

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Our Thanks	2
World Affairs Councils of America	3
Leadership Missions	5
WACA Delegation	7
Schedule of Events	8
Overview Essay	10
Discussion Reports	
Benjamin Angel, Office of Commissioner Joaquin Alumnia’s Cabinet	12
Gerhard Stahl, Secretary-General, Committee of the Regions	14
Ronald D. Asmus, Executive Director, Transatlantic Centre, German Marshall Fund USA	15
Christoph Heusgen, Director General of Secretariat, Council of the European Union	17
David O’Sullivan, Secretary General, European Commission	19
Claus Sorensen, Director, Office of Commissioner Fischer Boel	20
Carolla Kaps, Correspondent for the <i>Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung</i>	22
Lt. Gen. Jean-Paul Perruche, Army Corps Director-General	23
Edward McMillan-Scott, Vice-President of the European Parliament	25
American Chamber of Commerce	27
Fabrizio Barbaso, Director-General for Enlargement	28
Christian Burgsmuller, Directorate-General of Trade	30
Carles Esteve Mosso, Head, Merger Policy, Directorate-General of Competition	30
Joaquim Nunes de Almeida, Director-General of Justice, Freedom and Security	32
American European Community Association	33
Noel White, Counselor for Administrative Affairs, European Parliament	35
Luana Reale, Head of Development Policy, Directorate-General of Development	36
Graham Avery, Director of Strategy, Directorate-General of External Relations	38
Karel Kovanda, Deputy Director General, European Commission	40
Kyle Scott, Minister Counselor, United States Mission to the European Union	41
Belgian Contacts	44
American Contacts	47
Photos	49

Our Thanks

The World Affairs Councils of America wishes to express its deepest gratitude to the European Union Mission in Washington DC, especially Ambassador John Bruton, Mr. Jonathan Davidson, Ms. Helen Henderson, Mr. Bill Burros, and Ms. Despina Manos, for support of our many European Union related activities in 2004-2005.

We would also like to thank Ms. Janice George of the Civil Society Partnership and Visits Unit in Brussels for arranging one of the most comprehensive, informative, and productive missions that WACA has undertaken. She worked so hard on our behalf and was absolutely magnificent in organizing the trip.

Finally, we thank Mr. Ron Asmus and the German Marshall Fund, Mr. Mike Maibach and the American Chamber of Commerce, Mr. George de Vierman and the American European Community Association, and Ms. Carolla Kaps for everything they did to make our leadership mission agenda a spectacular one.

This was the third WACA leadership mission to Brussels and was a huge success. The breadth and depth of the meetings were beyond compare, and we very much appreciate the honesty and openness of all with whom our delegates met. We have gained a great insight to the achievements of the European Union as well as the future challenges, and we look forward to deepening our relationship with long-lasting partnerships and projects for future cooperation.

It was a historic time for our delegation to be there, as some of the hard decisions were brought regarding the EU Constitution. The delegation met with some of the utmost experts in Brussels and created long-lasting relations that promise a strong tie between our organization and the European Union.

The members of our delegation have pledged to disseminate locally what they have learned, to try to return to Brussels either as another high-level delegation or as individuals in the future, to encourage follow-on trips to Belgium by our 86 world affairs councils around the country, and to seek to raise the level of programming on the European Union throughout the world affairs council system.

They are pleased to put forward this trip report as a statement of thanks to the sponsors of this trip. Many thanks!

Jerry W. Leach
President
World Affairs Councils of America



World Affairs Councils of America

Engaging Grassroots America in World Affairs

World affairs councils are non-profit, non-partisan organizations open to all who wish to join. Started in 1918, the council system has 484,000 members and participants, 86 councils, and 26 affiliates. Councils operate on membership dues, corporate sponsorships, grants, in-kind donations, fundraising events, and fee-for-service activities. Over 2,000 corporations, foundations, and individuals support council work.

The council system has the biggest international affairs speakers' program in the country with over 2,500 events each year. Councils also run international exchanges, school programs, teachers' workshops, model UNs, foreign policy discussions, national opinion polls, travel programs, young professionals' programs, conferences, corporate programs, journals, newspaper columns, and local radio and television programs. The system has four flagship programs: World in Transition, Great Decisions, the NPR radio program It's Your World, and Academic WorldQuest annually in Washington DC.

The national association organizes an annual conference, leadership missions abroad, a speaker referral system, international speaker exchanges, people-to-people diplomacy missions, educational workshops, book tours, subscription discounts, operations workshops, research papers, videoconferences, and national publications. It also runs national program series such as *World Bank Town Meetings*, *Mexican Migration*, *Two Koreas*, *Future of Russia*, *Western Hemisphere*, *Human Rights Worldwide*, *the EU*, *Rising Anti-Americanism*, *American Security*, *UN Reform*, and *The People Speak*.

The 2006 Washington conference will be January 18-21 on *The World's Emerging Powers*. The 2005 conference was on *Tackling the World's Toughest Issues* and 2004 on *The US and Europe: Rivals or Partners?* The council system holds a national high school world affairs knowledge competition called *Academic WorldQuest* in Washington. Councils reach over 20 million people every year with their programs.

National Association

Dr. Jerry W. Leach, President
Ms. Ljiljana Komnencic, Program Director
Ms. Keerti Hasija, Special Projects Director
Ms. Cori Welbourn Bassett, Communications Director
1800 K Street NW, Suite 1014, Washington, D.C. 20006
Phone: (202) 833-4557 Fax: (202) 833-4555
Email: ncwao@aol.com
Website: www.worldaffairscouncils.org

Largest International Affairs Non-Profit in the US

National Board

Amb. James R. Jones
Maria Zammit
Mimi C. Gregory
James N. Falk

Chairman
Vice Chairman
Secretary
Treasurer

Carlos Alvarez
Sally Billington
Dr. Marshall Bouton
John A. Carpenter
Fares I. Fares
Robert Fischer

Jonathan M. Fox
Felicity Harley
Dr. Joseph M. Ha
Eileen M. Heaphy
Amb. Mark Johnson
A. Alex Lari

Noel V. Lateef
Amb. Marilyn McAfee
Claudia McBride
Deanna K.W. Pelfrey
Barbara Propes
James B. Tapp

Jane M. Wales
Angela Weck
Peter White
Donald Winkelmann
Maria Wulff

Councils

Akron
Anchorage
Asheville NC
Atlanta
Boston
Brattleboro VT
Buffalo
Charleston
Charlotte
Chicago
Cincinnati
Cleveland
Colchester VT
Colorado Springs
Columbus OH
Columbia
Corpus Christi
Dallas-Ft. Worth
Dayton
Denver
Detroit

Grand Rapids
Greensboro
Hampton Roads Va
Hartford
Hawaii
Hilton Head SC
Houston
Indianapolis
Jacksonville FL
Jacksonville IL
Juneau
Kansas City
Lansing
Las Vegas
Long Island
Los Angeles
Louisville
Miami
Minneapolis
Milwaukee
Missoula MT

Monterey Bay
Montgomery
Naples FL
New Hampshire
New Orleans
New York
No. California
Orange County CA
Olympia
Palm Beaches FL
Palm Springs
Peoria
Philadelphia
Pittsburgh
Poughkeepsie NY
Portland ME
Portland OR
Providence
Quad Cities IA
Raleigh-Durham
Reading PA

Richmond VA
Riverside CA
Salt Lake City
San Antonio
San Diego
Santa Fe
Savannah
Scottsdale AZ
Seattle
Sonoma County
Spokane WA
Springfield IL
Springfield MA
St. Louis
Stamford CT
Tacoma WA
Traverse City MI
Valley Forge
Ventura County
Washington DC
Wilmington DE

Affiliates

American Academy of Diplomacy
American Foreign Service Association
American University of Kuwait
Atlantic Partnership
Brookings Institution
Canadian Institute of Int'l Affairs
Carnegie Endowment for Int'l Peace
Council on Foreign Relations
Center for Strategic and Int'l Studies
Fares Foundation
Foreign Policy Research Institute
Inter-American Dialogue
International Center for Journalists

International Law Institute
Korean Economic Institute
Korea America Friendship Society
Japan Center for International Exchange
Mexican Council on Foreign Relations
Middle East Institute
National Council for International Visitors
National Geographic Society
New York Times
Royal Institute for International Affairs
Singapore International Foundation
Turkish Business Confederation (TUSIAD)
United States-Indonesia Society

National Sponsors

American Airlines
Anheuser-Busch
Carnegie Corporation
Claremont Group

EABC
Fox Family Foundation
Gambrinus
Nike

Northrop Grumman
Siemens
Wedge Alternatives

World Affairs Councils of America

Leadership Missions

What is a leadership mission?

A leadership mission is an overseas fact-finding visit to a city, country, or international organization by a national leadership delegation of the World Affairs Council movement.

The World Affairs Councils of America is the largest non-profit international affairs organization in the United States with 87 councils around the country, 28 national and international affiliates, and 484,000 members and participants.

What is the purpose?

The main purposes are to get to know the people, the issues, and the problems of the city, the country or the organization first-hand and to establish a much greater connection between the country and a well-informed and influential part of the American public. These trips are for meeting and discussion purposes, not for sightseeing.

