really functionally important to both sides, it needs to be relevant to the most important issues for both sides. And Iraq was clearly, maybe not quite anymore, but even arguably it's still the most important issue for the United States because we are now having a 130.000 troops there and a lot of them were dying. And for Europe not to be playing in that, I think, is deeply damaging to the transatlantic relations. People have not commented on it much because there was, for all the reasons I'm talking about, there was an agreement on both sides not to really deal with it. And that kept it out of the headlines but what it meant is that the transatlantic alliance is utterly irrelevant to what the United States was doing in Iraq. And it need not have been that way and it meant that, it meant that... Well, it created two lessons. One, of course, since... At least as it is now, they seem to have won the Iraq war and they would actually show to Europe that it is not that essential in all of this. I think that's a sort of ironical way to look at it, but it's the lesson. And you could see that... and you could see that in a lot of Afghanistan. One of the bits that have received wisdom about the doing of the Afghanistan and Iraq war is that NATO is in Afghanistan for legitimacy reasons and it gained some legitimacy but you lose a lot on the political restrictions, on the coalition warfare. They did not have that in Iraq, they did not have legitimacy and they did not have the restrictions. Turns out that it was a pretty good trade, they weren't enabled to do that trade in Afghanistan because at the moment restrictions are very binding and legitimacy does not seem to make any difference. In Iraq the legitimacy did make any difference and they did not have any restrictions and that did make a difference. That's the deal with that. That's a somewhat... way of looking at it, but it's definitely part of the American received wisdom on this issue. And particularly, I think, if you see Afghanistan continue to go south, this becomes very problematic for NATO and for the transatlantic relations. And on the comparison of Iraq and Afghanistan and the role that NATO played in the two, which is why, I think... And the basic lesson of this is if you're in an alliance if you want to be a tight alliance, you need to go down together and you need to go up together. And they didn't do that in Iraq. And so that creates a certain distance.

Ms. Psihoda: What about Iran?

Mr. Shapiro: Iran was a certainly better story. The transatlantic relationship has certainly functioned very well in the case of Iran, in a sense that they have been able to come up with a common position. And they have been able to use their combined leverage to serve that common position. The only problem is that it has not helped the problem. So it's a sort of triumph for the transatlantic relations but it has not really improved the Iran issue at all. So the transatlantic people are happy about that, the Iran people are less happy. And, you know, that would be fine for transatlantic relations if we did not have these other examples where they weren't working together and things have gone even better. I personally think that it's very good that they work together in Iran and it has made a difference, even though it has not brought the problems where they wanted them to be. And you know it could have been worse and the fact that they worked together means that they are sort of set up as they move forward for a more of policy of outcome than they would have been otherwise. But it's hard to make that case.

Ms. Psihoda: And how about Israel and Palestine?

Mr. Shapiro: Israel and Palestine is a worst side example, especially to Iraq is on its border and then with Iran they are having problems. I mean, it's such a disaster on so many levels but I think we've gotten ourselves in the situation where the US is seen as the supporter of Israel and the Europeans are seen as the supporter of the Palestinians. And this is simply not good for transatlantic relations, even worse for the Israeli-Palestinian problem.

Ms. Psihoda: But hasn't there been a move by Obama to get closer to the European position?

Mr. Shapiro: No. You know, Israel was very particularly sure American politics and the Europeans actually don't really interact, they don't really play that much. So, it's for all of you see American politics toward Israel or toward Israel/Palestine. And in part this is because Europeans talk a lot about these problems, they are not delivering these problems. They are symbolically involved in a certain way when you talk about Lebanon, which I guess is important. But they are really not involved in the core Israel/Palestine issue. They don't want to be. And their involvement basically consists of throwing money to the Palestinians and watching them steal it. So, the Europeans are, you know, and this is a hierarchical problem, in these place probably 50 years. And the Americans have often not been, usually not been, let's say effective at dealing with it. So, the Europeans have not been responsible, they have not even been trying to deal with it. Again, they are just sort of leaving it to the Americans, which is particularly odd in this case because their view is that the Americans get the problem on [inaudible] and it's very important to Europe. They say all these things, these things are broadly true, but they don't do anything about it. They pretend to do things about it, but

they certainly don't really. And you don't really see, especially for the last ten years, any kind of concern in European effort to really get involved. The US would have mixed feelings about that, frankly, but in the end they will accept it if the Europeans were really serious because they... Well, because they don't have great ideas with these problems, because they need help, because... There is a lot of people in the US who are pretty happy that the Europeans aren't involved into this and it would be complicated if they were. But in my view it could be done but the Europeans aren't really interested in it. So, it's a sort of fake transatlantic issue, it's a rhetorical issue. But there isn't an actual conflict because the Europeans aren't doing anything.

Ms. Psihoda: And on the issue of international terrorism: Is there more cooperation or less?

Mr. Shapiro: Yeah, there is a huge matter of cooperation on that issue. And this is a big practical success in transatlantic relations in the last ten years. They work together very effectively, they disagree on all of the theoretical elements, but we see a lot of surface disagreement. You know, whether it's a war or any other crap. None of that really matters, I mean, has some political resonance but it does not matter to the actual cooperation, which is very, very tight and has been consistently tight throughout the period that we've talking about and since 9/11 essentially. And, you know, in fact, with the French and the Germans during the Iraq crisis and throughout it has been always tighten. That's been another source of the scandals where the Germans would stand up and say, "You know, we don't agree with the war there" but then they would be cooperating with the United States at things that they were publicly condemning. So, I would say on a certain level the transatlantic relations and terror have been too covered. They had exceeded the political foundations because and the reason for this is because these are so sort of secret worlds. And you can hide them, but then it usually comes out and you can hope to hide it. And because the interaction occurs at the level of professionals who have roughly the same worldview. So, yeah, you can have German public opinion thinks this and American public opinion thinks that, but in fact the American and German intelligence agencies think exactly the same thing. And so they work together very, very effectively. And if you look closely at, well if you remember a couple of plots tow or three years ago in Germany, if look closely at those you see that print of American intelligence and you see, well sometimes you see more than that because the Germans occasionally leak but this is how they got the information with that. Basically though they use American signals and the intelligence standards that were brought from Pakistan and the British and the Germans have gotten a lot out of this. It has been a very strict cooperation with the French. So, with the smaller countries it does not work as well with because they are just not as terribly interested in the problem but – and the Germans have been very interested in that problems – but in general it works quite well at the operational level. And all of the countries value that. On the

rhetorical level you can see the source of analyst dispute during the Bush years, which has been completely faded after the Obama years even though the policy has very changed. So, the best example is having improved atmospherics that kind of allow them to do what are already doing.

Ms. Psihoda: Do you think that this could be a new purpose for the transatlantic alliance? I mean, the purpose, obviously the Soviet Union has disappeared. So, they are still searching for a new purpose. Do you think that they find some or that it is just going to be like in the last ten or fifteen years that they are still in search of a purpose and that the alliance somehow exists but it will not be as important as it was when the Soviet Union was still of a global scale?

Mr. Shapiro: Yeah, I don't think that it is ever going to be rediscovered a purpose like the Soviet Union unless it actually [inaudible] Russia. Certainly terrorism is not going to do that. And this whole search for a purpose is a little bit absurd. You know, NATO, I guess which is the sort of embodiment of the search of purpose is a sort of paradox when you think about it. So for forty years it had a very obvious purpose and it never did anything, right. For the last twenty years it has been searching for a purpose and it has been very, very busy. So, you have to... So, it seems that the NATO governments know less what NATO is for but they need it more. They all use that. It's because NATO is actually, even without a purpose pretty useful. And NATO is being called on for any number of things. And we think about Afghanistan and Kosovo but actually it has been called on for a huge number of things. So, the time when it's [inaudible] people sitting out in Brussels and saying, "NATO – what is it for?". They don't bother look at the fact that NATO is busier than it has ever been, that it has been called upon by its member governments all the time. And the problem is not that NATO is in danger of wasting away, the problem is that NATO is in danger of so exceeding its capabilities that it fails, which frankly is not much of an institutional threat. I mean, it's a threat to the missions. And then NATO, it is undercapable [inaudible] what it is asked to do. But that's a very different type of problem and assumedly if it failed, people would not say, "G, NATO failed, we should get rid of it" because they don't know what to replace it with. They say, "G, we need to make NATO better". And so, the fact, I just find that to be, personally incredibly state of debate, the fact that it's very difficult to define what NATO does, well, you know, that's the state of existence for most alliances, you know, most of history in the world. Almost anomalous was the Cold War and I think the best way to judge whether NATO is relevant is not sort of sit around and think about its purpose but to look at what it actually does. And by that measure it is essentially much more relevant.

Ms. Psihoda: And for the future of the transatlantic relationship what would be... I mean do you think it's going to get more important as NATO gets even busier? Do you think it is getting less important?

Mr. Shapiro: Well, I mean, I think the key is the sort of European position, although “position” is sort of the wrong word about whether it wants to be a global power and that’s the real struggle in terms where the coalition is right now. And, you know, I would say that does not look very good at the moment, from my perspective. Maybe from the Austrian perspective it looks great. And that will define the transatlantic relationship. It’s that sort of European identity question, which is, I think, deeply unresolved. There is a lot of division with it within Europe and it’s a political problem, it’s not a technocratic problem. They are not going to solve it through the Lisbon treaty and external action services. The fundamental question is will Europe a) decide to be a political entity and b) as a political entity decide to take an active interest in China, in Israel/Palestine, in Afghanistan. For the moment it is not doing that. I talked a little bit about the reasons. I don’t think that the tenor of the US-European relations is really going to be the main factor driving that. As I said this dependency thing has a big effect on it. But I don’t think that this is a Bush vs. Obama issue because the dependency issue has not really changed. And I don’t know where that’s going, I really don’t. I think it has to get worse before it can get better. But I’m not sure that even if they got worse, they will get better.

Ms. Psihoda: So, what you are sayin is that it actually depends on Europe, the future of the transatlantic alliance depends on Europe.

Mr. Shapiro: That’s right. I think that’s not the normal view. Especially in Europe people like to say, “Well, it’s the United States not looking to us, it’s the United States looking to the Pacific”. The way you asked these questions. I don’t think that that’s the central issue frankly. The United States is looking to Europe because there is no other place to look. And there is not going to be any other place to look, it is just not going to happen. The real question is, “Will Europe respond?”.

Ms. Psihoda: Ok, alright, thank you very much for your time and this extensive interview.

**Transcript of the Follow-Up Interview with Jeremy Shapiro, M.A.,
conducted on September 4th, 2009.**

Ms. Psihoda: Could you go into more detail about how the repair of the US-German and US-French relations was carried out?

Mr. Shapiro: Some of my work that you can find on the website talks about what the US and French were doing together in counterterrorism. You are just interested in German and French relations?

Ms. Psihoda: Yeah, German and French, because you said that the government apparatuses never ceased to work together. I mean how can I find out about that?

Mr. Shapiro: Yeah, right. I mean you will find a fair amount of sort of published papers asserting that. You won't find too much detail and that Deanna Priest article talks about how the US and France organized that base in Paris to do kind of counterterrorism. On the German thing that I referred to that was a plot... was that 2007 or 2006... 2007 I think. That was to attack US military bases in Germany and there were about 7 or 8 people arrested. And if you look carefully at that you'll find that there was discussions of the technique (inaudible) there was a plot that emanated out of Pakistan. And there is discussions of how the plot was uncovered because the people were communicating from Pakistan via this technique known as... I think it was yahoo email, one of those email services, and the way that they were trying to avoid detection by the American singles intelligence was to use the draft emails folder. You know how that works?

Ms. Psihoda: No.

Mr. Shapiro: You can write an email and save it as a draft. It does not get sent. So it does not enter into the whole email system, it is just stored on the yahoo of computers. And then someone else who has your email password can log on and read the email in the draft folder. So it's... What happens when you actually send an email, it goes through all this servers and things. This email never gets sent. So it actually just stored on the yahoo server. And so it's a lot more... from the perspective of the people sending emails... it's a lot more secure. Of course, the person has to have your password. So they set up special accounts for this. And it was a popular technique for communicating internationally for terrorist trying to avoid surveillance. And there is discussion in the press about how this technique was compromised by... and it's... I don't think the press does not know this quite clear that the fact is that the Americans only could have done that. So you should be able to find that. It's abundantly clear that the Americans would have the capability to do that.

Ms. Psihoda: Why? I mean it's an easy thing, right?

Mr. Shapiro: No, it's not. Because you have to be able to identify the accounts. And it's not within the German capacity.

Ms. Psihoda: But they did it?

Mr. Shapiro: The Americans did it and gave it to the Germans. And that's as much as said in the press reports. So that's just an example, one of the few examples that emerged in the press about how they cooperate. And you could see there what I think is a sort of classic cooperation, which is that the Germans, that the Europeans, in general have the problem, they have the people on the ground and the Americans have the secret intelligence and then cooperate on that. Because it was an attack aimed at Americans but in Germany. So they have an interest in cooperation but they have that problem.

Ms. Psihoda: And what about the thing that you mentioned about the based security in Iraq? You said that there was based security, right. So the Germans did based security during the Iraq war. So is it correct the way that I understood it: The Germans were guarding those bases in Europe or outside Europe?

Mr. Shapiro: No, in Germany.

Ms. Psihoda: Okay, so to free soldiers to go to Iraq.

Mr. Shapiro: Yeah, they took over a lot of the bases but, of course, the German bases, you know, the American bases in Germany were quite critical for the Iraq war because they have the sort of the logistics no elsewhere. And most of the troops that deployed at Iraq actually came from Germany. So, they also enabled the... They guarded the bases. They also enabled the transport out of these bases and through the German ports above all the equipment for the troops, which is something that they have agreements to do and done before and never really contemplated not doing this. This is not a secret in any sense. But, you know, I mean the thing is that if you were actually going to oppose the war, they have the power, they have the sovereign right to say, "No, you cannot deploy from the bases". There was an example from the 1980s where the French and Spanish would not allow an attack on Libya from their soil. But that's always something, which is on [inaudible] that any use of these bases can be vetoed essentially. The Germans never considered doing that. There is another famous scandal with the Germans where it was revealed that German intelligence agents in Bagdad were providing targeting information for the Americans, which is in the press a lot.

Ms. Psihoda: Can you explain a bit the plot about the "targeting information"?

Mr. Shapiro: I don't recall the precise detail but it is basically that the Germans had people in Bagdad during the war because their embassy was still there. And they the... As part of their embassy they had intelligence officers. And those intelligence officers passed information about where things were to the

Americans, which was a problem for the Americans because they did not have an embassy there for twenty years.

Ms. Psihoda: Is it actually true that the Germans found out where Saddam Hussein was hiding?

Mr. Shapiro: Well, it is certainly not correct because, of course, the [inaudible] attack the very first day of the war, it's actually two days before the war started, there was an attempt to kill Saddam Hussein because they thought, they knew where he was. And it was a deep bunker so they sent in a huge amount of [inaudible] but he was not there. I don't recall if that information came from the Germans or the Americans. I am not precisely sure about what the information was.

Ms. Psihoda: Ok.

Mr. Shapiro: You know, there was another German scandal. Well, there has been a lot of German scandals about the question of rendition and the degree of German complicity on their rendition program. There was a very famous case of a guy going to... the guy has a fight with his wife and he... in Germany... and he leaves and goes to Albania or Macedonia. And he is arrested crossing border in Macedonia because his name is on a terrorism list. And he has been handled to the Americans and sent to Guantanamo... no, sent to Bagram, sent to Afghanistan [reference to Bagram detention facility in Afghanistan]. And has a rather unpleasant time there. And eventually after about eight or nine months the Americans figure out... after actually intervention by Merkel and by Secretary of State... figure out that he is in fact the wrong guy and they never should have arrested him. And they bring him back. So he has basically lost nine months of his life sitting in a stinking cell in Bagram. So it's a terrific scandal.

Ms. Psihoda: He was a German man?

Mr. Shapiro: He was a German resident. I don't think that he was a German national. So, there have been some questions raised about German complicity. I would ask simply this question: This is a man who is leaving Germany and he stopped at the Macedonian border and found to be on a terrorist list. I don't know if you have ever been at the Macedonian border but it is not what I would call center of information technology fusion. Okay? And they pull this guy right out. So, how did they know that this guy was coming? They knew that he was coming, clearly they knew he was coming. How did they know that he was coming? That... an example of that, you can't know for certain... but it leaks of German-American cooperation. It leaks of the Germans saying to the Americans, "This guy you had asked us to watch because his name is on the list but we won't arrest because he is in Germany. He is leaving Germany, we find you might want to know". And then the Americans tell the Macedonians to arrest him when he comes. I guess the Americans could have been watching him in Germany themselves but it's actually

very unlikely that they would have been doing that but they know that he was leaving. So, I mean, you never know that kind of thing but it's typically of the way that these things work. So, you know... In Italy there was the sort of famous case where they kidnapped a guy of the streets in Milan. And they did it with the... it turned out with the cooperation with the Italian intelligence services. The government said to not know about it. But, you know, they basically, they pulled the CIA's mobile phone records and the people they were calling was Italian intelligence. Whether the government knew about it or not is a bit confusing. But that's not the point. I mean the intelligence agencies sometimes cooperate even if the governments don't want them to. The Germans clearly were not willing to do that, they were not willing to kidnap this guy of the streets of Berlin but they probably were willing to tell them [Americans] that he was leaving Germany. This is something the Germans have done with the French too, by the way. They actually rerouted a plane to get Christian Ganczarski. So I guess there is examples like that.

Ms. Psihoda: Is there any example of French and American intelligence cooperation?

Mr. Shapiro: Well, not that kind of thing because the French would be proud of having to arrest anybody themselves. They are much different. Yeah, I mean you will see in that Dana Priest article a lot of examples of US-French cooperation. You know, they have a huge base together in Djibouti, which is focused on counterterrorism operations. There is tremendous sort of respect among the US. In fact, I would say the US and the French among the Western countries, are the countries that are most focused on counterterrorism. They cooperate, all over Europe they cooperate probably most effectively. They cooperate with the British now. It took a while to get the British cooperation going as operations for counterterrorism. Yeah, so it's pretty effective the relationship [US-French relationship], has been actually for quite some time.

Ms. Psihoda: And on the level of political leaders... I mean, in my perspective, because there was a meeting in 2003 in New York and then Schröder went to the White House in February 2004... And for me the question raises if there is a breach then why do these political leaders still meet? I mean was the breach or the crisis really that deep or was it just over-exaggerated because those leaders met actually still in 2003?

Mr. Shapiro: Ah, yeah. Yes, let's put the breach into perspective. I mean these are allies, treaty allies, they are sworn to protect each other. The breach, the crisis was a crisis of friendship and that's even the way it's was characterized. So, it was never that they were not going to talk to each other. They always met throughout this period. I mean, there was, you know, Bush could be somewhat [inaudible] and some say that there was breakdown in the communication between the leaders, I mean they had very few phone calls. But there was never any sort of

“we are not going to talk to” and no one ever said that. And certainly the governments always talked to each other. I mean a meeting between them is neither an indication for crisis nor a repair because they have meetings all the time for various reasons.

Ms. Psihoda: So this is just a routine that they follow?

Mr. Shapiro: Yeah, I mean there is all sorts of summit meetings that are set up and they follow those. Even on itself a meeting does not mean too much, either way. You know, certain specific meetings might mean something. I mean, for example Bush's trip to Brussels in 2005. It's an important service involved because no other President had done it before. And it was an indication that he was a) trying to repair the [inaudible] and b) trying to reach out to the European Union. There was an important meeting, I think in February 2004 between Bush and Schroeder. When Schroeder went to the White House and Bush puts his hand on his shoulder. So this is the sort of beginning of the repair. But that's sort of more what happened in the meeting than the fact that they had it.

Ms. Psihoda: How about the relationship between the Department of State and the Department of Defense?