Better knowledge of the host county and its issues means better programs back home at the local council level. These include country-specific information channeled through more speaker invitations, radio and television programs, council publications, curriculum materials, teachers' workshops, business roundtables, conferences, and travel programs.

The world affairs council movement prides itself on independence. It wishes to confront the world's issues directly, not through the prisms of official foreign policy, interest group ideology, or the national media. The movement strongly believes in people-to-people diplomacy and is one of the preeminent organizations of its kind in the United States.

Who goes?

Delegations are made up of generally 10 national leaders of the council system, i.e. presidents of councils, national board members, local chairpersons, program directors, and local board members. Trips usually last between 7-10 days.

Who pays?

The host government or organization covers the expenses inside the county. The hosts sometimes pay the international airfare to the country as well. Hosts have been the ministry of foreign affairs, the national information service, local foundations, or local non-profit organizations.

What do the delegations do?

Delegations hold a wide variety of discussions and make numerous site visits. Typically, discussions include a session at the foreign ministry and also often with defense, education, economics, privatization, and other field experts. Commonly, delegations meet with the media, business associations, think tanks, foundations, and universities as well. Sessions are largely short briefings followed by extensive question-and-answer periods.

Site visits often include industrial facilities, military installations, development projects, and rural settings. Delegations are usually hosted once by the American Embassy and sometimes pay a courtesy call on the national president.

How do the hosts benefit?

What the delegation learns is communicated to the members throughout the United States through a trip report, local programming, and council conferences and workshops.

Local programming on the host country has increased through 80 world affairs councils as a result of each tour. Perspectives gained on tours appear in publications, on radio and television, at conferences, in national foreign policy discussion publications, and in educational materials which we prepare for classrooms.

These visits also lead to the development of long-term working relationships between counterpart organizations in the host country and the World Affairs Councils. The working relationships produce joint projects, conferences, professional exchanges, speakers' visits to the United States, intern exchanges, publications, or the like. The tours sometimes lead to increased business interest from some of the 2,000 corporations that financially support the world affairs council movement around the country.

National delegation visits often then lead to follow-up by local councils. Many local councils have educational travel programs for their members. Leadership missions often start a series of trips from around the council world. For local trips, the travelers normally are paying their own way.

What countries or organizations have hosted study tours?

Over the last ten years, the world affairs council system has taken leadership delegations to China, Japan, Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong, Vietnam, Singapore, the Philippines, India, Turkey, Jordan, Syria, Saudi Arabia, Israel, Morocco, Lebanon, Brazil, Canada, NATO, the European Union, Poland, Kuwait, and Egypt. Several countries have issued repeat invitations.

**WORLD AFFAIRS COUNCILS OF AMERICA
EUROPEAN COMMISSION, BRUSSELS: DELEGATION LIST**

Dr. John E. Rielly

WACA Patron
Adjunct Professor of Political Science, Northwestern University
Chicago, Illinois

F. M. (Fred) Ameri

Senior Vice-President, RBF Consulting
Chairman, Orange County World Affairs Council
Newport Beach, California

Col. W. Wayde Benson

Military Correspondent, ABC News
Board Member, New Orleans World Affairs Council
New Orleans, Louisiana

Dr. Patricia LeMay Burr

Distinguished Chair, International Business
H-E-B School of Business & Administration
Board Member, San Antonio World Affairs Council
San Antonio, Texas

Mr. Martin Charwat

Financial Planner
President and Founder, Mid-Hudson Valley World Affairs Council
Poughkeepsie, New York

Ms. Eileen M. Heaphy

National Executive Committee and Executive Director, World Affairs Forum
Stamford, Connecticut

Ms. Deanna K. W. Pelfrey, APR, Fellow PRSA

President, Pelfrey Associates, INC
National Board, World Affairs Councils of America
Louisville, Kentucky

Mr. Michael Phillip

Vice President Senior Financial Advisor
Chairman, Ventura County World Affairs Council
Camarillo, California

Dr. Jacqueline D. Taylor

Vice-President, Davenport University
President Emeritus and Board Member, Western Michigan Council
Grand Rapids, Michigan

Linda Trout, J.D.

Executive Director, International Relations Council
Kansas City, Missouri

**WACA DELEGATION TO EUROPEAN UNION - BRUSSELS
MAY 29 – JUNE 4, 2005**

SCHEDULE

Monday, May 30

- | | | |
|-------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 10:00 a.m. | Mr. Benjamin Angel | Chair: Dr. John Rielly
Notes: Dr. Jacqueline Taylor |
| 11:30 a.m. | Mr. Gerhard Stahl | Chair: Ms. Eileen Heaphy
Notes: Dr. Patricia LeMay Burr |
| 12:45 p.m. | Mr. Ronald Asmus | Chair: Dr. John Rielly
Notes: Dr. John Rielly |
| 3:00 p.m. | Mr. Christoph Heusgen | Chair: Ms. Deanna Pelfrey
Notes: Colonel W. Wayde Benson |

Tuesday, May 31

- | | | |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 10:30 a.m. | Mr. David O’Sullivan | Chair: Mr. Michael Phillip
Notes: Ms. Linda Trout |
| 4:30 p.m. | Mr. Claus Sorensen | Chair: Mr. Martin Charwat
Notes: Mr. Fred Ameri |
| 7:30 p.m. | Ms. Carolla Kaps | Chair: Dr. Patricia LeMay Burr
Notes: Ms. Deanna Pelfrey |

Wednesday, June 1

- | | | |
|-------------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 9:30 a.m. | Lt. General Jean-Paul
Perruche | Chair: Colonel W. Wayde Benson
Notes: Dr. Jacqueline Taylor |
| 11:00 a.m. | Mr. Edward McMillan-
Scott | Chair: Ms. Deanna Pelfrey
Notes: Ms. Linda Trout |
| 3:00 p.m. | Mr. Joaquin Nunes
DeAlmeida | Chair: Colonel W. Wayde Benson
Notes: Mr. Martin Charwat |
| 7:00 p.m. | American European
Community Association | Chair: Ms. Linda Trout
Notes: Dr. Jacqueline Taylor |

Thursday, June 2

**8:00 a.m. American Chamber of
Commerce**

**Chair: Dr. Patricia LeMay Burr
Notes: Ms. Linda Trout**

9:45 a.m. Mr. Noel White

**Chair: Mr. Fred Ameri
Notes: Ms. Eileen Heaphy**

11:00 a.m. Mr. Fabrizio Barbaso

**Chair: Mr. Michael Phillip
Notes: Mr. Martin Charwat**

3:15 p.m. Mr. Christian Burgsmuller

**Chair: Mr. Martin Charwat
Notes: Mr. Michael Phillip**

5:00 p.m. Mr. Carles Esteva Mosso

**Chair: Dr. Jacqueline Taylor
Notes: Dr. John Rielly**

Friday, June 3

10:00 a.m. Ms. Luana Reale

**Chair: Mr. Fred Ameri
Notes: Ms. Deanna Pelfrey**

**1:00 p.m. Mr. Graham Avery
& Mr. Andrew Denison**

**Chair: Dr. John Rielly
Notes: Dr. Jacqueline Taylor**

3:00 p.m. Mr. Karel Kovanda

**Chair: Ms. Eileen Heaphy
Notes: Dr. Patricia LeMay Burr**

4:30 p.m. Mr. Kyle Scott

**Chair: Dr. Jacqueline Taylor
Notes: Ms. Eileen Heaphy**

Overview Essay

Dr. John Rielly

The WACA delegation of ten members arrived in Brussels on Sunday, May 29 just in time to hear the flash news report from Paris that the French people had rejected the European Constitution by a vote of 55% to 45%. Combined with the even more decisive rejection by the Dutch people three days later, this shocking result would both alarm and depress European Union officials and would dominate the discussion in virtually every meeting throughout the week. Over and over again we heard the refrain “This is a sad day for the European Union.” Our delegation members concurred that it was a sad day, not only for the EU but for the United States as well.

For half a century every American government had supported the cause of European integration. A united integrated Europe would not only avoid the catastrophic wars that European nations had inflicted on the world during the twentieth century, but would bring a durable peace and remarkable prosperity to European peoples. The European Union and its predecessor institutions, by pooling sovereignty over a course of decades, had created a common market of unprecedented prosperity, had eliminated border checks for its citizens, had imposed common standards for both products and professional services, and despite almost universal skepticism, had successfully created and implemented a common currency, the Euro. At the same time the European Court of Justice guaranteed protection of human rights, and a European Parliament gave representation to all major political constituencies.

If the EU had not yet achieved a common foreign policy, it had achieved a consensus on many international issues and represented a major force in international bodies. Why had the French and the Dutch — who had been in the forefront of European integration from the beginning — rejected the European constitution? The individual reports which follow, provide an analysis of the many subjects discussed with a wide variety of EU officials. This brief overview will focus on some of the answers offered to the above question — why was the Constitution rejected.

In both France and the Netherlands, as it was generally agreed, voter motivation rarely focused on the Constitution. With a text of over 400 pages of soporific language, few people had read it. In France the vote represented a protest against the French political elite in general and the Chirac government in particular. At a time of high unemployment and growing economic insecurity, over two thirds of lower income people voted “no”. Some believed that the constitution would reinforce an unequal status quo, while others feared that it would unleash the forces of globalization and diminish the elaborate social protection provided by the French state. Anti-globalization sentiment ran high — shared by both the political right and the left-both denouncing “liberal Anglo-Saxon capitalism”— with President Chirac indulging in similar populist rhetoric. Resentment against the European bureaucrats in Brussels also ran high in both countries. Many objective observers agreed that Brussels had often imposed excessive restrictions, violating the principle of subsidiarity, which dictated that local issues be handled locally.