Mr. Shapiro: Yeah, no that's true and it will always be true. Right, I mean the State Department's job is to have good relations with other countries. So the State Department always does not favor breaks with relations from Iraq to the United Kingdom. That is the institutional bias. So it's somewhat always true. In this case, it wasn't... You said the Pentagon, which is fair but it's sort of important to distinguish that it wasn't really the military. It was really the Pentagon civilians, who were very angry about this... Rumsfeld and those guys were very angry about the refusal and they also didn't think that these countries mattered by a multilateral military perspective. So there was no harm in punishment and they advocated a lot of punishment measures. Condoleezza Rice was famous for saying, “We are going to punish France, ignore Germany and forgive Russia”. This is sort of an indication of how important they thought they were. What's interesting is in the event... and I don't think you find this documented anywhere... When they were having interagency meetings figure out what to do about this... As I said the Pentagon was for it, the State Department was against it, what was probably decisive was the intelligence agencies who sort of raised their hands and were arguing, “Well, we know they don't fight in Iraq but we need these people for counterterrorism”. And so, in fact, most of these measures weren't taken and they really were not taken at all on the governmental level. The Pentagon did some things about not meeting French officials and not going to the Paris air show but it was incredibly minor. And beyond the Pentagon not anything was done. It to a [inaudible] degree the [inaudible] army's were bad in 2003, might have been if the intelligence agencies haven't stepped up and said, “It's this counterterrorism cooperation”, which, of course, in the 2003 year was very

important ... "That's very, very valuable to us and we don't want to risk it by doing this".

Ms. Psihoda: And the intelligence agencies, they are in the Pentagon or where are they located?

Mr. Shapiro: No, they are separate. The CIA especially, which is the one I am referring to mostly, but probably also the NSA. They are separate but they would take part in the interagency deliberations on what to do with the government or not.

Ms. Psihoda: But they are not included in the government apparatus? They are separate from the government apparatus?

Mr. Shapiro: No, they are in the government apparatus. They are just not in the Pentagon. CIA is a sort of... Technically it's in the executive office of the President but it's basically an independent agency. It's sort of part of the government but it's independent at the Department. It's not part of the State [Department]. However, very confusing the organization of the US government, they never understand that. But stressed saying the intelligence agencies represented yet again a different perspective than either State [Department] or Defense [Department]. And in this case they were quite decisive.

Ms. Psihoda: Do you have maybe some minutes for one or two other questions?

Mr. Shapiro: Sure.

Ms. Psihoda: What do you think about the outcome of the elections in Germany? Well, we probably know that Merkel is going to make it but I mean will this have an effect on the Obama administration? Will Obama go to Merkel after the election and ask for more troops or not? Or if Steinmeier should make it, would there be a change in the relations to Obama?

Mr. Shapiro: I don't see any major changes there. I mean I think that the German government has been saying for about a year or certainly since Obama came in that "We can't really do anything interesting until the election is over". So that will sort of free an obstacle and we might see more movement but I don't think that... Both of the candidates are, of course, pretty forward, they want to have a good relationship with Obama. The Social Democrats think that they have sort of a special relationship with the Democratic Party because they are both from the left, I guess. I think the Social Democrats don't understand American politics at all. That's an idiotic statement but they believe it actually. In fact, the Americans are probably more comfortable with the Christian Democrats. They like Merkel. Obama, in particular, likes Merkel because she does not bubble in an image, she just says, you know, well, I can't do. I can't go to Afghanistan because of these domestic constraints and, of course, Obama understands that even if he does not like it. But he understands and he thinks that she is a straight shooter and that

she is basically trying to do things that he wants her to do within the constraints. Whereas Steinmeier is a little bit more of a double viewer. So, yeah, but I mean this is frankly minor stuff. Frankly, he [Obama] can work with either party. You know, foreign governance almost always prefers continuity. So I think they have a slight preference for Merkel but it seems they could make it with either.

Ms. Psihoda: How do you see the change from Blair to Brown in Great Britain? Has this affected the special relationship in the transatlantic relationship somehow?

Mr. Shapiro: Hmm, it's affected it, not dramatically. You know, if you look at that... Have you ever seen that movie "Love actually"? It's an important movie to understand the special relationship and it's also very romantic with Hugh Grant. And Hugh Grant plays the British prime minister, probably randy British prime minister and at one point the American President comes to visit and basically sexually harasses and essentially insults one member of his staff. And they had been involved in this session of negotiations where the British basically thought the Americans were stupid but they were going to do it, they said, anyway. Because that's what they do but he was so insulted by this attack on his staff member that he, in the press conferences, basically dressed down the American President, told him that he won't approve him anymore and that, you know, you just have to do the right thing. So very stoic speech, got a big applause in the room. And it's a British fancy about how you are going to deal with the American President. And it reflects to some degree how a lot of British prime ministers have felt and what none of them has ever done. Because it does not really matter what they think or how they feel, I should say. There is just a sort of strategic [inaudible] about not doing that. It's pretty strong and I think in your first day in the prime minister's office as you are assured of reading what the American alliance means to you, you recognize that you are not ever going to make this press conference that Hugh Grant has done. Probably you have the sort of wishful feeling about having the conversation that you are never going to do that. But then you quickly are able to rationalize in the way the content can nationalize things in the war of Iraq. Because you internalize the constraints and so it means that what kind of a lot of British prime ministers that had different feelings towards the United States and actually they all end up with the same policy. So you know Brown did more or less the same way. They tend to enter with the sort of image that they are going to stand up to the United States and then they tend to not. I have not seen it that much different with Brown. The one distinction is that Blair was a very effective politician on the American scene. He was so articulate that he represented to the American public the sort of outside voice of approval for American diplomacy, which was important in some of the Iraq days and afterwards, which Brown would never be able to do because he is not as charismatic even if he wanted to be able. So that capacity of Blair to be a factor in American politics is a loss for British and American relationship.

Ms. Psihoda: But also Brown is now very weak because of this government scandals, right?

Mr. Shapiro: Right.

Ms. Psihoda: And therefore I guess the US cannot rely so much on the British anymore, right?

Mr. Shapiro: No, well, they have the difficulty relying on him to deliver to his country but there is less likelihood that he will defect from them [US]. You know, the stronger the prime minister, the more he feels the capacity to defy the Americans but the weaker he is, the less able he is to deliver the country. So it's always a trade-off and right now, you know, Brown is quite weak, probably weaker than the Americans would like. But he does not really threaten the alliance. You know, they are having problems with the mission in Afghanistan but Brown is actually double [inaudible]. It's interesting to object the... The mission in Afghanistan is basically opposed by about two thirds of the British public, that it's probably 60 to 65%. None of three major parties communicate that. A couple of them talk about how it is going to commonly done but that's not opposition. That's an attack on the government without putting a threat to the American alliance. It is not on the panel of policy to withdraw from Afghanistan. So we would not expect a change in the American alliance especially to the extent that Cameron [David Cameron is the leader of the Conservative Party in the UK] is anti-European, which he is, is going to mean to reassure in his party and the public that they are still main rooted in the international system on making sure that there is good relationship with the Americans. You can't pick fights with Europe and the Americans. So the relationship remains special because of history and because of even more importantly the placement.

Ms. Psihoda: And in Afghanistan, about ISAF... There are more and more American troops taking the lead in Afghanistan and outnumber the European troops. Is it a feasible argument that there is again some sort of unilateralism?

Mr. Shapiro: I don't want to have an argument about that but is it unilateralism if you come to people and say, "Hey, we should do this together and they say no, you go ahead". You know, the mission in Afghanistan has UN Security backing, it has NATO backing, it has participation by 42 states including every single member of NATO. So it's the least unilateral mission that you could see in history. I mean 42 countries is 25% of the world. Okay, so there is nothing even remotely unilateral about the structure of the mission. Everybody has committed to do this, right. As things have gotten worse and as there has been a determination that more resources are required, the resources have primarily been forthcoming only from the United States, and that means that the person who commits the resources and that's not the US choice fundamentally because it's just the fact that no one else would contribute to a mission we need to get done. As the

mission becomes more... as resources are contributed more by the United States, naturally the United States is making more of the decisions. It could never be otherwise. The sort of internal decisions, they are not making the general decisions about... The sort of highest level decisions are made by the mission itself that was named years by UN Security Council and by NATO. So, you know, obviously America had a big influence in that. So, you know, I mean I don't know if this is unilateral... I mean does it mean if your allies don't... if you have an important mission but your allies aren't interested in contributing, you should just abandon the mission, is that the way to avoid unilateralism. I mean I am familiar with the views you are talking about but it just frustrates me beyond means.

Ms. Psihoda: Alright, then my final question would be that one: Do you think that these structural gaps and those cultural differences between Europe and the US are kind of over-exaggerated? Or do they still exist but now is the time when we are not going to talk about them? However, when we have some other political leaders in the future, could it be that those gaps and differences will come up again and we'll have again a crisis?

Mr. Shapiro: Yeah, I think that they both exist and that they are exaggerated in their effect because the relationship has never been based on love or fundamental common values. It's been always been based on the fact that we need each other. And so in my view the relationship... The better explanation of the relationship's ups and downs, even though all of these gaps are real, is a neutral perception of need. In 2003 the United States fundamentally believed that they did not need Europe and actually to a certain extent Europe was convinced that they did not need the United States and so it was a lot easier to have dispute. In the period since 2003 both sides have both sides have very much reached the conclusion that they need each other. So that's why they repaired the rift. From the US perspective it was that there was a lot of problems in the world and they needed partners to solve them and they were not likely to find any partners better than the Europeans. And that's pretty solid consensus in the United States right now. And in Europe there is a sort of similar consensus. And I think it's right, by the way, we do need each other. As long as they need each other and they believe that they need each other, the alliance will persist and that's I think the fundamental glue. The values thing is certainly not irrelevant; it's one of the reasons why they believe that they are good partners. And the gaps are not irrelevant, they are real, they create some of the frictions. But all of those are overcomeable... can be overcome... I don't want to harm your English... if the need is there.

Ms. Psihoda: Alright, thank you very much for this follow-up interview.

Transcript of the Interview with Justin Vaisse, Ph.D., conducted on August 13th, 2009.

Ms. Psihoda: So, my first question would be if you could elaborate a bit the rapprochement between the French and the United States that has been taken place.

Mr. Vaisse: Well, that's very easy because you have already mentioned the most important facts and the most important fact is that it took place before Obama arrived that is it started very soon after the Iraq war. Bush and Chirac were not talking on the phone for a long time after the winter of 2003 and even the spring of 2003 and then there was an effort on both sides, you know, to get back to a normal relationship. And it started in 2004 really but it did not really... were visible until 2005... would be the visit by first Condoleezza Rice and then Bush and that's the major... But you have two points of inflection or change: The first one is really January 12/13, 2003, and the second one early 2005. That is starting in January 12/13 in 2003 when Chirac realizes that the US are going no matter what, then relations get really out of control and get really, really bad. And then the second big change... And so then you have a period of time, which is sort of exceptional in transatlantic relations, which is really a crisis situation like you had in Suez 67... only a couple of time before. And then in 2005 it changes back to a normal working relationship, not entirely good and with... not necessarily with very good atmospherics, as you say, but at least working relationship on many issues and a patching up of relations et cetera. And so the atmospherics change when Obama arrives but the fundamentals are in place. And so the real change is 2005 but you mentioned that, so I don't have much to add on that. Then you would have to look, well, there is another issue, maybe you had a question on that afterwards. I am anticipating on it, which is to what extent does the election of Sarkozy change things. Well, yeah, it does change things for... because it's not Chirac. So you get all the psychological, personal thing out of the picture and it's a part of it because... yeah, the personality and psychology of leaders is important for transatlantic relations. And, also because Sarkozy, you know, he wants so much the rupture with Chirac that... You know, Americans at this point were really happy to welcome anybody else than Chirac. It's like... And, you know, after Bush many people were so happy to have someone who is not... first not Bush, whoever he or she is. Now this said when you look more closely there are many issue that have really not changed among which French and Americans. And so I am just restricting on the French-American relations here. [I] don't see [change] on [them] and this has been my point in various places. Basically, the idea is that even though atmospherics and the personal thing between Sarkozy and Bush and then Sarkozy and Obama are much better than between Chirac and Bush, the substance of different issues and of policies has not changed that much. The most important thing is the NATO thing, the full reintegration into NATO military

command. But if you look closer, yes, it's important symbolically. There is no doubt about that. But then if you look closer, the concrete application of that... the concrete implications of that are not huge. You are talking about a couple of hundred people rejoining, fully rejoining the military organization. And the French are rejoining two committees that they had been away from. But for the rest there had been a sort of creeping reintegration in the 90s and 2000s anyway and so it does not change fundamentally things. And so, yeah, it's important once again symbolically and diplomacy is largely about symbols and also for sending signals to other Europeans. But if you look issue by issue like on Syria, for example, on terrorism, on Afghanistan, on Iran, there is not much difference in foreign policy and there are even new subjects of irritation, I would say, like the financial crisis or the role of the Dollar or European defense or where Sarkozy would not be as good a partner as Chirac was. So, you see after Chirac disentangled the impression that was given "Sarkozy, the Atlanticist" – he is no Tony Blair that's for sure, it's different. Even though, of course, his opponents in France have been portraying him as Sarkozy, the American bla, bla, bla. You know if you look at... Israel/Palestine is another good example, Turkey is another good example. Chirac was in favor of Turkey into the EU, Sarkozy, as you know, is not and the official American position for a number of years has been Turkey into the EU. So that's a very interesting thing that should be seen. And it's also from, you know, a sort of political science point of view, pointing to the importance of symbols and atmospherics et cetera in relations and also the distortion that meet the media image does to the actual relations.

Ms. Psihoda: I guess, the repair of the relationship between Chirac and Bush, you can find online on any newspapers?

Mr. Vaisse: Yeah, largely, but, of course, you would have the most important book is "Allies at War". But also there are a couple of others which are not as good... like Elizabeth Pond wrote a book. There is a good book on Germany by Steve Szabo. He is now at the German Marshall Fund. That was really good. I think that's pretty much it for serious books where you would find the exact... And since then there have not been many books. But once again, I insist on that: Look on the issues beyond the headlines. And the ones who really follow this closely know that things have not changed that much. The distance has not been great and sometimes it has been a distance in the other direction of disagreement like Turkey and other things. And then, you know, when Obama arrived... For Sarkozy it was not as comfortable as with Bush because when Bush... Bush was very much eager to have Sarkozy embrace him, anybody was very good to have anyone embrace him at the end of his presidency. So, it was easier and also it was declining and Sarkozy had the presidency of the European Council and so it was sort of a very comfortable position for Sarkozy. He could shine if you liked. But then in January arrives a bigger star. Sarkozy is not the President of the European Council any longer and he is sort of eclipsed by Obama who is a huge

star. So, there is a sort of, not competition, I would say, but, you know, the sort of media field or space... It was now filled by Obama largely and also on initiatives and et cetera. And so there were couple of issues where things have not been really, really smooth but, once again, that's... we're still talking about atmospherics and signals and they are important but to a certain extent. But then when you look really at details on Syria, on Israel/Palestine, on Iran, on Afghanistan, on terrorism, on Africa, you name it... Things don't change that much.

Ms. Psihoda: And would you say that this rupture between the French/US relationship was also on the government side, like government apparatuses? Or was it only the leaders? Like that the government establishment still worked together but the leader were just not cooperating?

Mr. Vaisse: It was definitely the Pentagon on the US side and that's very important. It was really Rumsfeld, Wolfowitz, and core of others that is the number one, two, three in the Pentagon and others. And one good example of that is the fact that one of the more concrete consequences of the fight was the end of the common military exercises like "Red Flag" and then "Nevada", I think. And also the absence of any American participants to the air show, the Paris air show of 2004... was it 3 or 4... I think it was 2004, because the Pentagon had asked some high officials not to participate and that downgraded the level of participation of US officials. So it would not be Three-Star-Generals and, you know, big, the top... It would be at lower levels. I can't remember what, but I think you will find that at Allies at War. So, and the State Department was on a very different line. And you know it was Condi Rice who famously said, "Forget Germany, forgive Russia, and punish France". The exact formula was "Punish France, forgive Russia, forget Germany" or something like that. And that's certainly there otherwise it was in a column by Jim Hogland in the Washington Post in May 2003. And so there was a meeting at the... I think it was a Deputies' Committee, no it was not a Deputies'... I think it was the real staff. It was the National Security Council in May say, "You know, what to do with the allies that had not been along". And, you know, at that time it was the time of triumphalism; there had been a victory in Afghanistan two years earlier and now big victory in Iraq against all the people [who] were saying... There was no insurrection yet in Iraq. It really started in June, July and August. So it was a moment of [inaudible]. And so there was a meeting of the NSC on that question where basically the State Department say, "patch things up" and, you know, "let's cut the crap". And the Pentagon was pushing for sanctions and [inaudible]. That's my understanding. I am not 100% sure and, of course, we will have to wait for the archives 30 years from now. But basically that's what transpired from the meeting.

Ms. Psihoda: And about the French government? Were they also like rejecting cooperation?

Mr. Vaisse: No, because they... I mean it's an asymmetrical relation in a sense that there are not so many things that France can do to "hurt" the US. But, basically, no. It was more how to patch things up with the position of some in the American government, the State Department in particular. But there was pretty much the mindset in the French government... because many thought that things had gone too far and Chirac got criticized especially by the elites, by part of the elites in France. You know, he was supported by a huge majority of the population. But still people were thinking that, pretty much like in Germany, that [it] is about Schröder. Basically that "Yes, Chirac had been right but he had gone too far and he should have done that differently". And so, Chirac was eager to patch things up but there was no sort of enduring... And then very soon afterwards when the election began... Then his position was, at least partly, vindicated in a sense that it happened what Schröder and Chirac had said would happen, which is it would be extremely difficult to stabilize Iraq and it would create all sorts of problems and also the recruiting tool for terrorists et cetera. And more importantly [it] would lead to... And that's a bit anachronistic because at that time it was not so prominent but would lead to sort of "forget Afghanistan" and did divert resources from Afghanistan to Iraq. And that's really what happened and we are paying the price now probably to some extent.

Ms. Psihoda: And apart from Iraq are there any other reasons for this cooperation? For this rapprochement? Repair of the damage?

Mr. Vaisse: No, it's pressure. It's pressure of the elites and business and public opinion to some extent. Well, public opinion not so much but I would say business leaders and the fear of boycotts. On that I must warn you. You may find a study on the effect of the boycott [of] 2003 and it's a really bad study. It does not work. I should have written something to sort of set the record straight but I never got to it.

Ms. Psihoda: Is there any difference from Bush II to Obama in the transatlantic relationship? I mean are they carried out differently? Does Obama have a different perception of the transatlantic relationship? Does he care more about the transatlantic relationship?

Mr. Vaisse: Well, yeah, obviously he is not really a transatlantic guy. There is no reason why he should care about the transatlantic relations out of his own history. He has just been to Europe once and the main issues for him are number one Afghanistan, number two Iraq, number three Iran, number four Russia, number five climate change. And you know Europe matters for some of these issues but not that much. And so there is no reason why he should pay too much attention to that. Europe was for Obama to extent that it was a political... You have to get back to the campaign and basically what Obama was saying during the campaign was "I will"... And that was important because that resonated among American voters, "I will restore America's image". And America's image means America's

image in Europe. It's not America's image in Nicaragua or in Zimbabwe. It's America's image in Europe because that's the nature of international relations and media and all of this. And so, and he did that. And he did that very rapidly by... You know, by his Berlin visit when he was just a candidate and by going to Europe three times in his first six months. He went to... yeah, to London and then to Normandy in early June and then again in Europe in July. And that was really important but that was important on a political and symbolic... You know, to be able to work with Europe, once again which Bush was doing. But the image of 2003 was too strong in everybody's mind and there was still the idea that... And, you know, there were also good reasons for Europeans for not wanting to be very cheerful and very welcoming or very nice with Bush. And so that's what has changed. But then now, you know, beyond this, what did Obama get on Afghanistan? Not much. He's getting cooperation on a number of issues but it's though and the expectations were set pretty high... so... which was not a case during the Bush administration. The second Bush administration... there was no expectations of, you know, Europeans delivering enormously et cetera. So, I think it was last month or a month before... yeah, in early June when Obama visited Buchenwald. That was just before Cairo. But basically the idea is that Europe is both central and somewhat sidelined for various reasons.