Both the French government and the opposition Socialist Party were divided, though officially on record as supporting approval of the Constitution. President Chirac, who had decided a year

ago on a referendum when none was required, continued to feud with his principal rival in the French government, Nicolas Sarkozy, who openly campaigned to replace Chirac in the next election. The Socialist Party officially endorsed the Constitution but was totally split between the Secretary General, François Hollande, who campaigned for the “yes,” and Laurent Fabius, the former Prime Minister under President Mitterrand, a pro-American, free market oriented Socialist who led the campaign against the Constitution. Thus Fabius found himself joining with the anti-immigrant nationalistic right led by Jean Marie LePen.

In France as in the Netherlands, the rapid expansion of the European Union and the presence of ten new countries reinforced and inflamed fears of competition for jobs, fear of the “Polish plumber” who would lower wages and threaten West European jobs. The decision of the European Union to open discussions with Turkey about possible future membership was considered a major miscalculation and generated deep and widespread opposition.

In the Netherlands many of the same factors influenced voters. Here the dominant issue almost certainly was anti Islamic sentiment fired by the twin killings by Islamic terrorists of political leader Pym Fortyn and movie Producer Leo van Gogh. For several decades the Netherlands had been the most socially tolerant country in Europe and was more hospitable to immigrants than most of its neighbors. By 2005 a majority of the Dutch had concluded that the attempt to assimilate a large Muslim population had failed. Now they insisted that Muslims must adapt to European values, not the other way around. While the Constitution had little to do with this issue, it became the focus of accumulated anti-immigrant frustration and anger.

In the days immediately after the referendums, most European leaders had not sufficiently recovered from the shock to analyze clearly what the next step would be, or how severely Europe had been damaged. Many believed future planned referendums (e.g. Great Britain) would either be postponed or cancelled. Some of the proposed reforms contained in the Constitution might be taken up and passed by the European Council, such as the creation of a European Foreign Minister and a long-term President of the Council. But much uncertainty remained. Clearly the further expansion of the European Union would be slowed. Clearly the value of the Euro declined. Clearly the attempt to promote a tight, more rapidly integrated Europe, would be halted. Those countries that had favored a loose trading bloc rather than a politically united Europe (e.g. Great Britain) were probably pleased with the outcome. All of these questions would confront the European Union as the Presidency moved to Great Britain in July of 2005. Although few doubted that the European Union would survive, no one doubted that the prospects for a stronger Europe, one that would play a larger role on the world scene, had been seriously diminished.

The reality of the vote and the learning experience in the EU will have a continuing impact on every World Affairs Council represented through the members of the delegation who learned again the high value of an individual’s right to vote their beliefs.

**Meeting with Mr. Benjamin Angel, Member of the Private Office of Commissioner
Almunia's Cabinet
Monday, May 30, 2005
10:00 a.m.**

Chair: Dr. John Rielly

Notes: Dr. Jacqueline Taylor

Mr. Benjamin Angel opened the meeting on economic and monetary affairs by announcing that it was "Not a particularly happy day for the EU."

Mr. Angel advised the delegation that the economic policy guidelines of the 1990s provided a detailed orientation for the EU, were used as a practical text, and had been adopted for a three year period. So far, implementation has not been too convincing although the EU has a strong commitment to economic policy.

Each of the member states must keep their budgets balanced and cannot show a deficit of more than 3 % – if that occurs fines can be imposed of up to .05 % per person. Establishing this strong sanction is to deter budget deficits by member states, but it has not been enough.

The EU went to court over the budget deficit sanctions for the first time and it won! The Economic and Monetary Affairs Commission used that court decision as an opportunity to revise its rules and bring about consensus. Member states now have two years to correct budget deficit problems. Greater attention is paid to quality. This allows temporary budget deficits to be taken into account. It had been felt that the EU system formerly had been unfair to smaller member states such as the Netherlands, which questioned why it was being sanctioned when Germany and France had not followed the EU monetary rules. Italy, which had suffered through a recession, and Portugal with huge deficits, were in a difficult situation. The EU determined not to use sanctions in a prolonged period of recession or sluggish growth. Greece has also been a problem with a deficit budget because of a military situation with Turkey.

A Stability Pact was established. The focus on stability is critical with long, tense, very serious discussions taking place with member states. These discussions have resulted in a stable financial market with less risk to the Euro, a strong Euro has evolved, and interest rates have remained stable. The EU Finance Ministry acts in a similar manner to the US Federal Reserve Board and has maintained the same interest rates for two years. The monetary policy is not a problem in the EU; however lack of trust and reform or mistrust by investors can cause a problem.

A question was raised from the delegation related to the EU being considerably more disciplined in its monetary policies than the U.S., e.g., the US is now running both budget and trade deficits. Discussion with the group and Mr. Angel focused on the challenges facing both the EU and the US, namely the high cost of pensions being paid by the EU, social security in the US, and health care costs in both countries. It was stated that the EU will have to "find" the funds to finance pensions within 15-20 years because of aging demographics, i.e., at that time there will only be two workers for one pensioner.

Membership criteria related to economic policy indicated that as the EU expands the new member states must meet the same financial criteria. If Estonia, Slovenia and Lithuania, part of the second, new wave of EU members, fail it will be due to inflation which is their main problem. The wave of membership also included Malta, Cyprus and Latvia. All countries being considered as a part of expansion or enlargement have been eager to join because of the political situation and the perceived stability of the EU.

In response to a delegation question regarding implementation of the Euro, Mr. Angel explained that all member state banknotes (paper money) had been destroyed or shredded and used as fertilizer, and coins were kept in the member states. The United Kingdom, Sweden and Denmark are all in the Euro zone, but do not use the Euro. The Euro may well be affected by France not voting for the EU constitution. The Euro has fluctuated in relation to the US dollar ever since its inception. The US has \$600 billion in US reserves behind the dollar.

Mr. Angel felt that there was almost an uncanny connection between the vote in France and its relation to Turkey being possibly admitted to the EU; Turkey and its admission is a challenge for the EU. Turkey's whole legal system would have to change and also there is a human rights problem with the Kurds in Turkey. Overall, France fears enlargement and the French are extremely protective of their country; the free labor movement also affected the French vote.

Meeting with Mr. Gerhard Stahl, Secretary General, Committee of the Regions
Monday, May 30, 2005
11:30 a.m.

Chair: Ms. Eileen Heaphy

Notes: Dr. Patricia LeMay Burr

"It's quite a complicated structure. In none of the text books will you find a proper description of the history of the European Union," claimed Mr. Stahl as he began an overview of the evolution of the European Union.

Noting that he had spent four weeks in the U.S. on a fact-finding program funded by the U.S. government, he described his career that began in 1976 with a posting as an economist in the German Finance Ministry.

The major phases of the European Union that he described included:

1. The European Coal and Steel Community formed as a post WWII reconciliation effort, rooted in the idea that if coal and steel were major war resources, then the integrated management of those resources could ensure peace. Coal and steel access and management were the basis of the first agreement.
2. The Treaty of Rome, signed in 1957, created a common market concept with six members: France, Germany, Italy, Belgium, The Netherlands and Luxembourg. That organization came into being in 1958.
3. In 1967, a merger of several key groups resulted in the formation of The European Community.
4. In 1979, the European Monetary System was established to protect members from wide fluctuations by world markets. The European Currency Unit (ECU), a forerunner to the Euro, was introduced.
5. In the 1980's, high unemployment plagued Europe, creating debate over the role of integration as a solution.
6. In 1992, the Maastricht Treaty changed the European Community to the European Union and set a detailed timetable for the Economic Monetary Union development. Brussels was identified as the central city of the EU.
7. Today, in 2005, the EU has surpassed an era of voluntary intergovernmental cooperation. It is an evolving union with fundamental recognition by members of the economic, social and political value of integration. The European Central Bank sets monetary policy for the entire EU. Conversion to the Euro was the largest currency conversion in world history.

Note: The May 31, 2005, *International Herald Tribune* reported results of a May 29 national telephone poll of 1500 French respondents over the age of 18 conducted by TNS Sofres/Unilog

to determine why respondents voted against the Constitution on May 29. Respondents were allowed to choose more than one answer. Results were:

- 46% Treaty will worsen French unemployment
- 40% Fed up with current situation
- 35% Will allow Treaty to be renegotiated
- 34% Treaty too liberal economically
- 19% Europe threatens French identity
- 18% Because of Turkey
- 12% Politicians I feel close to, called for no vote

The poll determined that higher income respondents voted yes while the lower income voted no; older respondents voted yes while the younger voted no; professional and executives voted yes while the no vote included farmers, laborers, office workers, teachers, social workers, middle management, social workers and skilled trades.

Mr. Stahl explained the make up and focus of the Committee of the Regions. It was created to give regions, cities and ethnic enclaves a voice in the building of the European Union. Some mayors have become very powerful spokesmen on issues of importance to cities. Regions with political problems such as the Basque region in Spain and France can voice their concerns in the COR, whose goal in these issues is to ensure commitment to democratic principles and a total rejection of violence in pursuing political goals. There is no room in democratic Europe for terrorist or other violent methods in the political process.