Ms. Psihoda: So, would you say that Asia or Africa is more important for Obama than Europe?

Mr. Vaisse: It depends how you define important; important as an ally or important as an issue or subject. You know, once again, I get the order of priority for Obama, the hierarchy is Afghanistan, Iraq, Iran, Russia, et cetera. And then now how many... You know, who are the allies around? It's still Europe first and foremost and that's where naturally he can find help. Now this has not changed. But if you take the time that he is spending on foreign policy issues, Europe itself does not figure prominently. Partly because it's in peace and there is no big problems to solve. So that's good news in a sense. But on the other hand also because Europe is not so important to realizing the articles that a more important for him and that he needs to realize like once again, you know, Afghanistan, the peace process, the energy question around Russia and issues like that.

Ms. Psihoda: So, actually the transatlantic relationship is there but it's not so important?

Mr. Vaisse: You know, once again, it's central and sidelined. Central because it is still the most important but it's sort of on automatic pilot in a sense that there are very frequent consultations between, you know, Phil Gordon, for example, and his counterparts in France, Germany and UK. And that's where the transatlantic relations is. I mean if you want to point a place it's not the US-EU summits, which are terribly boring and which nobody cares about. It's not all these institutions that were created like 10, 15 years ago like the Transatlantic Business Dialogue or

these things that nobody is really interested in. It's really in the dense communications that exist on every issue or almost every issue between the political directors of the different ministries or the Assistant Secretary of State for Europe and Political Director of France, of Germany and UK. That's where I think transatlantic relations are. And then at a higher level, it means that when Obama is taking an important decision that he would get the views of his allies. So it's still central but it's not... But because there is no disagreement and because... And also on some issues because Europe does not deliver so much, it's not very present. The noise level is not very high.

Ms. Psihoda: Okay, would you say for Obama it's more a US-EU relationship or US-European relationship?

Mr. Vaisse: No, you know, for any President it's a US-European relationship. I mean Obama made an effort, there was a... I know there was a debate discussion inside the US government to whether Obama should go to Prague, to the US-EU summit in early April. And then it was decided that he would go, which was a sign sort of to show that EU was important. Because otherwise if he had not gone, people would have said, "Oh, look he overlooks the EU bla, bla, bla et cetera". But the truth is, it's still pretty much a relationship with Berlin, Paris and London. And that's what counts and that's what delivers. Now it does not mean that the EU does not count and certainly among the people that have been named by Obama like, you know, Phil Gordon, Ann-Marie Scouter, Hilary Clinton, Jim Steinberg, all the top people... It does not mean that they don't consider that the EU is important. I think probably taken as a whole they have a much better view of what the EU is than the predecessors in the Bush administration. But, you know, it has not, still not risen to the importance that it would like to have.

Ms. Psihoda: What do you think the EU has to do to be more important? I mean there is always the discussion about is the EU a strategic partner. Does it have a strategic role. Do you think that is going to happen in the future and if so how? Because for the moment, I think, it is not the case.

Mr. Vaisse: No, it's not the case and the question is whether there is some *europeanization* or not. That is if there is a gradual convergence and work towards cooperation to complement that. And there is a project we have been having with the European Council of Foreign Relations to try to see whether things are going in this direction or the other. And if it's going in the right directions, which is more harmony, less disparity in positions one and two better cooperation, active cooperation, costly cooperation if you would like. That it's, you know... I disagree with you, you know, I... the UK disagree with EU Germany on major point with Russia, but we gonna adopt a common policy that is minimum. That is we are not just going to paper over the differences and say, oh we have a common policy but we are actually going to do something together, which would cost us in terms of what our original position was. So to try to measure that and

see if things are going... you know, if we Europeans are more united than we were five years ago, ten years ago, fifteen years ago like on the Balkans, for example. In the beginning of the 1990s it was total the catastrophe and then we got better on the Balkans as the decade went by. Bosnia was better than the early breakup of the Yugoslavia, and then Kosovo was better than Bosnia to some extent. So, the bottom line is, I don't but there are some issue... I don't know what the answer is if it will ever be... But there are a lot of small indications that things are going in the right direction. I mean the ATALANTA mission [EU NAVFOR Somalia – Operation Atalanta], the operation of the coast of Somalia, is a success. I mean there is one institution over there fighting pirates and it's the EU. And, you know, it may seem small et cetera but it is still relevant because it's protecting European ships and American ships and Russian ships and, you know, ships from everywhere. So, it's providing public good, which is safety of the sailings and it's done under a British commander and with Danish-French-Portuguese help and resources. So, if you take examples like that... or Russia, for example, there is huge level of disagreement but we still can come up with 27 countries agreeing on one position. So, because it is not as forceful as you would like it to be but it is still a common position. And so, if the Irish vote in the right way on October 2nd and we get Lisbon, this will give a boost to these things. So, national capitals London, Berlin, Paris are going to remain central for the foreseeable future but it might be complemented more and more, especially on some issues, by other areas in which the EU will be in the driver's seat, I think. And, you know, you have also to answer with some optimism, I guess.

Ms. Psihoda: Yeah, sure. I mean, you also see the monitoring mission in Georgia and you see what the EU has done in DRC, so if you take all that into account, I think probably the EU is having some role but the US... And, of course, they are thankful and grateful that we are in Georgia because they cannot be there because the Russians voted against them, but it seems to me that this is not enough. So, do you think the EU has to do even more to become a strategic global player?

Mr. Vaisse: Well, the first thing is... I mean, it's largely in the hands of London, Paris, and Berlin, and, you know, I am not overseeing other smaller countries, but it remains that the big players are them. And then Italy, Spain, Poland, Netherlands would be close second. There is an activism abroad, I think... their network of embassies... They have military forces that are being meaningful et cetera. But still the trio remains really the key to much of that issue. That's one thing. Well, once again, positions, disparity of positions, we fundamentally disagree on a lot of things and it's hard and this is not going to change because the reason why German has the attitude it has vis-à-vis Russia, the reason France, the reason Rome the attitude it has vis-à-vis Moscow are grounded in history, in economic links, in investment, in cultural factors, in networks et cetera. And these things you don't change just by fiat or... On energy considerations,

even if I think people here in this town are making way too much [out of it], but Europe's dependency on Russia, I think, is overblown, but, you know, there is still an issue about energy. So this is not going to change rapidly because nation states are still the most important thing but, you know, that would be one place to work and the other would be in military resources because we need manpower to pacify countries. And, you know, I am not an interventionist. I don't think that we should go around and try to fix every failed state that exists because it might be a danger bla, bla, bla. Unfortunately we won't be able to do that and we will exhaust ourselves and getting hated by the rest of the world for doing so. But still it remains that we are in Afghanistan, I don't think there was much choice and Europeans were very supportive in 2001. It did not turn out the way we wanted but now that we are there, I don't think that we have a choice of leaving. I mean, leaving would really be bad, so we have to be there and for this we need more resources. And, you know, in general, I think, there should be more of an effort toward ESPD and military resources. So these would be... Foreign policy positions and military resources and civilian resources to some extent would be the two keys to improve the situation.

Ms. Psihoda: Okay, and what role would EU actors have? I mean, we were talking about Berlin, Paris, and London, what about the President of the Commission? What about the President of the European Council? Do they have a role in the transatlantic relationship?

Mr. Vaisse: Yeah, and the Higher Representative... Well, it depends and it asks the question of what will Lisbon change to all of that, it's very hard to know. It is very hard to know because it's largely personality dependent. It will really depend on who we pick as a next Higher Representative, who will replace Solana, who we pick to replace, well, to be the first President of the EU so to speak. You know, will it be a forceful personality like Tony Blair or is it going to be someone more, you know, less forceful let's say. And I won't name any names, you know, but someone who is remarkable but not the sort of strong will and determined person. It's very hard to tell but... because, you know, if there was a permanent President of the European Council, could he do what Sarkozy did last year? Sarkozy, I think, was really good when he was President of the EU, he really gave a lift to this whole European thing but it's also because he was the President of France and there is not doubt about that. And it's something that someone with the same energy and activity probably could not have done even with the same level [of] energy et cetera. It's also because there were specific links, because he was the President of the big three. And so that's complicated because then it means that the Higher Representative or the President will not have so much leverage, as much leverage as Sarkozy had. So the common service diplomatic choir... I can't remember what the acronym is... the basically external service action, external action service... I can't remember... but basically that will be an improvement and that may foster what we call *europeanization* even though it is debated and I am

not sure it exists at all but it will take time. And I see [inaudible] situation continuing for long that is both the three Europeans and the EU apparatus. And, you know, it's not necessarily a bad thing. I mean, yes, ideally, we would have a more united EU policy, you know, CSFP and ESDP could be strong bla, bla, bla. Yes, but at the same time, yeah, we need more definitely but we don't need something entirely unified probably. I wonder to what extent we are not good with a mixed system so that's an important point.

Ms. Psihoda: Do you think that there is an elite crisis at the European Union?

Mr. Vaisse: You mean the quality of people making decisions?

Ms. Psihoda: Yeah, and also that people being in elite positions don't have a face. They don't have a name. People don't know them. People know the Chancellor of Germany but they don't know the President of the Commission. Is this kind of an elite problem?

Mr. Vaisse: Right, let's say visibility problem, yeah. The permanent President of Europe might be a partial remedy to that even though it is just adding to the other figures. So I am not sure it's as much a part of the solution as it's part of the problem because it's adding one layer. Now, it is a problem? Yeah, because people cannot associate. People still believe in sovereignty, history, wars, passions, this is the stuff of politics et cetera, regulating the size of paper tissue or things like that does not get you to be recognized on TV by night. You know, flying to Georgia and, you know, putting yourself in between Putin and Saakashvili that is sort of dramatic. So you can get a lot from that. But, you know, tedious mediation between Azerbaijan and Armenia or whatever done in the structure of a common action decided by 27 countries that does not give you a lot of visibility points. So, I think, yes, it is a problem and yes, it will remain certainly. You know but then I have to get back to what I was saying about that it's largely personality dependent. If you have very a strong and forceful Higher Representative, then he might change things and change perceptions.

Ms. Psihoda: Do you think we have personalities like this in the European Union right now?

Mr. Vaisse: Yeah, I think we do. Yeah, you could imagine that and also people can reveal themselves in the situations. You know, who knows... Like Felipe Gonzalez if he was named High Representative or he could... he is a very pro-European leader and he could certainly turn himself into someone strong. Even Tony Blair could actually be because he has talk power. He has the visibility et cetera. He could shake things up a bit. I think it's also dependent on luck and, you know, the joke would be we need a good war. But it's only partly a joke. What it means is that we need some drama of history. And, you know, it's profoundly anti-European to say that because precisely the whole project of the EU, the whole identity of the EU is really inherently devised to be boring and precisely to escape

the brutality of history. And it's very good. I mean that's what largely contributed to peace, prosperity bla, bla, bla. But then, I think, you need a dose of it. We want war but not too much and not in our place. No, you know, I may sound cynical but more seriously it's true that the entire EU project was aimed... was at putting in place procedures and... You know, all this multilateralism was precisely aimed at avoiding the brutality and tragedy of the battle.

Ms. Psihoda: Talking a little bit about issues, what areas would you identify as good cooperation of the transatlantic relationship?

Mr. Vaisse: You mean the best ones? And I'm US-European relations... I'm taking this as meaning not on the EU but also... Terrorism, especially with France and Germany and not so much or not so well with the others. The best issues of cooperation... because, you know, there are many issues on which we cooperate well but... I mean Georgia was actually a good... It was actually a tandem; Sarkozy was consulting with the Americans quite a bit.

Ms. Psihoda: What about climate change, and Afghanistan, and Iran?

Mr. Vaisse: Well, obviously no, Afghanistan, it's disappointing for the Americans in a sense that they are not getting what they would like to get. Climate change – no, because the Europeans are not getting what they would like to get for a simple reason which is the American political system and habits and power structure system if you would like. Israel/Palestine – the Europeans are not getting what they would like to get even though it has become much better. But they would like much more involvement and pressure on part of the US on Israel even though they don't say it this way. And it's a bit a simplistic way to put but basically puts it down to that more pressure on both Israel and the Palestinians.

Ms. Psihoda: But Obama has changed his policy on this issue?

Mr. Vaisse: Yeah, and the jury is still out, and there is real pressure. This [inaudible] of war and now we are going to see who wins if it's Netanyahu or Obama. But Europeans... And so, yeah, I think... You know, right now it's a convergence but it's not cooperation. It's just a convergence of existing positions. I mean, the Americans... obviously there has been a turn here and so it coincides better with the European positions but it does not mean that it was actively built as a US-European thing. Contrary to terrorism, for example... You know, there was a willingness to share, to put into place the instruments et cetera. Financial regulation – so, so, not too bad.

Ms. Psihoda: How important is the transatlantic relationship for the current economic crisis?

Mr. Vaisse: Well, it would be important if it worked. No, that's a bit too stark. But basically that's the idea. That is it would... There are strong disagreements inside Europe between Germany, France and the UK to make things simple even

though there are other positions. And then there is a difference between the US and at least France and Germany on the other hand. And so the cooperation is good but it's not as good as it should be or could be.

Ms. Psihoda: And what about Iran?

Mr. Vaisse: Iran – here as well there is a disagreement among Europeans even though it has been one of the areas of success because of the EU-3 and all that what has been done. You know, they have not succeeded but they have not failed either. And so there is more, there is a good connection but things... It's not going to last if only because it's now hard to see how sanctions could work. So even if there is a US-European agreement on toughened sanctions et cetera. It's hard to see where it goes but it has been a good area of cooperation. Yeah, I would probably rank it in the good cooperation problem.

Ms. Psihoda: Alright. Well, thank you for your time and thank you very much for this extensive interview.

Transcript of the Interview with Karen Donfried, Ph.D., conducted on September 2nd, 2009.

Ms. Psihoda: On part of the research on the transatlantic relationship between Europe and the US will also touch the subject of change versus continuity in US foreign policy but more importantly to me in the transatlantic relationship. This I put in context with the change from Bush to Obama. So this – the change from Bush to Obama in the transatlantic relationship – would be sort of my beginning question on which I would ask you to elaborate a bit.

Ms. Donfried: So, you asked a question about change versus continuity in the transatlantic relationship with the change from Bush to Obama. And I actually think though that there has been a very significant change. I mean first of all if you talk about the individuals. Well, I think... I mean there is one question of is there a change of definitely speaking and is there a perceived change. And there is no question... and if you look at public opinion surveys... Europeans are incredibly enthusiastic about Barack Obama in a way that they never were about President Bush. And the Pew survey came out recently... GMF is releasing its surveys "Transatlantic Trends" next Wednesday. You should definitely go to our website on Wednesday and get that data because it is highly relevant for the topic that you are writing about. And it is actually quite similar to other surveys in showing a very significant Obama bounce. Now, you know, I think in that sense, I mean there has been a clear change... His policies on some issues are markedly different: The decision to withdraw from Iraq, the decision to close Guantanamo. On other issues there is not obvious change: on Afghanistan, in fact, he is recommitting to the US to that effort. On Iran the US administration remains committed to trying to prevent Iran from developing a nuclear weapons capacity. And what's interesting is even though Obama as a person is tremendously popular in Europe... I mean his approval ratings in Europe are much higher than they are in Europe... that even with that you don't see differences in European opinion on policy. In other words Europeans are not more enthusiastic about engaging in Afghanistan because of Barack Obama. You know, so you have not seen that personal popularity translate into greater policy coherence. And this is the challenge for the administration: How can you do that? I mean how do you use that tremendous personal capital he has for benefit to the US on the policy side. And you do not have an answer to that now. He still relatively new in office and the economic situation has been a huge factor dominating his presidency thus far. And certainly on the domestic scene it's all with that health care reform. So, you know, it would be interesting to see how this plays out on the foreign policy side but I do think it's an important opportunity... a moment of opportunity for the United State because there is this enthusiasm for this new American President in Europe. And you know we really need to think it out how to take advantage of that to really closer policies.

Ms. Psihoda: How do you see the relationship with Merkel? I mean if I follow you correctly – and this is also what I have read and heard – Merkel for my mind is in a certain trap, let's put it like this. Because she has the elections coming up in September and she cannot be for his [Obama's] policies because they are mostly not accepted by Europeans. They are unpopular but she cannot be against Obama either because Obama is one of the most popular politicians in Germany right now. How do you see that tension or that difficult relation?

Ms. Donfried: You know it's interesting because there has been a lot, particularly in the German press about Merkel and Obama not getting along. I tend to be a realist and how I view relations between the countries. So I mean I think it's nice if political leaders like each other. I don't really know whether Barack Obama and Angela Merkel like each other but I don't think that's what's going to drive their relationship. It's going to be driven by interest. Angela Merkel has a strong interest in maintaining a very good relationship to the United States. And the United States looks at Germany as the role member state in the European Union and has a strong interest in maintaining a very good relationship with Germany. When Merkel was first elected part of her campaign was, "We need to improve the relationship with the US" and that was the United States of George Bush. And even though George Bush was not popular in Germany, Germans believed what she said, "Yeah, actually it would be more benefit for us to have a good relationship with Washington". And, you know, and you saw that and she did work on that relationship. Now you have Barack Obama who is very popular in Germany so it's all of net plus. But you are right, there is this policy issues. She is not going to say, "We will send many more troops to Afghanistan". But what they did was very clever. Right a year ago, more or less, when they extended the German participation in the Afghanistan mission, they renewed it for more than a year to get pass the election and they renewed it at a slightly larger number. So Merkel has actually been able to increase the German troop presence in Afghanistan without ruffling any domestic public feathers. So I think she has actually played it quite well where she is doing things that would be helpful to Obama but not that will get her into domestic political hot water, let's say. I mean people have been looking at the NATO summit and the various visits they had, "Oh, how are they getting along". You know Angela Merkel is Angela Merkel. I mean she is not going to become Barack Obama. I think she has been very steady in her relationships with people and... You know, I think it was a good thing for the Germans and the French to get Barack Obama to Europe so early, right, April 3-4 for that NATO summit. And, you know, some people say it was too early but I would think for European interest the amount of time that Obama has spent in Europe is remarkable. And, you know, that also put some pressure on Europeans because he is investing a lot in that relationship. And at some point presumably he is hoping for a return on that investment. And I think it's understood in Washington that in the case of Germany the return on that investment is not going to come before September 27 or the day after election.

But what happens later this fall... I mean we all assume Angela Merkel will remain the German Chancellor. There is a question about whether it's going to be a grand coalition or whether the FDP and CDU/CSU together will do well on that for a coalition of the center-right. But my sense is that even after the German election Angela Merkel is not going to be enthusiastic about sending more troops. Just look at any German public opinion survey: 70%, depending on the poll you look at, of the country does not want the Afghanistan war and they certainly do want to send more troops but there is a support for economic measures. And I think it could be very interesting if Germany would lead a civilian surge that they were to encourage more development assistance. And in a sense Germany is very well positioned to do this, the European Union as a whole is very well positioned to do this. I mean if you think about the kind of assistance that the European Union gave to the new member states in Central and Eastern Europe. A lot of that could be relevant in the case of an Afghanistan. You know, how do you really built those structures in a country that has not know democracy in any real sense. You know, so to me I think we need to think more broadly about this and not measure the health of the transatlantic relationship or the German/Merkel relationship on how many German troops are in Afghanistan. And to be honest I would argue that it is quite remarkable that there are, what, 4,000 German troops in Afghanistan today given Germany's history, given the World Wars. And I think it's quite remarkable actually that Germany is deployed in the numbers that it is deployed today in Afghanistan and I would not be critical of them being deployed in the north. You know, if they weren't in the north, someone else would need to be. I mean I would be careful about that. But why not look to Germany or European allies for the other piece of this smart power equation. And my sense is that the administration gets that. When Barack Obama went to the NATO summit in early April, he did not ask European allies for more troops. And I think because he was pretty sure the answer would be no. What the administration has done is send more American troops. You know, we are bumping up American troop numbers in significant ways as we are drawing down in Iraq. And in my mind the Americans said, "Okay, you know, we have been asking the European allies now for – well, they have been going on for eight years – to do more on the military side and it's not going to happen. There are other important parts of the Afghanistan project. So fine, you know, let's have the Europeans play a larger role on those other pieces". You know, so anyway, we will see. But I do think there are prospects for us to work closely together on some of these issues that are very difficult.

Ms. Psihoda: Did the Obama administration never ask for more military power from Europe?

Ms. Donfried: I am not sure if the Obama administration has publicly asked for more troops. Now we don't know what happened in informal conversations. My suspicion is that there probably were informal conversations about this and it was clear that [it] was not going to be forthcoming. So the decision was "okay,...". For

increases he should present someone. But mostly you have countries drawing down. You know because I mean the reality is a lot of these countries did not happen to be put into Afghanistan for eight years. Afghanistan is very far away from Europe. It is hard to keep up these deployments year after year. Most of our European allies do not have expeditionary forces. You know... They had static forces that were there for the defense of Europe during the Cold War. You know, so I think there are some practical reasons to... It's not just... You know it's also, there are just some practical reasons why this is a hard thing to do over time. You know for countries like the Netherlands or the Brits or the Canadians, obviously not European, who have been deployed in the south, it's also an issue of taking hits. They have had casualties and that is hard to sustain over time. But I mean, I think in the German case there are other issues that are driving them out. But you know, it would be a good thing for you, that would be pretty easy for you to research, I think. You know, whether the Obama administration has publicly asked Europe for more. But I do remember at the time of the NATO summit I was quite struck that that was not the case and that that was not what was on the table.

Ms. Psihoda: And what about the German elections? I mean does the Obama administration prefer Merkel? And what would be the likely outcome if Merkel wins or Steinmeier does?

Ms. Donfried: You know, I don't know if they have... if there is preference there. I am not sure if it really matters. It seems highly unlikely that the SPD is going to be the largest party after the German election. But if they did, it is not obvious to me that Steinmeier's foreign policy is markedly different from Merkel's. I mean I think on Russia, perhaps we have seen important differences but... You know, Steinmeier is not Schroeder, he is not. I mean he is more centrist on foreign policy. So, you know, I don't think we don't have a strong... any concerns that... I mean I think if there were a possibility of a coalition that would include "Die Linke" that might be of concern. But frankly I don't think that's in the realm of the possible. I mean I just don't see today a party considering a coalition with "Die Linke" at the federal level. So there is a benefit to being post-election because you have a government in place that has just gotten a bit of confidence from the public that hopefully is empowered to make important decisions across the policy spectrum. So I would think that's sort of what people are looking forward to. You know having a government in place that can act.

Ms. Psihoda: And why is it that we have the perception that Merkel got along with Bush better than with Obama when actually Bush is so unpopular in Europe? Because when we are looking to the press coverage we see those nice pictures of Bush and Merkel. And with Obama the press always portrays the two political leaders as a couple that does not really fit, that does not really like each other. Why is that the case?

Ms. Donfried: You know I think it makes for good reading. I think, certainly, the objective reasons for it on Bush is, you say, he was deeply unpopular across Europe in the way that President Bush was not on speaking terms with Gerhard Schroeder or Jacques Chirac. So, you had a very bad German-American relationship at that level with leaders. I don't think that was true at every level and Joschka Fischer and Colin Powell got along very well. I think there was... You know, when Merkel wins the election and is engaging Bush, is opening to Bush, is saying positive things to the US that was striking because it was such a contrast. The relationship with Germany had already begun to improve. You remember that Bush made that trip to Mainz. Wow, that was an uncomfortable visit. You know, the entire city had been emptied out. Schroeder was visibly uncomfortable. You know, from a public diplomacy standpoint, I mean it was significant that Bush went and, you know, it was a sort of "Yes, we are post-Iraq; we are getting over this" but there was a chew in the air, you know. And so I think it was the contrast that you now have this German leader who, you know, was there sort of unemotional about this relationship. America is important; the United States of America matters for Germany and I am going to build a stronger relationship with that country than what my predecessor had. She was very open about that. So that was new, you know. And it was the beginning of a broader change in Europe: Chirac leaves the scene, Sarkozy comes in. You know, you have sort of these changes in the governments that were most critical of the US on Iraq. Okay, so that captures the attention of the press. Then Obama comes in who is just this rock star in Europe, and Merkel does not really change her approach. She continues to say, "The United States of America is an important partner for Germany and I am going to build a strong relationship". But she does not follow the speed, she is... but she is very steady in that. So the press thinks, "Oh, my goodness, this is worse than her relationship with Bush". But objectively speaking I am not sure it is. But I think the external reality has changed fundamentally. So when she initially engaged Bush, the external reality was such a negative one that it stood out. The external reality now is such a positive one for Obama in Germany that it also stands out but in a different way. But my sense is that she has been quite steady in the way she has been engaged with the US. You know and it's interesting because, you know, so the political scientists have this debate about is the change that we are seeing in the transatlantic relationship a cyclical change having to do with a particular US President or is it a structural change having to do with sort of fundamental differences in the world? Right, so the cyclical change argument is, "It was all about George Bush". Right, so George Bush leaves, Barack Obama comes in, we are good, you know. It was just like that. But as you and I just talked about other issues before, with Barack Obama everything is not okay. You know, Afghanistan is still really hard, Guantanamo. I mean very hard publicly and Europe is not really that interested in taking Guantanamo detainees ... and there are differences... So, you know, clearly there are some structural differences here that are important. It's not the Cold War anymore. Germany is not dependent on the United States for its security in the

way it was. You know, so I think it's some combination. Yes, it does matter who is the US President, sure. But there are also structural changes that present challenges to us. And it seems to me that, you know, Merkel has been very sort of (inaudible) about this in seeing that the US is an important partner for us and I am not going to be too bugged down whether it is George Bush or Barack Obama and whether I like them. But I am going to make sure I am representing and looking out for German national interest in these various relationships. So, you know, I would get less excited about the hype of, you know, "Oh, she does not get along with Obama and she liked Bush more" because I just don't think that's how states go after their interest.

Ms. Psihoda: So you would be more... There would be more arguments for the structural change than for the cyclical change?

Ms. Donfried: I mean I think that what happened in the eight years of George Bush. I mean George Bush in many ways is sort of quint essentially American in exactly the way Europeans don't like us. And Barack Obama embodies the American dream that Europeans so admire the US for. And I think during the eight years of Bush the antipathy many Europeans felt toward him, which was sort of that who he was... this cowboy from Texas. But then it was exacerbated by the policy decisions he made that it was easy to imagine that it was all about him. And I think what you are seeing now with Obama is you have an American President whose person is very popular in Europe but we are realizing that there are also these deeper structural issues. Sort of in a sense that cyclical change [that] masked a deeper structural change. When Americans and Europeans look at the world, in broad strokes we see things the same way. But the way we perceive certain threats is different and that leads us to different policy conclusions. And so, you know, I do think that both of these arguments are important and they sort of played out in different ways over past eight or nine years.

Ms. Psihoda: But I mean these perceptions and the structural and cultural differences they have always been there...

Ms. Donfried: Yeah!

Ms. Psihoda: ...and it was not a problem. But on the issue of Iraq it seemed like this was a big problem. At least I got the perception that... I mean they have said this at each crisis in the transatlantic relationships that has so far occurred, "This was the the worst". But every time the next one is the worst...

Ms. Donfried: Right!

Ms. Psihoda: But I mean okay, then you could argue that there was the USSR and that was the reason why those structural differences did not play out. But then we had the Clinton presidencies and there were those structural differences. There was the beginning of a new system. The old bipolar system collapsed and

there was still no crisis. So the crisis about Iraq must have also been about the political leaders at the head of government at that time.

Ms. Donfried: Well, but I mean I would argue that Germany during the Cold War... Yes, we were bound together by a common threat, the Soviet threat. But for the US in many ways our foreign policy was about Europe. I mean the biggest problem we probably faced was the Soviet Union and, of course, our closest allies in that were the Europeans. The issues beyond Europe were not at the core of our relationship. We did not agree on these issues then but it mattered less because they were at the periphery. What has happened at the end of the Cold War and Clinton administration in many ways was sort of the period of evolution in this. I mean we still fought a war in Europe during the Clinton years, which was in the Balkans. I mean so we were still very focused on Europe but starting... You know... but in a sense, you know... In those years the focus on Europe was "Creating a Europe whole, free and in peace". That was the motto starting with Bush one and then taken on by Clinton. In a sense of the end of the Clinton period the American perspective was that we had largely achieved that goal. You know, you had NATO enlargement, you had EU enlargement. I mean sure there are issues in the Balkans. There are issues in wider Europe. But, you know, for an American looking at the world Europe looks really good. I mean it's a huge success of European and American policy. So, then the United States says, "Okay, great, really our focus now shifts". Right? It's about the Middle East, it's about rising powers like India and China... It, you know, global threat terrorism... all of those issues beyond Europe that Americans and Europeans had never agreed on. But now this is at the center of our relationship and it's hard. We don't really have the tools to deal with that. Do you deal with that in NATO? Well, a little bit but not really. Do you deal with it in the EU? Well, a little bit but not really. I mean, you have Javier Solana but I mean foreign policy still really is in the purview of the member states. You know, so to me that's the structural change. It's not that we agreed about everything in the Cold War but the things that we disagreed about were not at the center of our relationship. So and you know that's how I would view that.

Ms. Psihoda: Okay.

Ms. Donfried: And I mean you saw cyclical changes then too. Ronald Reagan was deeply unpopular in Europe. I was a student in Germany in those years. You know, hundreds of thousands of people were demonstrating against the dual track decision. So, you know, there is... there was cyclical change within that period as well but that structural change I really see is happening with the end of the Cold War and with these sort of new threats.

Ms. Psihoda: Okay, I see what you mean. What about the importance of the transatlantic relationship? Is it still as important for Obama as it is for Bush? Is it

less important or is it more important for Obama than for Bush? How would you see that?

Ms. Donfried: Ehm, you know, there is obviously a huge debate about this. I mean with Obama people are worried because he really hasn't... What is his connection to Europe? He has not spent broad [inaudible], which frankly was true of Bush as well. Ahm, and Clinton, of course, was a Rhode scholar. George Bush, the first George Bush I mean, had lots of connections and lots of government experiences. Ahm, you know, in my mind, if you look around the world, *the* closest allies for the Americans remain the Europeans. Ahm, I actually think values are important and I actually think the European-US values are quite similar. I mean I do think we share... you know, we can have a debate about that... but I do believe that that you can make a compelling argument that that remains the case. I also think that Europeans can bring assets to bear that help us meet the challenge that we face. You might be familiar with Bob Kagan writing on this.

Ms. Psihoda: Sure, Robert Kagan's "Power and Weakness", right?

Ms. Donfried: Right! You know, so Kagan was making the argument that, you know, "Europe is a nice for vacation but really they don't have much in the way of hard power and what can they really contribute". Ahm, well, I mean I actually think that Europeans have quite a bit to contribute across the spectrum. And what is interesting about Bob Kagan's writing is that he had originally written an article and then he turned it into that short book and I don't remember now if it was a foreword or afterword but he added a piece to the book, which said something he had not fully appreciated or valued when he wrote the article was the fact that the Europeans can bring legitimacy to US actions. And this is, of course, one of the powerful lessons of Iraq that the US has the power to go to war in Iraq but it did not actually had the legitimacy. And, you know, so I thought it was interesting that Kagan felt that. You know, so even he then was saying, "Okay, so maybe on soft power this is good". But I would say... I mean there is always this thing... You know, the Europeans before the US troop increase in Afghanistan and this is changing now, we basically weren't contributing equal amounts of troops to the International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan. We are going to greatly outnumber the European contribution, which... Well, is a separate issue, but... You know, I would not belittle 30,000 European troops on the ground in Afghanistan. That is a material help to us. Ahm, what the Europeans are doing on economic assistance, on development assistance is a material help to us. And there really aren't a lot of other countries out there who can be partners with us... whether it's on the legitimacy side or making the argument that action is needed. But also then really in helping to provide the material resources to achieve a goal. So in my mind the transatlantic relationship remains critically important for the US. You know, the world is changing. So, yes, there are rising powers like China and India. We see the G7, became the G8, it's now the G20. And I think what that means for the transatlantic relationship is that US-European agreement on

something used to be both a necessary and sufficient condition for international action. It may still be necessary but it is no longer sufficient. And this is a challenge for us... I mean for us collectively, for Americans and Europeans. So, you know, Americans and Europeans can agree on international economic action but the reality is we do need to discuss that in the G20 context. We do need these other countries to be a part of that, to be effective actors. You see it on climate change... I mean you see it across the board on these issues. So, that to me is the big change. It's not that the transatlantic relationship is not still vitally important for both sides but that it's not enough. And it used to be enough to really bring global action. So that's a challenge.

Ms. Psihoda: Do you see a difference between Bush and Obama in the perception of the transatlantic relationship and its importance?

Ms. Donfried: Ahm, you know, certainly the perception was that in his first term Bush did not value Europe to the extent he did in the second term. Ahm, I am not sure we agree with that. I mean people use the example of Iraq and say, "He had built this coalition of the willing", very disruptive for Europe. Well, he did not... That really was not his first choice, right. I mean, the Bush administration was trying to unite Europe behind US policy and it failed. So it was left with a suboptimal outcome, which was building a coalition of the willing. Okay, if you can't get everybody, you take as many as you can. And that was one of the interesting lessons of Iraq. It was not just a US-European dustup. I mean that worries deeply Europe. Europeans were divided among themselves. You know, with governments like the UK, like Poland, like Spain initially, Portugal, you know, backing US policy and the Germans, the French and others, you know, being critical, not supporting US policy. But, you know, I think Bush would have liked to have a united Europe behind that. So, yes, I mean he had to accept a suboptimal outcome. And then, of course, relations got very bad. You know, it's a pretty big deal if a country decides to go to war and other countries don't support. I mean that's sort of the upper end of, you know, policy disagreements. You know, in his second term it was pretty clear that the administration actively reached out to Europe. Ahm, which is significant, I mean that is acknowledging Europe matters; we want to rebuild bridges that were broken because of Iraq. And in particular the administration reached out to the European Union because there had been so much criticism from the European side that the Bush administration had engaged in a policy of disaggregation. You know, after decades of the US trying to support a united Europe, you know, you had been working against this. And so I think the administration was about to show, "No, no, no, we actually do support the European integration". They talked about the EU. That trip where President Bush went to Mainz... He, of course, also went to Brussels and visited each constituting part of the EU, the Commission, the Council, the Parliament, gave a speech there. Ahm, so, you know, that was I think symbolic of this difference in the engagement with Europe. And, you know, talking to European policy makers at

that time, they thought it was not just for symbolic but that it was real. That when President Bush was there, I think every European talked to him about Iran and the need for the US to engage in the EU-3 process and that in fact happened. Ahm, the US then also put things on the table like spare aircraft parts and WTO membership for Iran. You know, so you also saw policy changes that came from those negotiations with the Europeans. And, you know, this is... Some of the people who make the continuity argument, "Ah, US policy is not that different under Obama than it was under Bush"... Really what they are talking about is these changes that you saw on US policy in that second Bush term. Ahm, you know, I think that is important too, to sort of think about these eight years of Bush and, you know, how the second term was different from the first term. And, you know, Bush sort of going back to a more traditional US engagement with Europe in that second term than perhaps would have even been possible in the first term because of the role that Iraq played in sort of poisoning this relationship.

Ms. Psihoda: Okay. Talking a little bit about the EU: How is the perception towards the EU? I mean I guess it is still a US-European and not a US-EU relationship. What is the perception of the EU or how important is the EU for American Presidents, for Obama in that case?

Ms. Donfried: I think the EU is important and I think the fact that when President Obama went to Europe in early April for the NATO summit that he also went to Prague for a US-EU summit is significant. You know, I think everyone is waiting to see what is happening on October 2nd in Ireland. Will we have a Lisbon treaty ratified? Because I do actually think that the Lisbon treaty will make a difference on the foreign and security policy side.

Ms. Psihoda: In which ways?

Ms. Donfried: I think that by having an external action service, by having... by essentially combining the Solana position with the Commission position. So that you give that... whoever the new Solana is. Also the tools that the Commission has that... that makes that a more substantial and important position. You know, some of the changes that are in the treaty actually could be important for their being a more substantial EU foreign policy. It will depend also on who that person is. I think it's interesting to see who is chosen for that. So, you know, we'll see what happens with Lisbon. You know, I am... my view of European integration... I think it is very good for the United States that the EU has achieved what it has. I think that was a key post-World War II goal for the US and I think we have been very successful in sort of supporting that process. I am not convinced that we will continue to see integration deepening in the way it has over the past four-five decades. And I see that because in my mind Germany was a critical engine for ever-deeper European integration. Right, so if you think that during the first common then European community policy was the common agricultural policy. I mean essentially that was the German agreement to subsidize French farmers. I

mean in its very basic form. Okay, you know, then think about the Euro, hugely significant. You know, if we define, I mean when I took my International Relations 101 course, the definitions of a state sovereignty was money and troops. For countries to agree that money will be controlled not nationally... huge, right? But okay. Germany was the key country to agree with that because the ugly little truth is there was a European currency and that was called the "Deutschmark" but nobody had control over it except the German Central Bank. So it was Germany that was giving up sovereignty and, you know, this was Helmut Kohl's – whatever your judgment is on Helmut Kohl – this was his brilliance. I mean to say he was committed to creating a European Germany and not a German Europe. The Euro was a huge part of that. And if there had been a referendum in Germany, it would not have gone through. But, you know, you create the Euro, which again in my mind was Germany giving up sovereignty, you know, and the new... The area that's left, right the other part of that definition of state sovereignty is troops. Okay, but on foreign and security policy it is not Germany that has to give up sovereignty. It's France and it's the UK. I mean those are the two countries that have substantial expeditionary forces, those are the countries that have permanent seats on the UN Security Council and, wow, I don't see a lot of enthusiasm in France and the UK for giving up that seat in favor of a EU seat. And so, you know... And it seems to me that there is a bloc there here on foreign and security policy that it is hard to see... I mean at least in the short term. I mean I don't know... maybe... I don't know over time this changes. And the reason I have sort of gone through all of this is to say, so for the United States the EU is tremendously important when we are talking about trade policy. You know, when we are talking about areas where the Commission has competence, the EU is what we deal with. Okay, but there is this big area, foreign and security policy, where the EU, the Commission does not have competence. And, you know, yes the Lisbon treaty will make some differences in that but the US is still going to need to engage with key member states when we are talking about foreign and security policy. And, you know, so when I say the EU is very important for American policy I just want to differentiate, you know, what are the issues that we deal exclusively with EU on and what are the issues that we still are going to need to deal with member states on. And, you know, and I think that is just the reality.

Ms. Psihoda: But isn't it also that also Germany does not want to become the EU militarily powerful? And that's also a reason why the EU cannot manage to have a united foreign and security policy because Germany just does not want to have a militarily powerful EU. Isn't that also a reason?

Ms. Donfried: I don't know of that. I mean my sort of analysis, which, of course, you don't have to agree with, of German security policy or German military engagement is that Germans always want to be doing that in a multilateral context. Right, I mean ideally you have a UN Security Council resolution blessing the military action. But you at least... If you don't have that, which was Kosovo,

you are part of NATO operation, you are part of an EU operation. And so in my mind for Germany the more you can multilateralize German security, the better because Germans don't want to be out there on their own. So, you know, that would be my sense of that... that the Germans would actually be quite open to the EU playing a larger role on that. But, you know, again I certainly respect having a different view on that. Because I don't see the EU running off on military adventures. You know, Gerhard Schröder had this... When he was running for re-election, he had this comment about, you know, we are not going to be engaging in any military adventures. And what he meant was the US in Iraq. And I think, you know, in the German view if something is multilateralized, it is actually harder to bring about that action because, you know, you need to get agreement across many states. But I just think we are very far from that just because I do think there is a British and French sort of [inaudible]. So in a sense the Germans can sit back and don't actually have to take a prominent role on that.