**Meeting with Ronald D. Asmus, Executive Director, Transatlantic Centre, The German
Marshall Fund of the United States
Monday, May 30, 2005**

Chair: Dr. John Rielly

Notes: Dr. John Rielly

During the Cold War, NATO focused on issues within Europe. The key question now is whether NATO can successfully focus on issues outside of Europe. The focus today has shifted eastward — to Russia, China and the Balkans. Also important is the energy corridor along the Black Sea — an area of political turbulence. Until 9/11, Europeans resisted involvement in the East. That changed, Europe is now involved in Afghanistan as well as in the Balkans. As a forum for discussion of current political issues, NATO is less central today. Today the EU is more and more central. With the expansion of the EU, it has become more Atlanticist. France and Germany are losing out in setting the agenda. This was evident in the outcome of the French referendum — which reflected the feeling that the French are losing influence in the EU, that France has less and less opportunity to provide an alternative to NATO. This is also evident at the EU in Brussels, where Central Europeans are now filling jobs previously held by the French.

There remains a division on how important the defeat was. Some believe it is on a par with the defeat of the European Defense Community in 1954. Others regard it as only a blip. Still others say it is a setback but that the French and the EU needed a shock to wake them up. Although some in the US may be happy, the outcome is bad news for the US because we need a strong Europe as a partner on many key issues — whether terrorism, democracy promotion or the environment.

The Bush administration has recognized this during the past four months. Not only the President but many US officials are now coming to Brussels to talk with EU officials on a wide variety of issues — including the Ukraine, terrorism as well as the Balkans. Although the President's visit to Europe was very successful, we have not yet changed the very negative image of America as a society that emerged after Iraq. As one British journalist put it "We believe you Americans are engaged in a pre-enlightenment phase of history". The President's visit had a profound impact on European officials but no impact on the public or the press.

Both the EU and the US have a dilemma on how to deal with Russia. "We want to keep the pressure on Putin, on democracy, but not to sacrifice his cooperation on terrorism." The Europeans are sensitive about pressuring Russia because they are so dependent on Russian oil and gas. The East Europeans remain more skeptical about Russia-fearing that it could once again become a security threat.

There is great fluidity in Europe today. In a number of important countries old models are stuck — especially in France and Germany. Immigration has become a dominant issue, not only in France and Germany, but also in the Netherlands. The Dutch discovered that they could not assimilate Muslims, so now they are insisting that Muslims follow European values. This is one of the most explosive issues throughout Western Europe.

The focus on Europe as only post-World War II is over. We are beyond that. What we are seeing is really quite a dramatic and huge shift. My guess is that the U.S. State Department person in charge of Europe probably spends much of the day on China issues.

— Mr. Ronald D. Asmus, Executive Director, Transatlantic Centre, The German Marshall Fund of the United States

**Meeting with Dr. Christoph Heusgen, Director General Secretariat of the Council of the
European Union
Monday, May 30, 2005
3 p.m.**

Chair: Ms. Deanna Pelfrey

Notes: Colonel Wayde Benson

Dr. Heusgen, who served in the Office of the Consulate General in Chicago in the area of Press and Economic Affairs from 1983-1986, felt that it was very important for the World Affairs Council of America (WACA) delegation to come to Brussels to learn more about the European Union (EU). He stated that for the EU to succeed it must work with its partners — the United States and NATO. He pointed out that the EU represents 450 million people and reminded the delegation that the presidency of the EU changes every six months, with the United Kingdom (Prime Minister Tony Blair) soon assuming that role.

Since the French vote on the EU constitution was on everyone's mind, Heusgen talked about the impact of the referendum vote and its negative outcome, which he termed "very sad." The EU constitution was designed to address certain specific goals, was the subject of broad public debate, and now has to be re-evaluated in light of the French vote (Note: this meeting took place prior to the Dutch vote, which also rejected the EU Constitution). No official EU position or strategy has been formed as a result of the vote, but thoughts range from shelving the constitution for a period of time to looking at how changes can be made in the present system without a new EU constitution. Theories on the rationale for the negative vote vary within the EU itself, but most think that because the French have internal political divisions, the negative vote reflects a protest against the French government rather than dissatisfaction with the EU constitution itself. Further, the recent EU enlargement, together with future projected enlargements, may have resulted in the perception of a diminished French role, which could also have contributed to the negative vote.

During his February visit, President Bush stressed to Europeans the importance of the EU to the U.S. The EU view, in turn, is that U.S. support is and will continue to be important. However, issues remain, including divisions over Iraq. It was noted, however, that even though divisions remain over Iraq, Europe and the U.S. have moved past many of them and have begun working more closely, both in Iraq and other areas. A larger question related to Iraq is whether the EU and the U.S. can reach some agreement to legitimize force in the future. The U.S. and the EU have a common interest in preserving consensus on the legitimacy of force. The EU maintains that interventions must take place under the auspices of United Nations (UN) charter.

The U.S. plays a central role in the Middle East and Heusgen stated that without U.S. pressure, peace will not be possible; yet the U.S. alone cannot solve the problem. The relationship with the Arab world is very important to the EU – there has to be a long-term solution. The U.S. seems to favor Israel, and the solution has to be more balanced. He spoke of the Camp David agreement, stating that if France and others had been involved, perhaps Arafat could not have "run away."

Foreign policy, according to Heusgen, is a latecomer to the EU. Mr. Javier Solana is the first Foreign Minister of the EU and is serving a five-year term. It is the job of the Foreign Minister to integrate foreign policies within the EU as well as work with the EU military staff and military committee. The changing point for foreign affairs resulted from the Treaty of Amsterdam in 1999, and the EU now also has a military staff and military committee. The EU was involved in addressing the crisis in Macedonia in 2001, has been part of the Middle East process, and has had small military operations in the Congo as well as Kosovo in cooperation with American partners. He stressed that there must not be unnecessary duplication with NATO, and that better integration with NATO and the U.S. is necessary to adequately address security issues. The EU Military Staff is responsible for strategic planning, but not operational planning. There are at times some “hiccoughs” such as Cypress and Malta. Another issue is that it is difficult for the EU to exchange information between member states, as well as with the U.S., because of information technology and communications interoperability problems.

The EU developed relations with China in the 1990s and Heusgen stressed the importance of China, pointing out that economic issues are currently at the forefront of these EU-China relations. It has only been during the past year that political and security issues have been addressed to any extent.

When asked to articulate some successful highlights, Heusgen emphasized the following: the buildup of the EU (foreign relations and military staff); the handling of the 1990s Balkans crisis; the Macedonian situation; the Middle East road map, with the importance of Quartet (U.S., U.N., Russia and the EU) cooperation to reach a peaceful settlement; the EU development of a road map for member states; and the handling of the Ukrainian crisis, where Solana called for a round table to address and manage the situation. He also cited good relationships with former Secretary of State Colin Powell and now with Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice. In short, he stressed that while much has been accomplished, much remains to be done.

Meeting with Mr. David O'Sullivan, Secretary General of the European Commission.
Tuesday, May 31, 2005
10:00 a.m.

Chair: Mr. Michael Phillip

Notes: Linda Trout

The role of the Secretary General of the European Commission is four-fold:

1. Secretary of the College of Commission — the decision making machine, with a legal and political procedural function;
2. Policy coordination — pulling together the strands under the President to be certain there is a consistent political direction;
3. Manage relations with the Council and Parliament;
4. Serve as head of Administration.

To further explain his role, Mr. O'Sullivan described the schedule for a typical week, which culminates with the Commission meeting each Wednesday morning.

O'Sullivan is the fourth Secretary General of the Commission. As such, he has a defined legal role and his signature is required on legal documents. In contrast, the Head of Cabinet provides political advice to the President and has no administrative role.

The competition issues surrounding Boeing and Microsoft were O'Sullivan's main topics of discussion. In his opinion, the issues are not similar. Microsoft is a "pure competition" issue; it has gone to court and should be treated as a legal issue, not involving politics. The Airbus/Boeing issue has right and wrong on both sides. Airbus has benefited from direct subsidies while Boeing has had indirect subsidies. It is difficult, if not impossible, to untangle and calculate how much each has actually received on a per capita basis. If one side goes to the WTO, the other side will also.

Concerning the French election, it was a shock and a disappointment. It is hard to distinguish internal French and EU concerns. France and Germany have not had their late 20th century structural and economic reform. The countries which entered the EU through enlargement have gone through it — the British through Thatcher. France and Germany are, in some senses, stuck in the 60's and 70's with a great deal of tension between economic and social policies. The French have a fear of globalization and a fear of enlargement. The result of the election is (1) on a short-term basis, a significant political defeat for the governing party in France; (2) at the European level, the EU will continue with the referendum.

The Constitution is not dead; the EU takes a long term, historical view. They always knew there would be problems. After the French election in 2007, they will find a way to get back on track. What is being attempted is very difficult. To put 25 sovereign states together is — and very messy. They are building a "halfway house," not a United States of America. The actual constitution is not really at issue; there isn't an alternative vision, such as a demand to change an article.