Ms. Psihoda: Okay. And then we were talking about trade and that the EU does matter for the US in terms of trade. How do you see the possibilities for cooperation in terms of the economic and financial crisis between the EU and the US? What can be areas of cooperation? Is there any cooperation?

Ms. Donfried: You know, I mean, again, I think the press in a way overstates the US-European divide on this. I mean sort of the popular view is that the US is all about stimulus and Europe is all about regulation except for those Brits. You know that Anglo-American brand of capitalism that is so evil. You know, so that's sort of the caricatures, so stimulus versus regulation. Ahm, I mean we are much more closer than that. I mean the reality is that if you look at a social welfare state like Germany, there are these sort of built-in stabilizers that kick in when the economy is in recession because of the fabric of a social welfare state. Ahm, and I think it was an IMF study, there was a study recently that sort of played this out that if you look at all the programs that were triggered by the recession in Germany in terms of benefits that got people have employment. The amount of stimulus... I mean it's different from the stimulus package that was passed in the US but the total numbers are not as different as you would think. And, you know, there is obviously a vibrant discussion in this country about regulation that has not ended. I mean the European fear is that the US is not going to do any of them [regulations], that we are going to come out of this recession and forget the bad stuff. We'll see, I mean I don't know the answer to that. But there is certainly a vibrant debate in this country about the regulation piece of this as well. You know, and I think the Americans and the Europeans have done a pretty good job of managing the G20 meetings, of, you know, trying to build a consensus among themselves and we have this G20 meeting coming up. So, again, I don't want to say there are no differences, of course, there are. I mean we are not a social welfare state. So, yes, there was a separate stimulus package. But, you know, the European economies also were doing a lot of this sort of stimulus spending, just

as sort of what they called built-in stabilizers. And, you should, look at this public opinion survey because there were interesting questions about the economy as well and there is an embargo on the data until next week. So I don't want to say a whole lot about it. But the results were not quite what I had expected in terms of, you know, Europeans blaming the Americans for this sort of crisis, which you... arguably you could do given the toxic assets. So, anyway, we'll see, we'll see.

Ms. Psihoda: How important do think EU actors are for the transatlantic relationship? I mean obviously the Commission is important when it comes to trade but what about the Presidency? I mean we have seen Sarkozy and we had the perception at least that it was a well-going relationship. Then you had the Czechs where there unfortunately was not so much going on. And, yeah, how important are those EU figures and actors for the US compared to the national heads of the governments like Brown, Sarkozy, Merkel and others?

Ms. Donfried: I think it is going to be all of the above. I mean, obviously the presidency is changing, you know. If Lisbon is ratified, you will have the rotating Presidency but in a very different form. You will have an elected President and I think that's different. Again, it's going to matter tremendously who that person is but there will be a coherence there... that you do not have with a six month rotating presidency. So I think there are important structural changes coming both on the Presidency, both on the Solana figures we talked about. You know, that will be a more powerful position once you combine the Solana and Ferrero-Waldner portfolios. And I do think that the President and that foreign... Well, of course, they could not call him Foreign Minister... But that Foreign Minister will be of interest to the US because they will be more important. They will be more... they will carry more legitimacy and have more policy to their disposal, which is not to say that the Merkels and Sarkozys and Browns of the world are not important anymore. They will be important. So I think you are going to see... You know, this whole debate of what number the US is going to call... There is not and cannot be one number. You know, and that's the art of diplomacy. And it's going to be very interesting to see how these structures are going to play out because in many ways that is a question for European countries. Are they going to put powerful people in those jobs? And my preference would be to have powerful people put in those positions. But, you know, member states may be concerned about doing that because they don't want to lose their power. So, you know, it's going to be interesting to see how this is going to play out.

Ms. Psihoda: So there is a huge part of personality actually?

Ms. Donfried: I think so. I don't think that there is anyway around that.

Ms. Psihoda: And when we go back to the crisis and to the rapprochement... When we are talking about personality, was there a huge change in the terms of that the transatlantic relationship got better because of new leaders in Germany

and France? Or was there a rapprochement happening already between Bush and Schroeder and Bush and Chirac before the new leaders came in?

Ms. Donfried: I think it was really when Sarkozy and Merkel came and I do think that was an extreme [inaudible]. You know, again there is no policy that is closer to home than going to war. And, you know, Bush clearly felt... And he felt that he had been betrayed by Schroeder and Chirac. So there was no... I mean, sure, you could try to patch it up and he made a trip to Mainz but there was really no... It was just so deep. And then, you know, with Merkel and Sarkozy it was not just new leadership. It was leaders who were open about wanting a stronger relationship with Washington. And so they were leaders of the center-right as well. I mean there was a commonality there that I think made the rapprochement even sort of stronger than it might have been if Schroeder had been replaced by a Social Democrat. So, yeah, I mean I think leaders matter but also context matters.

Ms. Psihoda: Could you explore on the context?

Ms. Donfried: The context mattered just in that the break had been over an issue of one piece, so it was very fundamental. It was so deep. And it was not like that they just did not like each other or some minor disagreement. It was really a deep disagreement. I can't..., I mean when was there a break like that in post-War period of an issue of war where, you know, I mean Germany and France were trying to prevent the US and the UK from getting a second resolution in the UN Security Council. They succeeded in doing that. They could not stop the US from going to war but there was a really deep fracture. And I think everybody came away from it saying, "Oh, don't want to repeat that". That part was not good for anybody because it was just so sort of damaging within the relationship, within Europe. So, that's what I mean by the context.

Ms. Psihoda: Alright. Well, thank you very much for your time and for this extensive interview.

Transcript of the Interview with James Goldgeier, Ph.D., conducted on September 8th, 2009.

Ms. Psihoda: So, my first question would be: How important do you think are the transatlantic relations for Barack Obama and for his administration?

Mr. Goldgeier: Well, I think that he does take seriously the importance of transatlantic relations but I think he is concerned that he is not getting a lot from his interactions with his European counterparts. So I think he is grown frustrated. I mean the way that they look at it from the standpoint of the White House is that he went to Europe three times in his first six months. That's pretty unusual. You know, he has not been to Asia yet and on the issue that's probably going to be of greatest importance to him in terms of foreign policy in his first term, the war in Afghanistan, he is not getting a lot of help from his European counterparts. So, I think there is a lot of frustration. He knows that the transatlantic relations are important but I think that he is going to be continuing to get frustrated as to what he can get from that relationship.

Ms. Psihoda:

Do you think that Asia is more important to him? Or an engagement in Africa?

Mr. Goldgeier: Ahm, well, from my standpoint of view as national interest... You know, in the coming period Asia is going to become important, more and more important. And so US attention is definitely shifting from the kind of focus that it had on Europe previously. And is now more Middle East and Asia. So I think that is a pretty inevitable transition. But for the US it's best partners, it's main partners are the Europeans. So, it's hard to do things around the world unless there is a good transatlantic relationship.

Ms. Psihoda: Sure. How important do you think were the transatlantic relations for George W. Bush?

Mr. Goldgeier: I think he came in not realizing how important they would be and I think over time he realized how important they were. So he came in thinking, "It does not really matter. I can do whatever I want. The United States is so powerful. If they want to be with me, that's great. If they don't, I don't really care". And that's how he spent his first term and it was a disaster. So, I think by the second term he realized it was important to have a better relationship with the Europeans. So that took him a lot to learn.

Ms. Psihoda: Do you think the European Union, in particular, was more important for Bush than for Obama? Because actually he went to Brussels and started to rebuild the relationship through the European Union whereas Obama... Yes, he was at the EU-US summit, but you don't have the perception that the European Union is very important to him.

Mr. Goldgeier: I don't know if I would say that. I mean he did go to Prague in April because they were holding the EU presidency and he went to the meeting in Prague. Ahm, it's true... I mean it will be interesting to see... I hope that if... that if he goes to Brussels that he would go to the EU like Bush did early in his second term. I think we still have a problem in the United States... that the level of understanding of what the EU is and what the EU does is still do low. I don't think there is just much recognition of the role the EU plays.

Ms. Psihoda: Would you say that it is still a US-European relationship? Or are there also some parts or some areas when you would talk about a US-EU relationship?

Mr. Goldgeier: I think the main relationship the US has in Europe still are the bilateral country-to-country. You know, Britain and France, Germany, Italy, Poland, more than the US and EU.

Ms. Psihoda: And what could be reasons for why Bush did this kind of rapprochement, as I would call it, with Europe? I mean was it only that things got worse...

Mr. Goldgeier: Yes!!

Ms. Psihoda: ...in the world around...

Mr. Goldgeier: Yes! Yes!!

Ms. Psihoda: ...or were there also some other reasons, domestic reasons, public opinion reasons?

Mr. Goldgeier: No, I think he realized... I think things... I mean at that point things were going badly in Iraq and I think he realized, "Wait a minute, we can't just do whatever we want and be successful. We do need help". And that he should not have treated the Europeans the way he did in the first term. So I think he realized that he needed to reach out in the second term.

Ms. Psihoda: And talking a little bit about the transatlantic agenda: Do you think that there has been a change from Bush's second term to Obama on the transatlantic agenda?

Mr. Goldgeier: Ahm, I don't think probably not as... You know, the main thing that has changed is the style and the atmosphere. I mean, you know, in a sense... You know, Bush was such a hard person for the Europeans to like and Obama, you know, is so popular in Europe. But the problem is the issues are still the same and it's not clear what they are willing to maneuver. So, for example, on two issues that were important to the Europeans, closing Guantanamo and climate change... And Obama announced his intention to close Guantanamo and then realized that he was going to have problem and in fact it's... still figuring that

whole process out is very difficult. On climate change I think because of the nature... the debt of the economic crisis and the other issues he has got... I don't know that he is really going to be able to do that much on climate change. Not enough that would really get the Europeans to notice that the US is radically different. And on the issues that are important to the United States like Iran and Afghanistan... on Iran we'll see. I mean the administration is counting on if it tries to reach out to Iran and Iran rejects it that the Europeans will then support stiffer sanctions. So but that, you know, we'll see. And on Afghanistan, you know, they would like more help and they are not going to get it.

Ms. Psihoda: And on Iran, do you think that the Europeans are not going to go with the sanctions?

Mr. Goldgeier: I don't know. I wonder. I think it is going to be very hard for the US to get tougher sanctions.

Ms. Psihoda: Because of economic advantages that Europeans have.

Mr. Goldgeier: Mhmm, yes.

Ms. Psihoda: And on climate change: So we should not actually expect too much from the Copenhagen climate change meeting in December.

Mr. Goldgeier: No, I would not. I think politically it is very difficult for the President... both Congress, the economy, the stance that India and China are taking. And economics is very difficult for the US to do something bold, which is what we need. I mean we need bold things.

Ms. Psihoda:

Yeah, but we see the climate bill that has passed the House. At least I thought that this is a step in the right direction but, of course, it still needs to pass the Senate. How is your view on that?

Mr. Goldgeier: No, I think he certainly got... I mean this is an administration that is greatly different from the last administration on climate change because there are... First of all, they believe in science and they have people in place who take it seriously. I mean it is a very different group than the previous group. So that's good. But it's just the politics that is just going to be very difficult, especially with the economy. It's going to be easy for people who oppose this kind of legislation to say it's going to cause more job loss.

Ms. Psihoda: But then there are others arguing that it would actually create a lot of jobs.

Mr. Goldgeier: Right, I know. Right, I mean that's... You know, people who read Tom Friedman tell you that green jobs are the paths to... You know, the most

competitive economies are going to... you know, have green jobs. But that's going to be a tough argument.

Ms. Psihoda: Do you think that there was a crisis of confidence during the second Bush presidency? And I have also read that Katrina had an impact on Bush's reaching out to the Europeans. Were these probably some underlying reasons as well? So, is not there another explanation for Bush's reaching out other than just the "things were going bad around the world" argument?

Mr. Goldgeier: Well, I mean, you know, the population typically wants to see the United States working with others and, you know, there is always the sense that there is a lot of opposition to the United Nations, for example, to multilateralism and it's just not true. If you look at public opinion, the public's argument usually is they don't want the United States dealing with problems by itself. They think it's too much of a burden; it's too costly for the United States; the United States should ideally be working with other partners. So I think there is an expectation that the US is going to actually work with other countries.

Ms. Psihoda: How much does the Congress play a role in the transatlantic relations? I mean in the sense that the domestic politics is keeping the administration from further reaching out or from doing compromises on certain issues?

Mr. Goldgeier: In general the Congress does not play much of a role in foreign policy but there are specific... I mean trade is the area where it has the most impact. And I think that that is going to be an issue for this administration because even if they have in mind sort of more free trade Doha round or free trade agreement, North Atlantic Free Trade Agreement or something like that, I think it will be very hard. The politics in Congress are very anti-trade right now. So I think the administration is just going to try to keep things from being really bad. So like when we had things like a provision that the President tries to keep the Congress from putting too much of [inaudible] in the legislation. But I don't think it's going to be actively free trade. So I think that's going to frustrate people who want to see more movement on the trade agenda. But usually other than trade the Congress really... You know, in the place of all of these specific countries... But in general if there is something the President really wants on foreign policy, he should be able to get it.

Ms. Psihoda: I was thinking about the climate change bill and I think you also have to pass a bill for putting sanctions on Iran. So I thought that Congress could block these bills and then Obama would not be able to move forward with his policies.

Mr. Goldgeier: Well, climate change I think more than sanctions. I think he wants to do sanctions, he'll do sanctions but climate change... the politics of climate change will be difficult.

Ms. Psihoda: Is there a difference in the perception that Republicans and Democrats have of Europe, the EU and the transatlantic relations?

Mr. Goldgeier: Ahm, I think that... I think in general the Democrats are supportive of good relations with Europeans and the EU. Typically what you have had is when the Republicans said two different things: One, because Republicans typically are anti-government and anti-bureaucracy, they tend to look at the EU as this big bureaucracy and so they don't like it. Because it's just... to them it's just another bureaucracy and they don't like bureaucracy. The other thing about the Republicans is the strong support among... in the Republican party for the East European Countries. So that tends to color their attitude toward Europe. So when Don Rumsfeld talked about old Europe and new Europe, that's a pretty standard Republican approach to think about Europe.

Ms. Psihoda: Is this still a common sentence of reference? I mean is this still present this new and old Europe distinction?

Mr. Goldgeier: I think for a lot of Republicans, yes.

Ms. Psihoda: And I guess Eastern European countries are important because they are normally pro-American.

Mr. Goldgeier: Right.

Ms. Psihoda: Whereas old Europeans are a bit careful, I would say.

Mr. Goldgeier: Right. And usually also the East Europeans have a lot of sympathy because the Republicans tend to be more anti-Russians than the Democrats. And so there is more the concern that the Eastern Europeans need to be protected.

Ms. Psihoda: And how about the Democrats? Are there also issues that influence the relationship with Europe?

Mr. Goldgeier: You know, with the Democrats in general, you know, trade is a big issue and, you know, there have been issues with respect to the Europeans. But most of the issues are really more about cheap imports from other parts of the world. So it's not... I think for the Democrats in general good relations... I think Democrats are generally pretty supportive of it. And they don't... I mean they don't have these hang ups about old Europe or about bureaucracy and so on.

Ms. Psihoda: What about Afghanistan, do you think that there is going to change something? I mean we saw that there are more American troops but on the same time Germany has slightly increased its troop contingent in Afghanistan and so is France willing to do. Do you think that there is going to be a change of the situation there?

Mr. Goldgeier: No, I mean the real question is: How many more American troops are going to go in? How about Iraq? And I think unless things change where people can see there is a difference being made. I think... I mean it's a very difficult moment right now for Obama because the American population is losing faith in the mission.

Ms. Psihoda: Do they still have faith in the Iraq mission?

Mr. Goldgeier: I think people have really moved on from Iraq and sort of a sense it's not time for the Iraqis to take over and we are going to remove our troops. I don't think people are thinking much better about Iraq today.

Ms. Psihoda: Do you think that the takeover by Iraqis is going to be successful? Or could it be that now the Americans are pulling out of Iraq and are going into Afghanistan and then after some months they are again pulling out of Afghanistan and are going back into Iraq again?

Mr. Goldgeier: I think if the situation gets worse in Iraq again, I think the American public is going to say, "We gave them a chance". It's their fault, too bad. I don't think that people are going to support going back into Iraq.

Ms. Psihoda: Is there a possibility that Europeans are going to take over more responsibility in Iraq and are going to free American troops for Afghanistan?

Mr. Goldgeier: Well, I think there's more of a role for the Europeans to play on training, training Iraqis, training Afghanis. I don't think that that's a role Europe can play but I don't Europeans are going to do much on the security part.

Ms. Psihoda: And how about economic relations and the current economic crisis? Is there going to be a cooperation between the US and Europe in order to get the things right again?

Mr. Goldgeier: Well, I think, you know, the issue has been that there have been very different approaches, you know, across the Atlantic on the best way to deal with the crisis. And I think there are still huge debates between US and Europe on what the best way is to deal with the crisis. You know, the G20 meeting coming up in Pittsburgh... I think we'll get some sense of how well we are working together.

Ms. Psihoda: What about the last G8 and G20 meeting? Did you have the perception that we were working together well or not?

Mr. Goldgeier: No, I don't think that they went very well at all because I think there was a real... I mean especially the G20 about the US which wants the Europeans to do more stimulus and the Europeans said, "We are already doing plenty, we are not doing more". So I mean there is a real tension.

Ms. Psihoda: And the G8?

Mr. Goldgeier: Well, the problem is the G8 is sort of losing its justification for existence because we now have the G20. In fact, I think this administration probably would like to get rid of the G8 because the G20 is more representative. The problem with the G8 is that it leaves too many countries out that matter. It's just not... I mean it's heavily weighted towards the Europeans and it does not have China and India. And so it does not really make much sense anymore.

Ms. Psihoda: How about the Middle East and the Israel/Palestine conflict? Does there exist some sort of cooperation between the US and Europe?

Mr. Goldgeier: Well, I mean, I think the sort of the usual. I mean the big issue on Israel/Palestine is... for the US can find a way to move the parties forward. I think it's really a US/Israel/Palestine question. Europeans... You know, through the quartet in that Tony Blair has worked they play a little bit of a role but not a huge amount. I don't think the US is looking for the Europeans unless they can find some... I mean if there really was a deal then the US would want the Europeans to help financially. The US wants to be able to drive this process without a lot of other people meddling.

Ms. Psihoda: How about Russians? Do you see that Russia is going to influence the transatlantic relationship? Because Obama now has a different Russia policy than Bush had and the Eastern European countries are getting worried...

Mr. Goldgeier: They are getting worried. I don't think they should. I don't think that he cares about Eastern Europe. I think he does want a better relationship with Russia. So... But I think there is such uncertainty in the West about how best to deal with Russia. I mean there is not really one unified position on how the US and Europe would deal with Russia. So I think that's a problem.

Ms. Psihoda: What is the interest right now for Obama in his relations to Russia compared to the European interest with Russia?

Mr. Goldgeier: Well, so I mean he's got two issues on which he really cares a lot about that Europe is not involved. I mean that's not directly relevant to Europe. So one is the arms control. I think really he does want to get an arms control agreement and another one after that. And secondly, the issue of transit of American personal and material into Afghanistan. He is relying more on Russia. He is going to rely more on central Asia, which means he's got to have Russian cooperation. So that ability to move material and people into Afghanistan for resupply he really needs a strong relationship with Russia.

Ms. Psihoda: Whereas for Europeans the main concern is about energy, right?

Mr. Goldgeier: Right.

Ms. Psihoda: What about the NATO enlargement? How does the US perceive that? Is this something good? I mean Georgia and the Ukraine still want to get

into NATO. And how does this conflict with building a strong relationship with Russia?

Mr. Goldgeier: Yeah, so right now with NATO enlargement the process is on hold basically. I don't think it's going to be relevant even if Obama wins two terms and is President until January of 2017. I don't think enlargement to Ukraine and Georgia will have taken place before then. So I don't think it's really that relevant to his presidency. I mean the NATO is going to continue to have relations with Ukraine and Georgia to try to help move them along but enlargement is not going to happen any time soon.

Ms. Psihoda: And the recent enlargements did they conflict with the pursuit of good relations with Russia by the US?

Mr. Goldgeier: You mean Albania and Croatia? No. No, I mean the big issue is Ukraine and George but I don't think this is going to happen anytime soon. I mean the other... the other big issue for the fall is going to be missile defense... within the next couple of month figuring out if the Obama administration takes a position on missile defense, what position they take.

Ms. Psihoda: What do you think is going to be their position?

Mr. Goldgeier: I don't really know. I really don't know. But I mean there is talk... You know, I think they have to figure out sort of what it is they are defending against and what they want to defend and what the right way to do that is. And that may mean they go forward with the Polish and Czech deployment but they might not. And I think it's really more... I think for Obama it will rather be a technical question. Politically tough, of course, it's going to be difficult if he wants to do something different because people are going to see this as a problem for Poland and the Czech Republic if he decides something different.

Ms. Psihoda: Do you think that the EU enlargement has an impact on the Obama administration? Does he get anyhow involved in that or is he more of the opinion that this is something the EU has to figure out for itself?

Mr. Goldgeier: Yeah, I think it's a European question. I don't think he has got strong views on that. I mean I don't know but I would not think he has strong views on that.

Ms. Psihoda: How important do think are actors for the transatlantic relationship? I mean is it more that circumstances are responsible for the development of good or bad transatlantic relationships? Or is it also a question of actors like, for example, Schroeder, Chirac?

Mr. Goldgeier: You know, I think the actors can make a difference on the origins. The problem is that... I mean you yourself noted at the very beginning that there seems to be a lot of continuity and normally there is a lot of continuity. I mean

policies just don't change that much. But the actors can play an important role. I mean Obama is a very different role than Bush and that gives, you know, we talk about soft power. The US has a lot of soft power right now because of Obama. For France, having a President in Sarkozy... He is very different than Chirac was. He is much more pro-American, he is much more interested in working with the United States. So that makes a difference. I mean there is still the politics involved in all these places but I do think, you know, the actors... Within the constraints actors will make a difference. And I think we have seen that with both Sarkozy and Obama. But, you know, and I also... I mean normally Presidents develop good or bad relations with their counterparts and that has some impact. We don't know enough yet. You know, does Obama have a good relationship with Chancellor Merkel? We don't really know. I mean it does not seem like but we don't really know.

Ms. Psihoda: Are good relations with other head of governments important?

Mr. Goldgeier: I think at the margins it can be important. For resolving problems I think that it can be important for... You know, when tough problems exist... if leaders have a good working relationship... I think that they can resolve them more easily if they have a good relationship.

Ms. Psihoda: Why do you think do we have the perception that Merkel had a better relationship with Bush than with Obama?

Mr. Goldgeier: Ahm, well, I mean, Bush did seem to have a good relationship with Merkel. And then Obama comes in and he does not seem to have a relationship with her at all. And it may just be that there has not been enough time yet. I don't know. But it's also the fact that when he went to Europe in April he had two issues on his mind, Afghanistan and the financial crisis, and he did not really get anything from Merkel. So I would not expect him yet to have much more relationship with her. But Obama, you know, he is a very different person than Bush. I mean Bush, those kind of personal relationship were very important to him. Obama does not seem to really care a lot about personal relationships.

Ms. Psihoda: Is this just a question of personality or was it because Bush was so unpopular among the European public that he wanted to have good relationships with the head of governments?

Mr. Goldgeier: I think it's just dependent on the type of person. Like Clinton, these things were also very important to Clinton. Obama just seems like, you know, personal relations just don't interest him.

Ms. Psihoda: How important do you think are European Union actors for the transatlantic relationship?

Mr. Goldgeier: Well, I think they will be a lot more important when the Lisbon treaty goes into effect than they are right now. I mean right now, they are not that important at all but that's why Lisbon is important.

Ms. Psihoda: From your point of view, will it change a lot in the relations?

Mr. Goldgeier: I do. I think it will make... I think the six months rotating presidency is a disaster for the EU, it really is. I mean it's just crazy. Because you go from France holding the presidency and there is really stuff happening and then the Czechs come in and it all falls apart. It's just... It's really awful.

Ms. Psihoda: And if we have then a so-called Foreign Minister. Do you think that there is more US-European Union cooperation in crisis areas?

Mr. Goldgeier: I hope so, yeah. And I hope there will be more NATO-EU cooperation.

Ms. Psihoda: Right. What does the NATO-EU cooperation look from your perspective right now? Is there enough cooperation?

Mr. Goldgeier: No, there is not enough.

Ms. Psihoda: How about the new NATO Secretary General. Are there any change in the way he carries out the NATO policies or the way he goes to countries and asks for support for NATO missions?

Mr. Goldgeier: I think he is still pretty new. So I don't know. It's hard to say that he has got some new... I think the previous guy, Jaap de Hoop Scheffer, was excellent. So I hope that Rasmussen is as good.

Ms. Psihoda: And lastly, about the cultural differences and the strategic gaps that we all read about: Are they really so deep and important to the US-European relationship?

Mr. Goldgeier: Yes, I think so. I think mainly because what the US would want from Europe now is a partner for dealing with problems that are rising outside of Europe. I think Europe is still focused on Europe and so I think there is a real difference in the way they think about the world.

Ms. Psihoda: Is this going to influence the relationship?

Mr. Goldgeier: I think it will to the extent if the United States fail to convince the Europeans that they need to spend more time thinking about stuff outside of Europe. I think the US will grow less interested in Europe over time.

Ms. Psihoda: Do you see that this is going to happen? That Europeans will look beyond their borders in the foreseeable future?

Mr. Goldgeier: I don't know. I mean we have not seen it yet.

Ms. Psihoda: So if I just wrap up the Bush-Obama change argument a bit: You would say that changes are Guantanamo and climate change mainly. Are there any other changes from Bush to Obama?

Mr. Goldgeier: I was just saying that... I mean I was just saying that in fact that on the areas where the Europeans were hoping for big changes, you can see how hard it is for Obama to make a difference. I mean he wants to close Guantanamo but it's hard. And I think he wants to do something on climate change but it's hard. So, even on issues that the Europeans might have expected big changes, I think it's going to be very hard to see big changes.

Ms. Psihoda: Are there any other changes in his policies apart from Guantanamo and climate change?

Mr. Goldgeier: Ahm, well, we don't know. I mean we really don't know what his trade positions are. So that's an open question. And, of course, we have also seen a big change with the way he is approaching Israel because he is trying to get the Israelis to stop to build settlements but that's hard too. So, you just see whatever he wants to do, it's very difficult. And so I think Europeans might be surprised that how little changes. And they are maybe disappointed. It's just very hard for a President to really move things in a different direction.

Ms. Psihoda: And if you would sum up the areas of good cooperation between the US and Europe which ones would you name?

Mr. Goldgeier: Ahm, well, I mean so far Iran has been an area of good cooperation, I think. And piracy, counter piracy had been a good area. I think in general in counterterrorism that there has been good collaboration. So, there have been areas where there has been very important collaboration but that was true even under the previous President.

Ms. Psihoda: Alright. Well, thank you for your time and thank you very much for this extensive interview.

Interview with Daniel Hamilton, Ph.D., conducted on September 10th, 2009.

Ms. Psihoda: So, my first question would be: How important do you think are the transatlantic relations for Obama? And how important were they for Bush?

Mr. Hamilton: Well, I think for Obama he made it very clear right at the beginning of his administration that strong transatlantic relations is essential to getting... to tackling a lot of global challenges. Vice President Biden went right away to Munich and gave a very strong message about how the partnership was changing, not only rhetorically but on the terms of new attention. The President travelled to Europe more than any President, I think in memory, in the first six months to Europe. They also took immediate actions that were important to Europeans. They announced the closing of Guantanamo on the first day in office. They did the ban on torture. They did a number of things just to simply signal including a review of Afghanistan right away with European consultations. Announcing the withdrawal from Iraq, I mean, all of these were very important signals, I think also to Europeans that it was not just rhetoric but there were actions there. There were some differences on economic policy but I think the differences were within a framework that was agreed upon, a multilateral framework, to try to address the economic crisis. So, there are some differences. But many of these differences, I would argue, are within Europe as much as between Europe [and the US]. There is not a unified European position on any of these topics. And so, often it is not a question that the Europeans and Americans are differing at some issue. The Europeans are differing on the issues and Americans are sort of in the middle of the mix. I think that's more the reality. So, I come back to Obama in a minute but for Bush, since you asked about Bush, I think there was a change within the eight years of the Bush administration obviously. The first six months before September 11, it's important to remember... at the first meeting that Condi Rice had with European ambassadors she said, you know, Kyoto is dead, just announced it like that. And at that time that was a great shock for them and I think you saw a pattern of unilateral sort of decisions before September 11 that were quite shocking to some European diplomats. September 11, of course, transformed the way the administration was operating. They, I think in a great failure, turned down European offers of assistance in Afghanistan, preferring to do it by themselves and we wasted many years by that. And lots of other issues, obviously Iraq and all the others that we are familiar with. But I do think there was a clear recognition for a second term that something had to get back on track with the Europeans. And I mean, in terms of the Bush mentality they were blocking so many things that it was stopping the US from getting important work done. It's important on the other hand to see on the NATO side: NATO enlargement that actually proceeded at the same time with great consensus to take in a number of other countries. That was a continuation of the Clinton policy. So, there was less

controversy. But I think they reached the certain point and the Bush people tried to push that agenda in the second term too hard with Georgia and Ukraine. And they had abandoned sort of the Clinton approach, which was to put the NATO enlargement track in a broader framework of all the institutions of Europe enlarging, the EU and everything. NATO was just part of that and there were lot of other strategies with the Baltic states and others at the time in terms of assistance, economic assistance, law enforcement, help – lots of things, not just NATO. And what the Bush people I think failed to do in the second term was to have this broad strategy. They made it all “You are either in NATO or you are out” and it would become a test for them of sort of allied solidarity. And I think it backfired and now, of course, there is not any consensus on that. But I think in the second term of Bush to try to at least rhetorically repair the relationship including some high profile visits to the Commission and things like that. But, you know, really I don't know that they achieved much, it was rhetorically a different sort of mood but I don't see where they achieved anything of any substance. They made a bit more progress in the area homeland security and cooperation of data piracy but, you know, there was no big strategy. There were just some minor agreements that moved forward. And I think Europe had frankly written off working with the Bush administration already by 2003. So, the second term was just a waste of years. And I think that was the momentum to try to restore this relationship that Obama has come with. I think actually McCain, he actually was making the same case frankly in the campaign. He would say, “You know, these are our key allies and we are not working with them”. So, the critique was bipartisan. So, if you come to today, I mean, I think that's where we are.

Ms. Psihoda: What were the reasons for Bush to restore the relationship? I mean was it just like the case that things had become bad in the world or were there some other reasons? Domestic reasons, public opinion?

Mr. Hamilton: Well, I think both public opinion and elite opinion were not with the administration on that. If you look any public opinion polls... you know, the American public, it always favors strong relations with Europe and actually favors a strong Europe as well. The idea that some of the United States is opposed to a unified... this is not true when you look at public opinion. And also, you know, American public opinion is also very multilateralist [sic], they always support the UN in all those things. So, the elite opinion, so the Washington world, I think it also turned against this idea that you could do things just on your own unilateral. You know, I think there was the end of that unilateral sort of view, especially given what was happening in Iraq. And the realization in order to accomplish lots of their goals, you had to work with others. So, there was that sort of tendency but if you look at the substance, really again I don't see that there was much of a change. I mean the Republicans will argue differently but I don't see... what did they produce in four years in the second term? Not much. They did not use the US-EU framework. I mean he went to visit the Commission but did they actually, you

know, in the day-to-day work was there any strong US-EU cooperation on most things? No. There is a US-EU framework that existed since 1995; basically it is not being used. So, I don't see that they really changed. I think it was superficial, you know, as in the media a sort of a "feel good". But on substance, I don't think so.

Ms. Psihoda: Was there a crisis of confidence? Or I also read that hurricane Katrina was sort of reason for why Bush tried to get better on with the Europeans again?

Mr. Hamilton: Well, again, there is probably the distinction between Bush himself and his sort of team and sort of the US government thinking about these things and obviously they are driving the process. But we did a study on Katrina how the world tried to help the United States and it's a fascinating story because we did not know how to get help. The President himself said, you know, we are Americans, we do this ourselves, and then realized that's actually not true. And there is just all sorts of stories of how we could not set up to actually receive assistance. And I think this was kind of eye opening and I think it opens a whole new direction of ways we could work together, which is, you know, if one side of the Atlantic faces a major disaster, should not the other side of the Atlantic offer help. And I think that's an agenda for this administration, which is what I would call "resilience". That is resilient societies that can deal with change and sudden disruptions and should not we work on that together as co-partners. Because many of the threats we face today are not the old military threats but they are network threats: energy or cyber issues or, you know, terrorism, these are all networks. They prey on our networks, they use our networks in fact to disrupt and kill people and that's not a traditional security threat, that's something new. And should not we be working on that together and identify ways to start to think about that. I think that is an agenda for this administration. I think they will pursue that. I think they are still getting organized but I have argued for that very strongly and I think they are listening to that. But we'll see.

Ms. Psihoda: Would you say that the repair of the damage was already done by Bush when Obama came in?

Hamilton: No, no.

Ms. Psihoda: So there is still something to do?

Mr. Hamilton: There was just a palpable sense of relief, a sort of a breathing-out on election night last November everywhere in the world, I think. And I think there was a sense of "Now we can do something again". I mean, I think the other side of it is, of course, Europeans have not necessarily just said, "We are going to sign up to everything the Americans want now". I think there are lots of issues. But I think the tone and the style are very different. The atmosphere in which you try to address these issues is simply day and night. I mean it's just so different.

Ms. Psihoda: And how about the new European leaders, Merkel, Sarkozy and Brown, how did that change in European leadership affect the transatlantic relationship still under Bush?

Mr. Hamilton: Still under Bush? Well, Merkel seemed to get along with Bush and I think she tried... she's a very good politician, I think. She tried to just downplay some of the rougher edges where there was disagreement and tried to find new areas to work with them. She proposed this Transatlantic Economic Council, so it's a German idea, not an American, not a Bush idea, it was actually—he actually worked with the Germans to get this idea advanced. So there were some American thinking of this but, you know, here is where she showed she could do some things with the United States that was actually in the US-EU track but did not happen before. But it came from her and not from the administration. They did not quite know what to do. And I think she downplayed some of the other differences on the Middle East and those issues. Sarkozy came in but I think there was just not enough time to really get established in terms of relationships because he came in towards the end. And so I don't know that there was really much there. I mean he got Bush to come and to agree to the G20 summits and to participate in that during the last fall. So I think there were some efforts there at the French Presidency and they did some things. I mean he played an important role. I think the French did in the Russia-Georgia crisis where the United States' credibility was gone because of the way the Bush administration had positioned itself. So, I think there the French played an important role and they used their EU presidency to play that role. I think Gordon Brown was simply so hit by the financial crisis that his credibility was also low. And it was, you know, the Americans and the British trying to figure out to deal with this financial crisis that they were both sort of the leading edge of. So I don't know... you know, the relations I think were fine but Brown was, of course, trying to distance himself from Bush compared to Tony Blair. And so I don't think... it was pretty cool, I think fairly matter of fact kind of relationship, it was not a strong Anglo-American partnership.

Ms. Psihoda: Why do we have the perception that Merkel and Sarkozy seemed to get along better with Bush than with Obama?

Mr. Hamilton: See I don't think that's true. I think that's wrong.

Ms. Psihoda: Okay. I got this perception from what we see in the press coverage.

Mr. Hamilton: Yeah, I think that is just wrong. I think, I mean it's just sort of incidents and issues and, you know, Obama wanted to come to speak at the Brandenburger Gate and she had a big problem with that and it became a domestic political issue in Germany. It really had little to do with Obama because Steinmeier said that's a good idea. So the SPD was favoring it and she would say, "No, we are running for elections" and she said, "not so good" and "I am the

Chancellor and I get to decide these things". So I mean, you know, that's kind of a funny thing but I mean the fact that he went to Berlin of all places in the world he could have gone... I think, no, he sent a very strong message. If you listen to his election night's speech in Grand Park in Chicago, it's actually a very interesting speech because he lists a whole series of American events in history that sort of chart the progress of the civil rights movement in America, sort of the idea of American frontier. And he only mentioned one non-American event in that string – it's a very American story – it's the fall of the Berlin wall. And he mentions it again, so he again has a reference to Berlin what it means, you know, beyond America. So, he has some identification there, which, I think, you know, one should not ignore. But I mean, his getting along with Merkel, I think they all benefit popularity by being seen with him in Europe. I mean he is more popular than all of them. So I don't know that there is a problem there. I think they are all delighted that he is here compared to the alternative.

Ms. Psihoda: Would you say that the last crisis over Iraq and with Bush in 2003 is an especially different crisis or is it just another crisis in the transatlantic relationship as we have already seen some others?

Mr. Hamilton: Well, I think, no, I think it was very important and it's probably the worst crisis since the end of World War II with many core allies. There were others like Suez and so on. There was the Balkan problems in the early 90ies when neither side sort of knew what they were going to do. But it's hard to find a real time when there was such a big break. I mean Suez was maybe the other one but with the British and the French, not the Germans. And so this was serious and I think each side took some lessons from that. I think the European view is: 'Don't always go along with the Americans, they are not always right'. You know, you have to question their judgment and, you know, it's not a straight forward relationship like that. And the Americans, I think... it extenuates American tendency to think the Europeans can't be counted on and that we have to do this by ourselves. So it extenuates the American unilateral tendency. It does not dampen it. And that, I think that's a constant tension: the failure of Europe to speak clearly, you know, only extenuates unilateral tendencies in the United States. Because if the Americans don't think the Europeans are with them and they have to move on, you know, they will have to do it by themselves, maybe not what they want to do but if Europe is not there, you have to do it then. And that's the dilemma.

Ms. Psihoda: And that's the whole dilemma with unilateralism, I guess. Because we in Europe, we perceive it as very unilateral. If you go to the US, they ask you, "So what is unilateral? If the Europeans are saying, "No we are not going to do it". And then the Americans do it, is that unilateral?"

Mr. Hamilton: Yes, exactly.

Ms. Psihoda: And do you think with Obama that there is going to be more on the European side? I mean that we would give more or be there or be a stronger partner?

Mr. Hamilton: Oh, yeah, I think so. But it won't be... But it's not easy and you would have to look at each issue, it's not sort of a straightforward answer to that. On the economic side there are some differences and frankly the EU acts unilaterally on economics all the time. On trade issues and all sorts of things the EU is a major unilateral actor. They just don't want to ever say that. But they try talk about unilateralism in the context of security and defense but when talking about trade and economics, the EU is a huge bloc. So, you know, we are trying to work out issues on the economic side, which I think there is more of a tendency to work together on but there are some differences on how you approach it. On the international security issues obviously Afghanistan is a major issue and the Europeans basically welcome sort of a new look on Afghanistan but have not really stepped up their presence. In fact, I think, most Europeans still don't understand why they are there and their governments have not done a very good job frankly of explaining it. And you see that right now in the German controversy: their leaders can't even really explain what even happened with this bombing and, you know, it's just a confused picture. They are blaming an American general whose job was to basically go to Afghanistan and do what the Germans always said that they should do, which is: stop the civilian casualties; if there are civilian casualties, apologize, make sure that people are taken care of; look into, you know, investigate it, be transparent and open. This has been the German position for years. And so in this one incident when it was the German commander that ordered this and it was a mistake and the American general then said, let's bring transparency reporter, let's apologize, let's say how awful it was, then they get upset. I mean the whole world is turned upside down in terms of what the Germans are doing and it's because they have not provided a context for their people about why Germany is really engaged there. So that's difficult, I think it will be continuing very difficult on Afghanistan and I am not sure where we are going there. But you see, on Iran you see a new concerted effort, pretty well aligned among the allies on Iran. The problem is Iran, as Teheran is not necessarily the transatlantic part, but that part is together now. On the Middle East you see lots of collaboration now, on the Middle East peace process, I think, the US position is very, very close to the Europeans. I think they are all pretty aligned on that. The French and Americans are working on some elements, you know, in particular with Lebanon and Syria. So, there is lots of momentum on there. You know, I think there is no consensus on what to do with Russia but I think that's... a lack of consensus is frankly within Europe. The Europeans that can't agree on what to do with Russia. I think the US position now is, you know, you go down two tracks: you offer the Russians a serious, you know, list of things that one could do together and a serious partnership but it has to be based on certain principles. And those have to be respected and let's see where we go. And the Presidents

started this whole arms control disarmament agenda, which most Europeans have been asking for for a long, long time. So, I think that controversies are within Europe about, you know, how to approach Russia. It's not a European-American difference really. I think there was a difference again with some Europeans from Austria on... the President's fairly outspoken position on Turkey joining in the EU. And that occasion, you know, that caused some feathers to be ruffled. But other Europeans liked the fact that he said it. Again, the fact is that Europe does not agree on what it is and the Americans are simply saying, "You know, we think it would be a good idea". But on the same criteria as any other candidate that's been a US position for a long, long time. That's nothing new, it's just that the President said it so straightforwardly. You could go through the list: there is the issue of climate change, again the administration has moved way far toward the Europeans have wanted, the problem is that the timing does not work with the Copenhagen timetable.