The Lisbon Reform Process is to help member states to drive national reforms. Many countries are afraid that if they reform, they will become American. Lisbon helps these countries find European ways to deal with issues such as the tension between market economies and innovation on the one hand, and social/labor issues such as pensions and health care on the other. These issues must be dealt with at the national level; the Lisbon process tells the member countries to address these issues.

Environmental issues are very sensitive. Europe is so densely populated that it is very conscious of such problems as pollution, waste disposal, and traffic. People in Europe believe that global warming is real. Europe would like the US to join the Kyoto process — investment in research and development is not enough.

Turkey is a very difficult issue, according to O’Sullivan. There are geopolitical reasons to be certain that Turkey is pro-West, but the European public does not see Turkey as a part of Europe. It will take a long while. The US needs to quit pushing for a quick entry — a vote will be a no vote. The issue of Turkey needs to proceed cautiously, slowly and progressively.

I have no doubt that the long-term trend in Europe is toward greater integration. How to get the process back on track is not clear right now but will become clear with continuing discussion.

— Mr. David O’Sullivan, Secretary-General, European
Commission

**Meeting with Mr. Claus Sorensen, Head of the Private Office of Commissioner Fischer
Boel, Agriculture and Rural Development
Tuesday, May 31, 2005
4:30 p.m.**

Chair: Mr. Martin Charwat

Notes: Mr. Fred Ameri

Mr. Sorensen opened his remarks by addressing the French vote on the EU Constitution, which was the hot topic of the week, saying that the French “No” vote was a reflection of their national grievances. Most people in Europe take peace for granted and they have already forgotten the fall of the Iron Curtain.

He believes the destiny of the European Community and the United States are more strongly linked than ever, even though the Europeans view global issues from a different perspective than that of the Americans. He thinks that in 2050 the world will be a different place considering China’s 10% and India’s 8% expected growth.

With respect to agriculture, historically, Germany agreed to pay high prices for agricultural products in the 1950’s in order to build a base for its industrial production. In the 1960’s, agriculture became a pillar of EU policies. The decision to fix prices was left to the ministers of agriculture, resulting in a transition from deficit to surplus food production. This caused the EU to sever the link between farmers’ production and market price. Now, the farmer produces what is needed and gets paid a flat rate for his product. To off set the market price, the farmer is given a direct payment, like a welfare payment. The subsidy is approximately 60% of the market price formerly obtainable in a free market. It is anticipated that the subsidies will be phased out in five years. Consequently, Mr. Sorensen indicated that there would be a reduction in production. Through subsidizing, he believes that within five to ten years, farmers will have the opportunity to find other professions. Although subsidies may be a form of payment for non-production, he believes that the farmers will ultimately produce the right amount of needed agricultural products.

For meat, cereal, dairy and tobacco, subsidy programs are in place. Subsidy programs for wine, fruits and sugar (a touchy area) are in the process of preparation. These programs probably had an effect on the French farmer’s vote, since they knew what was coming.

The NATURA 2000 program calls for conservation and limitation of land use, which encouraged preservation of natural resources and the environment.

It is immensely important that we have people on the other side of the pond coming here to see what we think.

Look to 2050. The world and the game will look very different than it does now, given China’s and India’s growth rates.

— Claus Sorensen, Agriculture and Rural Development, following his warm welcome to the WAC Delegation

Meeting with Ms. Carolla Kaps, Correspondent
Frankfurter Allgemeine-Zeitung
Tuesday, May 31, 2005
7:30 p.m.

Chair: Dr. Patricia LeMay Burr

Notes: Ms. Deanna Pelfrey

Ms. Kaps is an economic correspondent for eleven countries, including Hungary, Slovenia, Romania, Bulgaria, Poland, and the Czech Republic. Her after dinner presentation followed a Question and Answer format rather than formal remarks. The following represent observations provided in her responses to questions.

As an opening remark, Ms. Kaps noted that Brussels, being the seat of the European Union, is a very international city but has a typically Belgian *laissez-faire* attitude.

Ms. Kaps believes that the EuroZone is not doing well, the world economy is frightening, and world events are not hopeful which leaves many concerned about the future.

The French *non* vote hit Brussels and the European Union hard, leaving the leadership not knowing what to do.

There is a general disquiet in Germany; there will be an early election and Ms. Kaps believes that Schroeder will be defeated primarily because the current government is not trusted. Currently, the Christian Democrats have a 20% lead. The general thinking is that with a new government there is the potential to experience openness, which does not exist at this time.

Germany is doing badly, and France is doing badly on the economic front. In the newly added ten member states there must be quick economic movement so that life improves for the population and the EU demonstrates its value. Further east, there is very slow movement at the present time.

The EU precipitates reforms in Eastern Europe that otherwise would not happen. So unity has benefits. As a unified force, the economic prosperity of the EU reaches areas that do not have it as a possibility.

Ms. Kaps is not a fan of the agricultural policy of the EU in Eastern Europe. Further, she believes that the agricultural subsidization of Africa is a problem. In Hungary with its Communist past, the EU subsidy for agriculture is seen as a positive; however, the problem is that the EU is phasing out this subsidy on a specific timetable. Between 2007 and 2013 the subsidy will be gradually phased out and, as a result, small farmers will be forced to work in hotels, business, and tourism; therefore, farmers feel short changed. Disappointment exists among many farmers regarding agricultural reform, reductions in price supports, and competition on the world markets.

Farmers are the most afraid in Poland. In the Czech Republic, "French wine got cheap" and that is popular. People there feel more comfortable under the EU.

Consolidation of banks is underway. Banks in Germany “slept too long”.

In journalism more Western control is being exercised as conglomerates buy newspapers. Journalists are good but there are fewer independent reporting positions available. In Eastern Europe the written work of journalists is closely edited. Journalists are fighting corruption but it is difficult.

Movement forward for the EU is challenging; it is not “milk and honey.” It requires member countries to lose sovereign rights, which is not appreciated. As a result, support steps back and popularity decreases; however, according to the polls, support for the EU has never decreased below 50%.

The Constitution was not well explained to the people before the vote.

— Ms. Carolla Kaps, Correspondent for the Frankfurter Allgemeine-Zeitung, regarding the French “no vote” on the EU Constitution

Meeting with Army Corps General Director of the EU Military Staff, Lt. Gen. Jean-Paul Perruche

Wednesday, June 1, 2005

9:30 a.m.

Chair: Colonel W. Wayde Benson

Notes: Dr. Jacqueline Taylor

Lt. General Perruche is responsible for the development of the policy for the EU Military staff — the EUMS is considered an outgrowth of the West European Organization that was created just following World War II. This organization was meant to protect Western Europe and the EUMS has been established to protect all of the European Union. There are strong political interests and common policies in the EU and it is natural for the EU to establish its own military organization rather than to use NATO — although it is important to note that the EU can cooperate with NATO and shares common qualities with NATO.

The EU has undergone a strong integration of its member states and there have already been situations in Bosnia and Macedonia where the EMUS has been called upon to use its strength. The structure of the EUMS limits any use of its forces outside of the EU member states, considering that NATO undertakes the succeeding tasks.

The Secretary-General of the EU has responsibility for the security of the EU member states, and although the EUMS operates with a small central staff, it is able to call upon its member states for troops which can number 60,000 if necessary. The largest number of these troops is from the member states of United Kingdom, France, Spain, Germany, Italy.

One of the strategic responsibilities of the EUMS is to work to transform political guidance into military guidance — each member state communicates with the EUMS and the EUMS provides a synthesis of intelligence to all member states. In fact, very interesting intelligence information was shared during the recent crisis in the Ukraine. Another responsibility is to provide training exercises for all troops of member states. The EUMS is able to integrate military and civilians for any crisis and includes training in the areas of awareness and early warning — this type of information adds confidence in managing a crisis. It is important for the EUMS to bring a package of solutions to any crisis and they must be aware of, or determine the underlying causes of the crisis — they cannot just solve any crisis with military action alone.

One example provided was the Bosnia situation. Several solutions were presented in the Bosnia case, which included military, education, training, economic programs, security issues and help in establishing a democratic process. On a routine basis, the EUMS is always watching so that if a crisis occurs, a contingency plan can be rapidly put into place. Perruche emphasized that there is always a structure and process available for any EU situation.

Intelligence sharing with all the member states is a priority that is continually being worked on, and as in the US, this can sometimes be difficult. This is a part of the responsibilities of the EUMS, though, right along with organizing an operation, streamlining the processes, coordinating all efforts, including the use of troops if necessary, and researching new technologies and processes to assist in a crisis.

Conclusively, Perruche outlined lessons learned from the recent crisis. For instance, no military solution alone can solve problem. It is necessary for the EUMS to integrate military and civilians at the outset and to address causes of crisis. The EUMS must act swiftly to take care of the new environment and must be able to send a specific number of troops rapidly — within a specified timeframe. It must take into account political, military and logistical aspects. Also, the EUMS cannot do action strictly around peacekeeping. It must encourage the area to take care of its own with its own training and enable its citizens to deal with a crisis. The EUMS needs significant coordination, support and many resources in order to accomplish this goal.

**Meeting with Edward McMillian-Scott, Vice-President of the
European Parliament. Wednesday, June 1, 2005
11:00 am**

Chair: Ms. Deanna Pelfrey

Notes: Ms. Linda Trout

Mr. McMillian-Scott is one of 14 Vice Presidents of the European Parliament. He has been a member since 1984 and currently serves as Deputy Speaker. It is unusual to remain in the EU Parliament for such a long while; there is a very high turnover of members. Most either go on to their national parliament or follow national service by coming to the EU.

He has responsibility for (1) relations with the national parliaments and (2) relations with the Mediterranean — His use of the term "Mediterranean" largely includes what the US terms the Middle East. It is in this second area that he is most involved and passionate. Under the Barcelona Process, the EU is furthering its involvement in the Spanish region. Needs to be clarified—Spain is a member of the EU, maybe “with Spain’s southern neighbors”

When the EU expanded last year to bring ten new countries into EU membership, the EU gained what they term "a new neighborhood." This designation incorporates the countries adjacent to the EU members: These new neighbors include many of the Mediterranean countries. The EU is proposing that these countries get the advantages of EU membership such as common currency, free trade and agriculture without membership.

The EU provides more than 1 billion dollars a year in aid to the 14 Mediterranean countries. In contrast, the US provides 2 billion dollars in aid to Egypt and Israel. The EU is not able to track this money and does not know what it is used for in the various countries. The EU is trying to create a free trade zone in the Mediterranean countries by 2010 but the effort is complicated by the fact that these Middle Eastern countries do not trade with each other.

McMillian-Scott was the head of the EU delegation to observe the Palestinian elections. He was very impressed with the openness of that election. He will be returning in July for the parliamentary elections. He sees progress in Palestinian-Israeli relations but this effort needs the active participation of the US as well as its neighboring countries.

Concerning the rejection of the constitution by the French, it is a crisis. In his opinion, the ratification process will not continue. At the upcoming EU Council meeting, they may conclude that the constitution was not understood, and work to codify it. They may also decide that Europe really has changed and the new, Eastern European countries have a different view of the economy.

The biggest challenge facing the EU is what to do about the constitution. The leaders of France, Germany and the UK have all been diminished in power. McMillian-Scott believes the constitution should not be adopted by national referenda.

McMillian-Scott recommends a new book by Mark Leonard entitled “How Europe Will Run The 21st Century.” The answer presented in the book is that the European model of inter-nation

cooperation — not based upon territory— may be adopted by other regions, such as Asia or the Arab countries.

A strong supporter of Turkey’s admission to the EU in the past, McMillian-Scott no longer is. Now that there have been open and free elections in countries including Ukraine and in the Palestine region, why should Turkey be at the head of the line? Further, following the Leonard book, a Pan-Arab Parliament may be a much better option. He suggests a Common Market of the Middle East.

The EU Parliament actually meets in Strasbourg, France. Each of the 782 members has an office in Brussels and in Strasbourg. There are meeting halls in each location and the members and staff move for the monthly meetings. All proceedings are available in all 20 languages of the EU, requiring translators at both locations.

The French vote was the first time that France has talked about Europe. It’s about time.

— Mr. Edward McMillian-Scott, Vice President, European Union Parliament

**Meeting with American Chamber of Commerce:
Maja Wessels, Honeywell - Claudio Murri, Time Warner - John
Disharoon, Caterpillar - Douglas Gregory, IBM - Michael Maibach, European
American Business Council - Susan Danger, Director of AmCham EU
Thursday, June 2, 2005
8:00 a.m.**

Chair: Dr. Patricia LeMay Burr

Notes: Ms. Linda Trout

Ms. Susan Danger opened the meeting with a description of the American Chamber EU: although it has officially existed as an independent organization for 1 1/2 years, the American Chamber EU has in fact, been in existence as a committee of the Belgium AmCham since the 1950's. Because it has a different mission in representing US companies to the EU, its composition is different than most AmChams. They have 135 to 140 member companies — to belong, a company must be of American origin. Dager is the only paid staff person. The organization has a committee structure and the subject area committees produce advocacy plans.

Each of the AmCham participants discussed the challenges of representing a US company to the EU. The first is that many countries and EU officers do not realize that many US companies have a large presence in European countries, employing many local workers and contributing to the economy. As a consequence, these lobbyists must convince EU officials that certain regulations, or lack thereof, will not just benefit the US company. It takes longer in Europe to work on the particular issue. One example provided was a regulation that a company had worked on for seven years.

US lobbyists are treated differently, even when they make good connections and communicate over a long period of time. In addition, there are frequently language issues because members of the EU Parliament will speak one of 20 languages and each US firm does not have a speaker in each of these languages. So, if one member sits on a committee which deals with an issue relating to the company's interests, talking with that person can be very difficult.

Business models are diverging and US companies are looking for coalitions. Europe is focused on consensus, and not leadership as US companies are. Globalization is happening across industries and across countries — in a horizontal manner — while governments operate vertically. AmCham EU is promoting horizontal government thinking.

There are not really European companies; there are national companies. While there may be a European policy, the local government has the most influence. However, it doesn't work to merely rely on the member of Parliament from a specific country, there are 25 countries and 782 members voting.

These lobbyists do not advocate at the Commission level; rather, they work at the director level. Personal credibility plays a larger role in Europe than in the US. There are 16,000 employees working for the Commission and they do not move in and out of government as in the US.

The analogy was made that lobbyists are trying to square a triangle. The three parts of the triangle — legislative, executive, and customers/clients — do not include other governments and the worldwide market. The latter are what the EU is being asked to consider. It is difficult to achieve a convergence of standards, whether concerning existing or new regulations. In other words, government structures are not keeping up with globalization.

It has become more acceptable to criticize the US. In the past, Europe was always comparing itself to the US and trying to do what the US did. The EU is focused on a social-economic model and will be critical of the US in certain areas.

The meeting ended with the comments of each AmCham participant, on how much progress Europe has made toward a unified market. Each emphasized that working with the EU is a long-term proposition.

**Meeting with Fabrizio Barbaso, Director-General “Enlargement”
Thursday, June 2, 2005
11:00 a.m.**

Chair: Mr. Michael Phillip

Notes: Mr. Martin Charwat

All Europeans were deeply affected by the result of the two referenda in France and in the Netherlands, where voters in both of these countries voted "No to the proposed E.U. constitution." Though their motives were substantially different and voters in 9 other countries had already ratified the constitutional treaty with large parliamentary majorities, the votes in France and the in Netherlands were major setbacks and will require reflection by E.U. officials.

Some commentators believe that concern about immigration and population flows were behind the vote. In any event, the enlargement process, although not related to the constitutional vote, was conflated with it and led to emotional reactions against ratification.

The present enlargement to 25 members is completed and has been successful. An action plan for security, freedom, and justice has been implemented. No new constitutional document is needed to implement it.

Plans for the accession of Romania and Bulgaria have been initiated and negotiations for Turkish accession will open in November 2005. If no problems arise, Romania and Bulgaria should become members in January, 2007. In the assumption that all their commitments are not met by that date, accession will be postponed until January, 2008.

Croatia is not raising anxieties for the E.U., as public opinion within the Union is largely favorable. Croatia has a long tradition in Europe; it is at the crossroads of the Mediterranean and Central Europe, and has stable institutions. An impediment to its accession is its failure to turn

over to the War Crimes Tribunal in the Hague, certain persons accused of war crimes during the wars of the early '90's — especially General Gotovina, who remains at large. Negotiations are contingent on his capture and turnover. If negotiations begin, they are expected to be concluded by 2010.

Turkey is the major challenge for the E.U. An Association agreement was signed in 1963, but progress has been very slow. Last year the Commission concluded that Turkey was sufficiently within the so-called "Copenhagen" standards on stability of institutions, human rights, and legal rights, in order for negotiations to be opened. Turkey, in addition, had to adopt a protocol extending the accession agreement and a customs' union with the 25 member states.

While there is no doubt that negotiations will start with Turkey on Oct. 3, 2005, they will be difficult and will probably take about 10 years. Turkey must modernize, must agree to stop torture, and must offer greater freedom of expression and religion. In parallel, the E.U. plans to launch a major effort to educate member state populations on Turkey's progress in these and other areas, so as to reduce misunderstanding. The E.U. recognizes its crucial job to communicate with relevant constituencies about the benefits of Turkish accession. This decision to strengthen communications regarding Turkey was taken 6 months ago — so it is not in reaction to the French and Dutch "No" voters on the E.U. constitution.

In addition to meeting the "Copenhagen" standards, Turkey's accession will also be conditioned on the peaceful settlement of territorial disputes with Greece and Cyprus. The Cyprus situation remains more difficult.

If Turkish accession fails, the E.U. should think about alternatives to anchor Turkey to E.U. structures, giving Turkey a privileged status with regard to economic, trade, and social links in order to keep good relations with this crucial nation.

Will Russia be invited to apply to join the E.U.?

This appears not to be too likely at present. Three conditions must be met:

1. It must belong to Europe;
2. It must share European values;
3. It must ask to join.

So far 1 is not clear and 2 and 3 have not occurred.

Meeting with Christian Burgsmuller, Directorate, General Trade
Thursday, June 2, 2005
3:15 p.m.

Chair: Mr. Martin Charwat

Notes: Mr. Michael Phillip

Trade policy in the EU is headed by one commissioner.

The EU and the US have one of the best trade relationships in the world, even though they are in many respects, competitors. 98% of all trade is accomplished without any issue. It is estimated that over twelve million jobs in the EU are directly related to trade.