Ms. Psihoda: Because?

Mr. Hamilton: Because we have to get a domestic energy bill and we have to get a domestic consensus before we start to enter into international commitments. We did it the other way around during the Clinton administration. They entered into international commitments and then came back to the US Senate and the vote was 98 to nothing against. So that's not maybe the best course. And to anyone who would want the United States to engaged has to understand some of the problems here of simply reversing 8 years of policy within a matter of months and getting the US in a place so that it can go to Copenhagen. I think Copenhagen is the beginning of a process, it's not going to be concluded there. And those who would make the US commitments sort of a litmus test [Nagelprobe] of seriousness, just have no political sense of how this is going to happen. You see what is happening here, the whole debate now is actually is health care. If we don't get that done... The next one is climate change, the next one is the energy bill. It's number two. But if health care does not get done, the energy one gets pushed off. So that's the process.

Ms. Psihoda: So, we should not expect too much from Copenhagen?

Mr. Hamilton: I don't think so. I think one should be very realistic about starting a process in Copenhagen that would continue. Why not have a, you know, can just continue? Like the Doha Round continues on trade talks, have Copenhagen as a process, not as a time limited couple of weeks or, you know, whatever it is. That will never happen because we don't even have China or India or any of these other countries on board.

Ms. Psihoda: And how about the climate bill that has passed the House?

Mr. Hamilton: Yeah, but the Senate is, you know, very difficult.

Ms. Psihoda: So it will take the Senate longer to pass it than until Copenhagen?

Mr. Hamilton: Yeah, right. I think so. Because they are worried about health care. So the timing just does not work. I've said, you know, I've said the President has two years to reposition the United States and basically the West. He has until the next midterm election. So, a year... now a year from November. That's 500 days, not 100 days, which everybody talked about. It's 500 days. And if he is successful, then I think the next 6 years are quite an exciting time to do a lot of new things together. But he cannot get it at putting. If this health care bill fails, he will be damaged seriously. And he won't be able to do a lot of other things. So, you know, one has to give this guy a little space to do his work. And I think the rating, the Marshall Fund ratings on, you know, European perceptions on the US foreign policy right now are way, way high. So.

Ms. Psihoda: Do you think this is the reason why he is pushing a lot of things very fast for the moment? Because he is afraid not to win the majority at the next midterm elections anymore?

Mr. Hamilton: Yeah, that's right. Here is this one window, this very small window. You saw it yesterday, I mean it was just nasty, the Republicans in the hall [Obama's health care speech in front of the full Congress].

Ms. Psihoda: Oh, yeah, I saw that. They even talked into his speech, which is not normal, right?

Mr. Hamilton: No.

Ms. Psihoda: This should not happen. In this situation it should not happen, right?

Mr. Hamilton: Right. It will happen in different contexts but that a certain type of event. But you just see sort of this polarization politically.

Ms. Psihoda: But it's also a problem with the Democrats, I think.

Mr. Hamilton: Yeah, well the real problem is that the Democrats aren't agreed. I mean he is spending all his time trying to get Democrats to agree. And again, this would not happen in a parliamentary system. But our parties aren't parliamentary parties like that. They don't really exist in any serious way. They are a collection of politicians.

Ms. Psihoda: And talking about economics. Can you explore a bit on why the EU is unilateral?

Mr. Hamilton: Well, the EU has a... You know, on trade policy the Commission speaks for all EU members states. And so it has quite a strong voice there. And sometimes it just signs agreements with countries, preferential trade agreements, which some would say violate the spirit of the WTO. There are a lot of preferential

trade agreements the EU has signed with lots of developing countries and others that are discriminatory. So that's just them doing it on their own. You know, it was not negotiated multilaterally within the WTO. The WTO should be the framework for that. The US and the EU have lots of court cases at WTO against each other. The EU just lost last week a WTO case on support for Airbus. This is illegal subsidies going to Airbus in violation of all sorts of rules the EU has agreed to. There is a counter case against the United States the EU has brought against Boeing, which has not been decided yet. So I would not be surprised if they vote against the United States too. But at the moment, you asked about the EU, I mean this was a violation. So they will be fined or have to change the laws or whatever they do. So—or they ignore the WTO and then that's pretty unilateral. And there are lots of cases like this—this chicken dispute, this silly chicken dispute mainly with the French. I mean every ruling has said there is not problem with the way you clean a chicken. But French agricultural lobby is not going to hear about it. And so they stopped lots of things from happening. So that's ignoring multilateral judgments and just doing what you want. There are a lot of cases like that and how the EU works as a trade body. I'm not saying others don't as well. But this idea that somehow the EU does not act unilateral is, of course... It acts unilateral a lot vis-à-vis weaker countries in terms of sanctions, in terms of imposing certain kinds of restrictions on countries. And it has done that every since it was created.

Ms. Psihoda: It does so also against its member states?

Mr. Hamilton: No, I mean against other countries. Well, also against certain member states. You elected a certain President in Austria there were some sanctions as well.

Ms. Psihoda: Right. And about the economic crisis: Do you think that the EU and the US can have a good relationship to get the things working again?

Mr. Hamilton: Yeah, I think as I said the overall framework is there and I think they are working pretty closely. I think there are some differences in approach. But as I said I think within Europe there are differences of approach. I mean Sarkozy says the European Central Bank is too deflationary and Merkel says the European Central Bank is too inflationary. Same policy and they are being attacked for doing exactly the opposite. So what's the European policy? And the British aren't even part of that. So, you know, if you are sitting here, how do you deal with that? I mean, there is no clear message from Europe. So the Europeans are not united on many of these issues. I think that we have different structures. So the US emphasis on stimulus is because we don't have all these safety nets and things. So you have to just inject the money directly into the system whereas in Europe some of these things start to happen and cushion people because of the nature of the system. So I understand the argument that you don't have to inject as much stimulus to stimulate the economy in Europe because these other

mechanisms kick in. But there is some differences in the approach on that. They just had this debate about cutting bonuses or, you know, cutting salaries, that types of things. And there are some differences there but again the differences are in Europe too. There are a lot of Europeans that would not agree with that, that's a Sarkozy proposal. And this idea, I would say the EU is also unilateral on climate change and energy, carbon all those kinds of things. Sarkozy is saying they are going to tax every French citizen and also anybody else who comes to France and impose a carbon tax. Well, that's a fairly unilateral measure. And so the EU did that. They are discussing penalizing airlines that, you know, when they come into Europe that don't adhere certain regulations, well, they shut down air traffic. So I mean there are lots of things like that.

Ms. Psihoda: Talking a little bit about Afghanistan: Just yesterday I was at an event at Carnegie [Endowment for Peace] where one guest speaker said that it would be better if German troops would actually pull out of Afghanistan because they are more preoccupied by defending themselves than... I mean he was saying that they are wasting their energy by defending themselves than by really doing something. And one of the cities... I think there are two cities in Afghanistan in the north where you see that there is the Taliban again. And whereas last year it was like 15 Taliban, now it's 80 of them. Whereas this should not happen when you have German troops there protecting the cities and fighting there. Do you think this argument is feasible?

Mr. Hamilton: Well, again I think first of all they are having elections in Germany and... So, you know, a lot of this is maneuvering for the next couple of weeks. And then you have to see what kind of German government you have. So it's hard to predict this right now. I mean if there is a new coalition in Germany that's more center-right, they probably send a somewhat different message than if they continue the coalition they have now. Their strategy was to... the Bundestag has to approve these mandates for German troops under the German law and their strategy was position the next vote after the election so that a new government could get an easy support. Well, now it probably looks like it's going to be problematic and the Bundestag has to approve this right away after the new government basically is installed. So this will be hard I think for Germans. That's why they are calling for this conference, I think, it's Merkel, that's her way of sort of showing that, you know, beyond the elections she is still thinking about all these things. I mean I think the core problem is that as I said before I don't think that the German government has explained to the German people why it is engaged in Afghanistan. It simply shies away from the fact that these people are trying to kill Europeans. The greatest single security threat to European lives in the world today comes from these ungoverned spaces in Afghanistan and Pakistan. I mean it's a very clear statement. Why don't they say that? It's about reconstruction and development aid and helping this poor country. Well, that's not really what it is about. And, you know, if they can't say that directly they are

fooling themselves about why they are there. So if they can't explain their own people, they won't have any German support and then maybe, yeah, they should not be there. But, you know, if they would be straight forward and this is a very important part of Germany sort of, you know, sixty year sort of rehabilitation if you will. You have to distinguish when the use of force, you know, when there are reasons to use force. And I think this is still a sensitive debate in Germany. You know, some, any would say there is no justification to use force any time which is, you know... The clear answer seems to be, you know, should not we have used force against Hitler if there was never any justification. So this is hard debate and there are many sides to it so I don't want to belittle it. But you see how hard it is for Germany still to participate even though there are lots of troops there. The Germans like to say how many troops they have, does not say what they are doing. That's the problem.

Ms. Psihoda: And do you think Merkel will increase the troop level when she gets elected after the elections?

Mr. Hamilton: I think it will be very hard for her. I think the cover is this conference. If they have an international conference that comes out saying we need more troops, then again that's a multilateral cover for Germans to make some decisions. But I don't think she would announce it on her own. I don't think she is that courageous and I don't think she has the political support to do that, especially not now after this incident here [referring to the Germans bombing Afghanistan and causing civilian casualties that Mr. Hamilton talked about above] and with a government that's seemingly corrupt and manipulating the polls.

Ms. Psihoda: And please clarify, where does the international conference take place?

Mr. Hamilton: They, Merkel and Sarkozy and Brown, suggested this conference later this year to sort of have a new sort of look with the UN backing to look at the new situation in Afghanistan of what should happen.

Ms. Psihoda: But this is just the EU-3?

Mr. Hamilton: No, it's the EU-3 proposing it. There will be a UN sponsored conference.

Ms. Psihoda: Do you think the outcome of German elections is going to influence the transatlantic relationship and the relationship with Obama?

Mr. Hamilton: No, I don't think so. I mean I have heard one colleague of mine once say, "You know, we are all democracies". Then actually the outcome of any election should not matter. That partnership should be able to withstand any... I don't see any German coalition that will change this very much. I mean I think she will remain the Chancellor. It's just the Chancellor of what kind of coalition. And you have basically just a few options and none of them are radical at all. They are

pretty centrist. If the FDP comes back in, then you might have Guido Westerwelle as German Foreign Minister. I mean he does not really have any foreign background. So that will be a little awkward and Germany's voice will be pretty weak. And she... and I frankly think people will look to her and not to him. So... And if you have a continuation of the current coalition, then it's a continuation.

Ms. Psihoda: How do you see the situation in Iraq? I mean you see US troops pulling and you could say, "Well, now they are pulling out of Iraq and going to Afghanistan and after some years they are pulling out of Afghanistan again and going into Iraq again". And how much can the EU do and is doing for the moment in Iraq?

Mr. Hamilton: Well, I think Iraq is not going as well as the Obama people had hoped in terms of withdrawal. There are still many problems there. But again this notion of withdrawal is probably also a misleading term. There will be US presence in Iraq for a long time to come. It's just what kind of presence is the issue. Less the fighting force military and more a different kind of presence that will include military forces, that just will. I mean it's not an end day when the last American leaves Iraq. I mean that's not going to happen for some time. I will just be a more modest presence. And, you know, you will have to see if you leave behind the instability that apparently we are supposed to stopping. We will have to reconsider that. But I think if you are working on Afghanistan you are on very different cases and they were premised on different issues and they are being waged for different reasons. They are not really alike at all. What they are alike is that they are a drain on US resources.

Ahm, I think the EU has a challenge. You know, now that we are withdrawing from Iraq, there is an opportunity here for the EU to have much more of a strategy on Iraq and to be engaged. It does not mean sending troops, it means engaged in a lot of other things: economic assistance, monitoring of elections, getting back in with all the things the EU says it likes to do all the time. So I think the time is now for that to happen, it's way past now. And the same in, you know, Afghanistan, Pakistan, the EU presence in that region is kind of I don't know, I mean it's a little odd frankly. For a region that is such a... I have one, I think one reference and I don't know if it's quite right but the EU assistance in Pakistan is less than to like Uruguay. I mean I am not sure that's true. And, you know, Pakistan where all those troubles are – probably the most dangerous place in the world at the moment – where is the EU? And I asked a group of EU colleagues frankly, some senior people, you know, pretty straightforward question, "What's the EU strategy on Pakistan?" and the table erupted in laughter. There was not even a beginning of an answer, they were just laughing, you know. It's mainly assistance, throwing money into it, but they don't know where the money goes.

Ms. Psihoda: Do they have a strategy for Iraq?

Mr. Hamilton: No. I think it has been, you know, because of the emotions about Iraq there was not a coherent EU effort and I think that this has not come together.

Ms. Psihoda: And do you think that things will change? That the EU will become engaged more in these regions?

Mr. Hamilton: It's hard to say. I think some EU nations, the major nations again, the French, in particular, in Iraq will engage. The British, no, had their experience in Iraq, so I think they are reluctant about that. So I see more French involvement than say EU involvement. And each of the nature European has their own special envoys for Afghanistan, Pakistan in addition to the EU envoy. So what they are all doing, I don't know. I know what Albright's doing but I don't know what the others are doing.

Ms. Psihoda: Do you think that this will change if Europe has the Lisbon treaty ratified?

Mr. Hamilton: Well, I think you might have a stronger voice and Solana is probably ready to retire. I think he seems a bit exhausted these days. So I mean, it would be good to have a vigorous person in that role. And if you had a President who could also speak on these issues I think that would help. But it's not about this or that individual. It's about what kind of resources are you ready to come in, to what type of strategy does the EU... You know, how will you have it, do you have any strategy, EU strategy in Iraq, how does that come together, you know, who defines that. And on Pakistan, same thing, I just don't see it. I just don't see the process even for coming together. Europe still does not have that sense that it needs to engage in that way so forcefully. I mean there are a lot of Europeans who think that but translating that into a EU strategy, you know, with deploying people and resources, you know, some defined goal. That's pretty far from that.

Ms. Psihoda: But you see some EU missions... I mean you see Congo, for example, as one of the successful examples and you see that the EU ATALANTA Mission fighting against piracy in the sea, which is also kind of a success story. So you see some successes.

Mr. Hamilton: No, I think you do. And I think that's another difference, this administration probably welcomes those kinds of efforts. The Bush administration did not. I think the challenge now is that okay, what can Europe do in these areas. There are some successes but if you look at these cases you mentioned. We usually have to fly the Europeans there because they cannot get there on their own. So it's a little embarrassing to say it's a EU success. And Americans, you know, we are like taxi service, flying Europeans to go to claim their success on these issues. So, you know, there are real challenges for Europe if it really aspires to conflict and prevention management. It simply has to step up the game and has to be more serious about what it means to do these things. Whether it

wants to do it with us or whether it's sort of a perverse way to show the Americans that Europe can do something too. It's kind of a, there is an odd psychology there. I think though on the United States side we should welcome the fact that Europeans can take care of some of these conflict issues and it does not come to us. And particularly in Africa Europe simply has a greater sense of connectedness and relationship than the US. I think there is particularly areas there and which the US probably should try to support as much as it could. I think what does not exist are good modalities security between the United States and the EU. We always talk about this but we are talking about NATO and the EU. But if you are talking about these kinds of issues, that's not really a NATO issue. It sometimes can be the US and the EU. And for many years that's been a taboo subject: the US-EU security. So I think that's a new area that again this administration probably wants to explore that previous administrations did not want to touch. And also in Europe, you know, the French and others had not a theology about this. I think that seems to be gone.

Ms. Psihoda: And the previous administration did not want to touch it because it did not believe in it?

Mr. Hamilton:

I think you had a couple of camps in the previous administration. Some of those who thought, "Well, if the Europeans can do this, great because it's burden-sharing". Especially in the Balkans, Wolfowitz and others at that time and Condi Rice and others, they wanted the Europeans... You know, to take over all the Balkan issues and the US to get out because that's burden-sharing. You know, if you say you can do it, great, go do it, we'll leave, we got other things to do. So there is some support of greater European capacity, not because of building Europe or something. It's simply that we have less to worry about. So I'm not sure about the real motivation there, if that's a good thing. You know, the term that the EU was using at that time was 'back-filling'. I don't know if that's a clear term but it means, you know, we have a problem, we have to move on, you can take care of things behind. There were others who opposed all of this because they thought it would challenge NATO. That our main security relationship with Europe is through NATO and this EU thing starts to build a caucus within NATO that is against the United States. So they were very skeptical about that. And, you know, those were strong voices. And then there were others, I think, particularly in military who thought this is all just silly and that the Europeans just aren't serious. It's all a waste of time to even talk to them because they can't even fly people anywhere. You know, it's just a waste of time, so why are we... You know, they are not capable, they can't fight with American soldiers anymore, they have no tradition, they are even debating where there should be places. So, why waste our time? Let's go do that ourselves. I mean I think that school as I said particularly the Pentagon during the Bush administration had a strong appealing. I think much of

that has gone away these days and whether that turns into something, that's the question.

Ms. Psihoda: Do you think it is still a US-European relationship or are there also some parts where you can see US-EU relationship?

Mr. Hamilton: Yeah, no, I think there is a big agenda for the US-EU relationship. It's just the EU is not all of Europe, which is hard sometimes to tell people on the EU. I mean, you know, Europe... The continent of Europe is not whole, free and at peace. This one little... You know, the Western part of Europe might have that feeling but if you go a little East or South it is not. And I think the challenge for the EU is what is its responsibility. Shouldn't the EU still have that goal of a Europe that's whole, free and at peace? And what's its responsibility to help achieve that goal? That's a hard conversation to have in Europe these days because people are so inward looking, they don't want to deal with people to their East and, you know, it's not moving ahead. But you have to come up with some answer to the Turks and the Ukrainians and the Georgians, all these frozen conflicts that are not frozen conflicts. They are conflicts waiting to explode as they did last summer. You know, this is a turbulent region, you know, it is not settled. And history, you know, Europe's tragedies of the last century were unsettled regions of Europe. So there is still a lot to do.

Ms. Psihoda: But is not that keeping us away from pursuing strategies outside of Europe? Like if we are still looking to enlargement, if we are still trying to fix the troubles that we have at the Eastern border and within Europe. Maybe this is one of the main problems that keeps the European Union from pursuing strategies for Afghanistan, Pakistan and other dangerous regions in the world.