We share common interest issues such as “intellectual property.” One example of another trade issue is “hormone beef.” There is scheduled for June 20th, a big US-EU trade summit in Washington D.C.

Q & A

Christian discussed in detail the EU position with regard to the Boeing/Airbus trade issue. He believes that mutual sanctions will resolve the issue, but the discourse will not be healthy.

Agricultural subsidies are currently sizable and are scheduled for a gradual phase-out. Incentive for new plant and plant relocation is left to the member state level.

In terms of the music industry, France provides heavy subsidies and restricts the screen time of French programming.

Meeting with Carlos Esteva Mosso, Directorate General for Competition
Thursday, June 2, 2005
5:00 p.m.

Chair: Dr. Jacqueline Taylor

Notes: Dr. John Rielly

Mr. Esteva Mosso is in charge of the Merger Policy and Strategic support unit of the Competition directorate. Prior to assuming this post at the beginning of this year, he was a member of the cabinet of Mario Monti, the previous Commissioner for Competition. This unit at the EU functions like the Antitrust Division of the US Justice Department, and to a limited extent like the US Federal Trade Commission. They recently established a special unit on cartels. They encouraged companies to plead guilty on a voluntary basis and offer to waive fines in many cases when they do. This has reduced the level of cartelization in the EU, where cartel violations remain a civil offence.

In the US it is a criminal offence, so in addition to fines, US executives can go to jail. The EU has no criminal law and no jails. The EU focuses on large mergers, generally involving three countries or more. Smaller cases are handled by national competition authorities. The EU has a fast track decision system, guaranteeing a preliminary decision within a month. They try hard to find an agreed solution and have blocked only 19 mergers out of 2500 cases in recent years. In this area of mergers, they work very closely with the US authorities. The dispute between the US authorities and the EU on the General Electric-Honeywell case was an exception, not the norm. At the time, there was no Assistant Attorney General for Antitrust in the US — and therefore not a clear interlocutor for the EU Competition Commissioner (Monti).

The differences were over substantive issues, not personalities --as sometimes claimed in the press. The EU claimed that GE could limit competition in the aerospace field by forcing engine buyers to buy avionics from Honeywell. The US argued that other producers would emerge, which could compete with GE in the future. Here the EU emphasized the impact in the medium term, while the US focused on the long term. The key issue here was whether the proposed merger would limit competition. Despite the fervent pleas of Jack Welch, CEO of GE and a direct intervention by President Bush, GE lost. American companies noted that it is no longer only the US that sets the standard in antitrust matters, but sometimes the EU.

The EU gives a lot of attention to monitoring state subsidies. Current cases focus on the German regional banks. They are often controlled by the regional governments and in almost all cases provide guarantees to the banks. Therefore their ratings are always triple A, usually giving them a competitive edge over private banks. These subsidies represent unfair competition according to the EU and therefore are being disallowed. This contrasts with the practice of American states, which regularly grant subsidies to companies to lure them to invest in their state.

One of the main objectives of the EU competition authority is to promote consistent competition regimes worldwide, by harmonizing rules. They tried and failed to achieve this through the World Trade Organization. Instead, the EU and the US jointly developed the International Competition Institution, an initiative of Asst Attorney General Joe Klein, supported by Mario Monti. Although this institution has no legal authority, it has been quite successful in persuading national competition authorities to harmonize competition rules according to international standards.

The problem of delocalization is an acute one for the EU. According to EU rules, poor countries and poor regions are allowed to have subsidies. Thus some companies are tempted to move from rich countries (e.g. Sweden) to poor countries like Portugal, to lower their wage costs. This problem has become more acute with the expansion of the EU to include East European countries, which are relatively poorer. This was a big issue in the two referendums, with French and Dutch workers fearing competition from poorer countries like Poland and Slovakia.

Although the EU competition authority has extended its reach, there is still a lot of power in national competition authorities. But the EU can overrule the national authorities-and is prepared to do in cases like the current attempt of Italian authorities to block a German bank from taking over an Italian bank. At the same time, there have been cases (e.g. Ruhrgas) where a national government has overruled a national competition authority. But it is the EU that has the last

word. It is important to note that the Competition authority at the EU deals only with questions of competition and does not address questions of job loss or employment. Nevertheless the Competition Directorate is regarded as one of the most powerful agencies in the European Union.

**Meeting with Mr. Joaquim Nunes de Almeida, Head of Unit “Fight against terrorism,
trafficking and exploitation of human beings, and law enforcement cooperation,”
Directorate-General “Justice, Freedom & Security”
Wednesday, June 1, 2005
3:00 p.m.**

Chair: Colonel W. Wayde Benson

Notes: Dr. Jacqueline Taylor

Joaquim, Nunes de Almeida, an attorney by training, spoke on terrorism and police cooperation among European member states. The unit's mission is to foster cooperation between the member states.

It has four big projects:

- 1: To make operational the principle of "availability of information" i.e. to see that information reaches all those it should. The unit believes that information sharing should be viewed as a right and should not have to be pleaded for by requesting agencies;
2. To develop interoperability of databases in order to protect human life, even if this may at times run afoul of privacy concerns;
3. To develop uniform standards between European member states on data protection;
4. To protect sources of information.

The unit is developing crisis management structures both against terrorist attacks and against natural disasters. Its aim is to have a central entry point to better deal with all types of major catastrophes.

The above structure is to be linked to police structures in member states — perhaps through Europol. Unlike the unit, Europol would have the right to participate in investigations and initiate investigations.

The unit also is in the early stages of defining what are the critical infrastructures that must be protected against terrorist attack. This requires defining priorities. The budget for this task is still

being worked on, but it will clearly command greater resources in the 2007-2013 period than it does now.

A policy paper is also being drafted on what can be done to prevent radicalization of young people and to prevent them from turning to violence. This is a delicate area but one in which proactive action needs to be taken.

Since the Madrid train bombings in March, 2004, the counter-terrorism unit has opened many new cases, and a situation center has been opened to better orient policies in the field of counter-terrorism.

The focus has been more on counter-terrorism than on organized crime, although the crisis management structures would serve both.

Standards have been developed on trafficking in human beings, and the 10 new accession states are all on notice that they must conform to these rules. Romania and Bulgaria, both candidate states, each face human trafficking issues that must be resolved before accession.

Intelligence sharing between European intelligence agencies and the U.S. Department of Homeland Security is probably better than intelligence sharing between these agencies and their own home-country police forces.

Foreign policy differences between the U.S. and some European states has not led to poor relations in intelligence sharing — even after the Iraq War. There appears to be an increasing climate of trust developing.

**Dinner with the American-European Community Association
Wednesday, June 1, 2005
7:00 p.m.**

Chair: Ms. Linda Trout

Notes: Dr. Jacqueline Taylor

The WACA Leadership Delegation had the privilege of being hosted by this prestigious association with members from the EU Parliament, Commission, business, industry, member state government officials, visiting diplomats, and European universities. The evening began with an informal reception at the Hotel Metropole where a large photo depicts such outstanding research geniuses as Madame Curie and Albert Einstein in a meeting at the Hotel, which has been in the family of Hotel Chairman Patrick Wielemans for four generations. Mr. Wielemans is also the Chair of the Alumni Club of Columbia University of New York. Ms. Ann Roberts-Bailes is the Executive Director of the AECA of Belgium. She also served as a gracious hostess for this elegant candlelight dinner and outstanding interactive discussion, which followed a presentation by Dr. John Rielly, WACA Delegation Leader.

The American European Community Association (AECA) is a dynamic forum that promotes and facilitates lively and informed debate on key business, economic and political topics. The association's chief goals are to improve and increase understanding and cooperation within Europe and between Europe and North America, and to advance opportunities in the globalized world.

Following a warm welcome from Mr. Wielemans and a toast for a successful evening and continued friendship, Dr. Rielly made his presentation where he argued that the Bush Administration's policy on security issues has already changed in the second term. It is not likely to implement a policy of preemption and regime change against additional states in the Middle East, including Iran. Where the Administration is not likely to change is on domestic policy. It will continue the profligate spending of the first term (expanding domestic spending by 32%), continue \$400 to \$500 billion dollar trade and budget deficits, continue to allow the dollar to weaken, continue to give priority to lowering taxes, and continue to rely heavily on Asian countries (including China) to finance America's growing external debt. The result will be a classic case of imperial overstretch, which will shorten the period of American hegemony. (Summary of presentation by Dr. John Rielly)

The oval table conversations often took the course of one-on-one or small group discussions as dinner guests and members exchanged points of view. An interesting interchange of opinions took place between a Conservative Member of Parliament and a Liberal Member of the Parliament who both admitted that they most often "agree to disagree." The Conservative Member of Parliament had a close tie with the MEP Edward McMillan-Scott who had earlier informed the WACA delegation that "The French vote was the first time that France has talked about Europe," and that, "It's about time." Even though they and others at the table came from divergent points of view, all agreed that the French vote on the EU constitution was a major problem for the EU and the future of the constitution was clearly in a state of confusion. They also were very sure, based on expected results, that the Dutch vote would also be a resounding "no." Additionally, they were in agreement that there are problems with health care costs and pensions in Europe and the European Union as there are nearly identical problems that are being faced in the United States. The recent visits by both President Bush and Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice were seen as positive steps in strengthening the relationships of the two major entities that are "across the pond" from each other and critical in their importance for both areas.