Mr. Hamilton: Yes, no one picks these challenges. They are all there, that's... The task of leadership is where are your priorities, limited resources, what do you have to do. Frankly you have to do all of it. The instability that could come from an unsettled part of Europe is serious. The direct threat to European lives coming from ungoverned spaces in Afghanistan and Pakistan is also serious. It's not an either-or-choice. I think the tools you have to deal with each of those are very different. But to simply say, "We'll deal with our own borders and let the Americans deal with that [Afghanistan, Pakistan]". Well, that... First, of all you can't complain about unilateralism then because you basically said, "Go do it". You are a free-rider, you basically let the Americans die so that the you can deal with your border issues. That's not usually a good support for a healthy transatlantic relationship. This idea of division of labor which one hears a lot. You know, the Europeans do the civilian stuff and the Americans do the military stuff. Well, that's not sustainable because again you are asking Americans to die for Europeans to say that they are all peaceful people. So you have to do something of all of that. And that's where we are.

Ms. Psihoda: Do you think that this is ever going to happen? Because we see the European Union being defined as social or civilian power. If scholars define them, and I'm pretty sure Europeans define themselves as this, then it's very hard to see them ever going to be a military power.

Mr. Hamilton: Well, I think that's... You hear that a lot. I'm not sure that it really is a consensus view. I think in academics it sounds nice but I don't know what it means really because the EU is being engaged in lots of different things. It is building a European Security and Defense Policy, it is building Common Foreign and Security Policy, it does have European defense agencies created, and I don't know if it was really put the test in open debate whether the notion of Europe as a civilian power would survive. It might survive in a country like Austria but... you know, I think... I'm not sure... I don't think the concept holds up frankly. I think it was a nice way to distinguish not what Europe is frankly, but what it's not. It's not the United States. That was the only way at the time for some analysts to come up with this. I know... We are all friends, I know them all. Frankly a lot of it came out of the German debates because Germany had to decide what it was. And it preferred to think about itself as a civilian power that somehow civilian tools were morally better. And I think that disrespects lots of questions that are, you know, more serious questions. When the first gulf war happened, there was the big debate in Germany about what to do. You know, and the most interesting voices at that time were not the civilian power people. But it was the Greens like Joska Fischer who said, you know, we have to think about this and, you know, we do have to stand up and get over these old taboos that simply using is bad and not using force and being civilian is good. And you see debate, it's a very long drawn-out debate, it's understandable that they had to have this debate. But the British aren't having that debate, you know, they have a different tradition. The French have a very different tradition. They would reject immediately the notion that they are a civilian power. So...

Ms. Psihoda: And how important do you think are European Union actors? Like the President of the Commission or the Foreign Minister, if we could name this person it like this, or the first President of European Union if we have Lisbon treaty pass. Do you think they have an influence in the transatlantic relationship or will Obama still look to Merkel, to Sarkozy, to Brown?

Mr. Hamilton: I mean the reality is you look to all of them. I think you somehow think you are only going to have one interlocutor is, of course, not the reality of Europe. I mean the Europeans won't do that, so why would you expect the Americans to do that? I mean, you know, Americans have interest in Europe and with Europeans. So when you want to advance your interests, you advance them on all fronts. You advance them in Brussels and whatever structure Brussels has, you advance them in national capitals, you do what you do. I think the issue is that the Bush administration, they did that with the intent of dividing Europe and stopping Europe from coalescing and, you know, breaking them apart. It was very

easy to do actually. It was almost a child's job to do it. So it shows that if the United States really wanted to destroy the European Union, you could do it pretty easily, I think. It does not want to do that. And certainly, I think, at this moment time it does not want to do that and it's not... I think one has to realize US support for EU, you know, is based on certain American interests, it's not based on sort of just wishing Europeans well. And I mean I do these little speeches but I can tell you what I usually say is if you think about throughout history American interests in Europe, I think they are pretty simple. And I think it shows how the US would react to efforts to deepen European integration. We are not always in favor, it depends on what the proposal is. But, you know, we want a continent that is not dominated by some country or group of countries that are hostile to the United States, pretty simple. We fought a few wars on that principle to stop that from happening. So we would, of course, want to resist any sense of some entity there that would be clearly antagonistic to the United States. I don't see that but it's an enduring, you know, 200-year-principle. I think we want an open Europe where we can have our ideas discussed, we can have our goods sold or our services provided, you know, Americans want an open market. We are good at open continental markets. So if we see the EU doing some of these things I was talking about, we are not going to like it. So just the fact that the EU is the EU is not necessarily... The US interest is what it is doing. And I think a Europe that's at peace that can deal with its own conflicts frankly. The idea that the Americans come over to solve European problems for them, I think, should be the greatest embarrassment to Europeans. The Americans don't want to do that. So, if we had any confidence that Europe could handle its own civil wars if you will, we would be the greatest supporter of Europe that would do that. We tried to do that after the Cold War, you know. We thought Europe could handle the Balkans, the Europeans told us they could handle it and it was a disaster on both sides. And I think we realized, you know, we are still in this together. And as I say, that's what disturbed me a bit about this sort of complacency in Western Europe, the other part of Europe is still not settled. It is still a challenge, and it is a challenge where Europe needs the United States to be there. So, we still have things to do.

Ms. Psihoda: What is the perception of EU enlargement like in the US? Are they supportive?

Mr. Hamilton: Oh, yes. We are more supportive than anybody in the EU.

Ms. Psihoda: I mean I know... Turkey is obvious because it is the gateway to the Middle East but I mean how about Ukraine and Georgia? Ok, we don't know if it is ever going to happen because the EU will have to define its geography once. But is it more perceived in the US as an issue that the Europeans themselves have to solve or does the US care about it.

Mr. Hamilton: I think, again, public opinion is supportive about this whole process but it is shallow. You know people don't spend much time thinking about this. If

you talk about the people that early work on it, I would still say that we the strongest supporter of EU enlargement and, you know, how you define EU enlargement these days is probably the debate. But extending the space of stability and prosperity in Europe where war does not happen clearly has to be our common interest and extending it as far East as we can certainly should be what we should be doing. I am surprised that this is still an issue but it seems to be because unless [inaudible] means to build some new walls, Europe is open. And if you don't spread this stability eastward, the instability will come westward. It is a pretty simple proposition. So, you know, with what priority and instruments and vigor are you going to do that? I think the problem is that the Bush administration reduced the whole of NATO in or out, the EU has yet to define a way to include countries within its orbit short of, you know, what it now calls membership. I mean it was seemed to me, you know, my two sense, the variable geometry is the new way of thinking about the EU. If the EU can get the Lisbon treaty done, why not have some core, you know, again that is ready to move to further integration and then allow others to come it. But coming in now means something a little bit different. It means maybe what the EU is today but the deeper core could still move ahead. Why not think about it in much more flexible ways? And I think that would revolutionize certain parts of Europe just as it did for Central Europe at the end of the Cold War. I mean, it's still that the EU is greatest success.

Ms. Psihoda: How do you see the situation in Iran? And do you think that we will have some success there? Is there going to be a progress or is the situation to be more or less deadlocked?

Hamilton: It is hard to know without knowing the details. I mean the fact that our ambassador in Vienna yesterday said that Iran is close to having materials for nuclear weapons is pretty stark. So, I don't know what the end of the proposal yesterday... It was to start some discussions but I have not seen them... I don't think that they were public... but what it was about... It does not seem like it's going well. And, know you, you have to face the prospect that the Iranians are going to have some nuclear capability and if they can project that capability in distance... couple of statements of their President... I think one has to be very concerned about this. The Israelis in particular but we are all committed to Israel and to... you know, it's a tough issue. So if we want to have the option of some military response that would not solve the whole lot. But if they have some nuclear capability and we allow that to continue then countries like Saudi Arabia, Turkey, Egypt and others might also consider, you know, what they need to do and the whole regime can collapse. And you would be faced with a whole nuclear deterrent regime in the worst part of the world you could imagine. It's a very hard, tough issue, it's very hard and I don't see it moving in a good way.

Ms. Psihoda: So, the EU-3+3 talks are not showing any progress?

Mr. Hamilton: It does not seem so. I mean their discussion of what I just heard... Again I am not following it with enough details, so I might be wrong. But their discussion of cutting off Iranian gas imports, imports into Iran, because they actually import gas, that would be serious. But the problem it's often that Europeans don't want to do that...

Ms. Psihoda: Yeah, because of the economic advantages they would lose, right?

Mr. Hamilton: Yeah, but this is serious now. I mean at some point you have to think clearly what you are risking. And the Russians have their own arrangements, which will be hard. But the Russians and the Chinese are on board here at the moment. It's very hard.

Ms. Psihoda: How do you see the EU participation in Israel/Palestine? Do you think that there are some EU efforts to help to do something or is it still a US issue?

Mr. Hamilton: Well, I think the interlocutor has been the United States and the EU was not credible and decided seen from the Israelis as an evenhanded partner. So I think the EU lost its ability to be the interlocutor. And with the US basically that was absent then from negotiations for a number of years that became part. Now, you know, you have a different difficult position that the United States is aligned with a lot of European views but we have an Israeli government that basically does not want to be part of that. So, I think what Summer is saying is that Netanyahu can do a bit more on these settlements despite everybody is saying he can't, he might be willing then to start some other type of negotiations. He has to show first that, to his own supporters that he is strong, and then he can maybe do something. That is assuming a lot, that is assuming whether he even wants to do this, which he might not want to do. So I think it's hard. I think where EU support is, you know, to be supportive of a US driven process, to look at some of these other illnesses, like I said, with Syria and with Lebanon and to support, provide humanitarian assistance to Palestinians. To work with the Palestinians, to understand the dilemma therein, they are not... There is no partner there either. They are fighting each other. So I mean we have still problems with Hamas, you know. We have different news whether it is a terrorist organization or not. So that stops some EU-US cooperation.

Ms. Psihoda: On the issue of international terrorism is there a lot of cooperation with the European partners?

Mr. Hamilton: Yeah. Yeah, I think intelligence cooperation has been strong. It's still a bit uneven because frankly U.S. intelligence does not believe European agencies can keep secrets. So, that's a problem. But I think with some European countries it's very strong and good. And as I said on some of these other areas of prevention or resilience I think there is a good whole agenda there that could be advanced, which would be very attractive. And they had been signing some

agreements already, but bilaterally not with the EU, with various countries. But I think this Mutual Legal Assistance Agreements and the... What's the other one? There are two agreements that have been held off from the Congress for a long time, which are I think supposed complete ratified this fall. So, they will go on into effect and also implemented into all EU member states. These were agreements signed early on with the Bush people, Mutual Legal Assistance and, it's not, I was saying Transatlantic Arrest [inaudible], it's not that but that would be an idea. There is European Arrest [inaudible] but not a transatlantic Arrest [inaudible]. That means somebody apprehended anywhere on that space could be sent then somewhere else. We still have some issues because of death penalty and Guantanamo. You know, we saying we are closing it but we need some help and then question is which way are they going to help. And then the Congress themselves they are not going to help. So, these are problems.

Ms. Psihoda: How important do you think is the Congress for U.S. foreign policy?

Mr. Hamilton: Oh, very important. I think most foreign observers just don't understand the role of the Congress and we are not a parliamentary system. It's two legal branches of government and our treaty system... For instance, you know, two thirds of the Senate has to approve these treaties. Well, that's very high bar. That is why we try to avoid treaty ratification, you know, if we can or it takes us so long to get these things done. We just have a different system. So that makes... You know, U.S. Senators have quite a role. And in money... You know, the oversight the parliament has over budget is also significant. I mean the President can propose but the Congress has to really approve this. So, there are lots of ways in which the Congress has an important role.

Ms. Psihoda: So if you would rap up the core areas of cooperation between the US and Europe, what would be good ones and what would be ones that did not work?

Mr. Hamilton: Well, we are in a new administration so it's hard to see right now. But I think the main premise, at least my premise, would for forty, fifty years this relationship was about stabilizing Europe. When we said transatlantic relations, we meant stabilizing the European continent. So it was about stabilizing Europe itself, the continent of Europe and all its problems. And the central issue of American foreign policy for a hundred years was Europe's instability and conflict rooted in Central Europe. There is still part of that agenda there today, the wider Europe that I was talking about, but that is not 90% of our agenda. It's maybe 30% or less. So there is still an agenda in Europe as mainly wider Europe. I+It's this unsettled space between the EU and Russia. So that's an agenda where I don't think we quite know how to work together on that yet. But the real agenda and how this relationship is challenged is the agenda beyond. You know, are we able to have a partnership that allows to work together to address the whole series of third issues that NATO is not going to resolve on its own? And I think

that's where the challenge for the relationship is. Because do the Americans have the patience to deal with all the complexities the Europeans [have] when we are dealing with Iran, for instance, or climate change or, you know, all this stuff? And do the Europeans have the will, even the desire or the ability to be that type of partner? Do they really want, like do they really want to be engaged in Afghanistan or do they want to leave it to the Americans while complaining at the same time? I think that's the challenge, do we have this kind of, can we build this kind of global partnership or not? I would argue we have to and that is the real task, it's finding out the new mechanisms and allow us to do that. The default is, you know, the Americans do it badly on their own and fail and the Europeans carping on the sideline and suffering then from that failure. So I think that is the agenda. We have an agenda partly in Europe, mainly wider Europe, we have this global agenda and the third [agenda], the other third I would say there is an agenda, which you should not talk about this in foreign affairs, but globalization also means that the connections across the Atlantic are closer not looser. Economically we are very dependent on each other. I think if the recession showed us anything, it should have shown us that. The idea that you can decouple from the United States as some European politicians were saying couple of years ago is nonsense. And the same we have to understand while we are talking about China and everything, we are still actually investing in Europe, half the profits for American companies in the world come from Europe, not from China or Mexico. So, we have to, you know, understand that. And so the real tensions we have they are not trade barriers because we don't have any trade barriers, it's domestic regulations and things that stop, you know, our two systems from working. We have friction because the two systems are different. That's a huge agenda and it occupies a lot of agencies in government, it's not a very sexy agenda, but it's a big part of the agenda. What kind of standards do you have on products, what kind of, you know, consumer standards, you know, what is the responsibility of the United States and Europe to have high standards for their people. If we don't have a common high standard, we'll have a Chinese standard, that's the choice. In fact we have one right now, talking about children toys. If we don't agree on what the standard needs to be on those kinds of products then lowest common denominator wins and we import toys from China, that's what happens. So, there is another agenda there. It's not quite the same as the traditional foreign affairs agenda but it's the rest of the world [inaudible] on our domestic societies now. And all of this is happening first across the Atlantic. It's not happening with Japan or with, you know, Brazil. It's happening between us. I think that's a good agenda to look at.

Ms. Psihoda: Do you think that this agenda has changed from Bush to Obama?

Mr. Hamilton: I think it will.

Ms. Psihoda: And in which aspects?

Mr. Hamilton: Well, first in recognizing that there is something to be done here. Secondly, it's not just about... The Bush agenda was about deregulation, just deregulate everything, a free market... And there were some Europeans that wanted that as well. I think the Obama administration is about high standards and aligning our standards at a high level. Well, that's actually much more a European agenda, right? High safety standards, consumer protection, all those kind of things. Let's have an agenda about that. And I think, you know, that could be attractive.

Ms. Psihoda:

And the areas of cooperation remain the same, I guess. I mean from what I have heard and read, terrorism is very good and then climate change we still have to wait...

Mr. Hamilton:

Well, I mean, so. Okay, on economics [we are] working together, have some differences. But I think, you know, working it out and we seem to be coming out of a recession sort of. On international security challenges, Afghanistan, we are sort of together but Europeans have not stepped up and the commitment is questionable. On the Middle East and the other sort of international security questions, I think, you find some agreements there. The problems have not gone away but there is a better transatlantic dialogue and interaction. I think the question, the open question is about Iraq. If you look at... I would look this issue what I call transatlantic resilience, societal security, how do we protect our own people, our societies from these kinds of network dangers and threats and disasters? And should not we do that together? I think that's a new area... That's actually a good area to work on. Climate change, the US has changed course but it will take longer than the European schedule allows. So there will be some problems. And that's the top list. I mean there is lots of issues, wider Europe I think is another one.

Ms. Psihoda: Alright, thank you very much for this extensive interview.

B. Abstract

This thesis has been written for the purpose of making a contribution to the academic discussion of the transatlantic relations between Europe and the United States in the field of foreign and security policy. With its main focus on the relations between the U.S. and Germany and the U.S. and France after the Iraq crisis in 2003, this thesis aims to analyze what impact the disagreement over the Iraq War had on their relationships. The study addresses the factors, which influenced the rapprochement in the U.S.-German and U.S.-French relations, the roles that the personalities in office as heads of government in Germany, France and the U.S. played, and the effect, which the change in leadership in Germany and France had on the rapprochement between Europe and the U.S. Moreover, it will be analyzed which effects the 2003 Iraq crisis had on the military cooperation between the United States and its European allies in Afghanistan and Iraq. The study found that the Iraq crisis had short-term effects on the relations between Germany and the U.S. and France and the U.S., which resulted in a deep rift between these strategic allies. However, it is argued that there has not been any serious rupture as the relations between these countries are too important to allow for any long-term estrangement. It is therefore concluded that a rapprochement set in with the beginning of the second term of the George W. Bush administration.

C. Deutsche Zusammenfassung

Die Diplomarbeit stellt einen Beitrag zur wissenschaftlichen Diskussion über die transatlantischen Beziehungen zwischen Europa und den USA dar. Sie untersucht welche Auswirkungen die Irakkrise im Jahr 2003 auf die außen- und sicherheitspolitischen Beziehungen zwischen den USA und Deutschland und den USA und Frankreich hatte.

Im Zuge dessen befasst sich die Studie mit den Faktoren, welche für die Annäherung in den U.S.-Deutschen und U.S.-Französischen Beziehungen verantwortlich waren. Es wird analysiert welche Rolle die politischen Führungspersonlichkeiten in Deutschland, Frankreich und den USA spielten und welche Auswirkungen der Wechsel der politischen Führungsspitze Deutschlands und Frankreichs auf die Annäherung in den Beziehungen hatte. Des Weiteren wird untersucht, welche Auswirkungen die Irakkrise auf die militärische Zusammenarbeit zwischen den USA und ihren europäischen Verbündeten in Afghanistan und Irak hatte.

Es konnte die Schlussfolgerung aufgestellt werden, dass die Folgen der Unstimmigkeiten über den Irakkrieg zwar kurzfristig in einer tiefen Kluft in den Beziehungen zwischen den USA und Deutschland und den USA und Frankreich mündeten. Allerdings kam es zu keinem größeren Zerwürfnis in den U.S.-Deutschen und U.S.-Französischen Beziehungen, da diese Beziehungen von beiden Seiten als zu wichtig erachtet werden. Hingegen wird die These aufgestellt, dass es mit Beginn der zweiten Präsidentschaft von George W. Bush zu einer Annäherung in den transatlantischen Beziehungen zwischen den USA und Deutschland und den USA und Frankreich kam.

D. Curriculum Vitae

Mag. Sophie Psihoda

Date of Birth: 5th March 1987
Nationality: Austrian

Education

- 2005-2010 **Mag.^a phil. Political Science, major (MA equivalent)**
University of Vienna, Austria
Additional Modules included: International Development,
Russian, and French
- Fall Term 2008 **Exchange Placement**
Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., USA
- 1997-2005 **Matura (A level equivalent) with Distinction;**
De La Salle Schule Strebersdorf, Vienna, Austria

Work Experience

- 4/2010-6/2010 **Eventmanagement & -organization**
brainswork, Non-Profit Organization, 1020 Vienna, Austria
- 7/2009-9/2009 **Intern at the Embassy of Austria**
Political Department at the Embassy of Austria,
Washington, D.C.,
- 10/2006-2/2007 **Research Assistant**
GATiB Genome Austrian Tissue Bank, a project of the
Department for Political Science, University of Vienna, Austria

Language Skills

Native German, business fluent English, fluent French, elementary Russian,
elementary Spanish

Scholarships/Awards

Scholarship, Joint Study Program, Georgetown University, USA, (08/2008-12/2008);
Scholarship for excellent grades ("Leistungsstipendium nach dem Studienförderungsgesetz StudFG"), (2006-2007, 2007-2008, 2008-2009);
Scholarship for excellent grades ("Leistungsstipendium aus den Mitteln der Stiftungen und Sondervermögen"), (2007, 2008)