The AECA was founded in London and New York in 1980 and the network is extensive, international and interactive. The creation of ties and friendships are central to the strengthening of the TransAtlantic relationship, strategic alliances and relationships have been established between AECA and other international associations on both sides of the Atlantic. Several individuals around the table felt that additional ties and friendships were established with this excellent opportunity to dialogue, exchange views, and open up minds and hearts to more clearly understand the underpinnings as well as the concerns and the visions for the future of both the European Union and the United States.

**Meeting with Mr. Noel White, Councillor for Administrative Affairs and Relations with
the European Parliament at the Irish Permanent Representation to the European Union
Thursday, June 2, 2005
9:45 a.m.**

Chair: Mr. Fred Ameri

Notes: Ms. Eileen Heaphy

The delegation's meeting with Mr. White was the only one with a diplomat representing a member nation before the EU. The meeting was very useful for explaining how a member state manages its relations with the EU institutions and how a member handles the presidency which it assumes for six months on a rotational basis .

The Irish Mission to the EU is the second smallest of the member states (pre-enlargement) with a staff of eighty. Although 80 seems like a large number, this staff must cover over 160 working groups on European issues which must be attended in order to protect and promote Irish interests. Although Ireland may not have a major interest in all the work of all the committees, it must be present in case an issue arises which requires their attention. During an Irish presidency, the mission's staff doubles because the presidency must chair all councils and must move the EU process forward. Although national interests must be put aside during the presidency, the six-month challenging period is very important to raising national public awareness of the value of the European Union.

White also discussed at length what membership to the European Union has done for Ireland, which is now considered the most economically successful member of the EU. The Common Agricultural Policy was crucial during the early years of membership in raising agricultural productivity. The agricultural sector rose 60% per capita, during that time. In the 80's, deepening Euro integration brought Ireland a lot of structural funds and the country was able to keep social and labor costs down through disciplined national wage agreements. Instead it plowed these new resources into education. Now Ireland routinely experiences 5% annual GDP growth with an inflation rate of only 2.1%. Its per capita rate is 23% above the EU average, and it has the lowest unemployment rate of only 4.3%. For the first time in its modern history, Ireland is a net importer of people, i.e. immigration instead of a net exporter. Its rate of college graduates has increased five fold with EU membership.

White pointed out that this process took 30 years and most of its local industry, which had been highly protected, did not survive. However, the country made a huge transition from an agricultural to an industrial and service society. Now Ireland receives fewer breaks from the EU and must compete in a different way by increasing the added value it brings to any process or product. Some economic bottlenecks still exist and need to be fixed in order to continue inward investment at the high level that has characterized the Irish economy. Nevertheless, Ireland continues to have disciplined public policies and a flexible workforce.

More significantly than the economic statistics, White pointed out that EU membership was even more important for the tremendous change in Irish self-perception that has occurred. Membership "opened Ireland's eyes" to Europe and helped break its dependency on the British Sterling. Although Great Britain is still hugely important to the Irish economy, the European perspective

brought more balance to the political and psychological relationship. White cited the idea often stated by northern Ireland nationalist leader John Hume that Ireland's ability to look outside the British Isles toward Europe made the peace process possible in Northern Ireland.

Meeting with Ms. Luana Reale, Policy Officer
“Development Policy, Coherence, and Forward Studies”
Unit, Directorate – General Development
Friday, June 3, 2005
10:00 am

Chair: Mr. Fred Ameri

Notes: Ms. Deanna Pelfrey

Ms. Reale is on a two year assignment to the EU from Italy and is working in the unit responsible for development policy regarding governance, emigration, and oversight. Her presentation was formal and was followed with questions and answers.

In November 2000, the Council and the Commission signed a joint statement agreeing to poverty reduction in developing countries. This joint statement centered on six areas with focus on economic issues, regional integration, and trade integration and considering gender issues, environment, and human rights. However, as implementation of this joint statement moved forward, it became apparent that integration and coordination of efforts was not occurring.

It was determined that new issues needed to be identified and a wider perspective gained in order to accomplish identified objectives. Key to this effort was to have more effective communication with all parties: stakeholders, economic and social committees, academic think tanks, NGOs, private sector, Council, and Parliament. A process of information gathering through meetings and surveys was begun and included dialogue with all parties.

When this process was completed, a report was prepared which is currently posted on the web site. From this report fourteen issues were identified and an issues paper prepared on each. As a result, the preparation of a new development policy is now in process.

New Policy: The new policy recognizes and incorporates the following elements –

- More specific;
- Parliament is participating;
- Development is part of external relations, not subordinated;
- Poverty is multi-dimensional and therefore must solve in a multi-dimensional manner;
- Involve trade, e.g., Doha meeting agreement.

The Commission manages community aid and development, but under the new policy there is now emphasis on the shared responsibility of development. The Commission and member states

are now engaged and working together to accomplish the objectives in a coherent, coordinated, and complementary manner.

Since there is agreement at the heart of the EU regarding human values and human rights, guidelines for these core elements must be managed at the Commission level, but community relations and communication for these elements must be managed at the national level.

General programming and development policy is established through one Directorate-General and implementation occurs through a separate Directorate-General.

In writing the new development, policy emphasis has been placed on brokering discussions with others, such as the ILO and the World Bank, and establishing partnerships with United Nations agencies.

As the new development policy is drafted, a core value dominates as all participants emphasize multilateralism. Language has even been borrowed from the Milan Declaration to emphasize security, human rights, and multilateralism.

Another vital aspect is that all development activities must be accountable to citizens; therefore, mechanisms must be in place to measure the impact for the dollars spent.

*All of the rich countries in the world
should be more humble regarding the poor
and poor nations.*

— Ms. Luana Reale, Policy Officer in
Development Policy, General Development

**Meeting with Mr. Graham Avery, Principal Adviser & Director of Strategy, Coordination
& Analysis, Directorate-General “External Relations”**

Friday, June 3, 2005

1:00 p.m.

Also present:

**Mr. Andrew Denison, Desk Officer in the U.S.A. Unit of the Directorate General “External
Relations”**

Chair: Dr. John Rielly

Notes: Dr. Jacqueline Taylor

Mr. Avery delivered the address and responded to the questions in this meeting; however, prior to the luncheon meeting, Mr. Denison had the opportunity to discuss with many members of the delegation the role of the EU Centers in the US and the strong support that they can be for the local World Affairs Councils. This is an important asset for the World Affairs Councils to use, and the delegation members will be contacted by Mr. Denison to help communicate this information.

Mr. Avery began by saying that after the French vote the following was being asked, “The answer is no! What is the question?” While this was somewhat tongue in cheek, it was reflective of the influence and the effect that the French vote had on the EU constitution and its future. By the time of this meeting, the Netherlands vote on the EU constitution had also resulted in a resounding “no.” His question related to what the next steps will be; how will the EU go from here; will the voting still take place in the other 14 member states that have not yet held their referendums?

Mr. Avery has been actively involved in enlargement issues for the last decade and he has been working with the EU since the United Kingdom became a member. He had spent some time in the US at the Center for International Affairs at Harvard during the Reagan/Gorbachev discussions and he came back to Europe even more motivated.

He feels that the enlargement of the EU is an extraordinary success story on how to build a coalition of member states in a peaceful way. With the collapse of the Soviet Union, the EU has been able to bring in countries such as Lithuania (a country that had been in the shadow of Moscow) and yet at the same time the EU was able to establish relations with Russia. External relations can help bring different kinds of people together in a way that should help them build together for European national foreign policy. He did indicate his regret that in the case of Iraq, the Europeans were not able to speak with a unified voice; however, Iraq has had an effect so he feels that the next time a situation like this occurs, the EU will be better prepared to identify common areas. While the US and the EU can go their separate ways, it is absolutely evident that if they can work together, they will both be much stronger. While some might think that it is a good thing that the US got a “bloody nose” in Iraq, there is more a sense of shame on the EU side that it could not get together and support the US.

Eastern European problems have been covered more through persuasion, as in the Ukraine, where the EU member states have been able to act together and have been able to address the situation rapidly. Also, in the case of Ukraine, the US was able to help. How can the EU and the US move beyond this and better communicate in “crunch” points and how can we better dialogue? One response to this is the EU/US Summit that is coming up soon and these questions will be discussed. He feels that the EU must be ready from time to time to use force and it is building up to that.

Iran will be a good example where discussion and collaboration have been used. Iran was persuaded not to use nuclear weapons and sanctions have been imposed. This can work with the current administration. The Bush II administration appears to be more interested in talking than during the Bush I administration. The EU is very much more ready to understand and listen. However, Turkey could be a test case.

It is still difficult to figure out Russia. Russian neighbors want to join the EU, but Russia itself joining the EU does not seem feasible and Russia has not applied to join. History shows that Russia probably does not want to submit to all the rules and regulations of the EU. Yet, cooperation is important and the EU sees hesitation from Russia related to the points in the Four Spaces, i.e., economics, justice, values and security. Also, there is a human rights question related to Chechnya.

The no vote rationale for France and the Netherlands focused on the following:

- France has had job increases due to growth because of being part of the EU
- The French feel that with more members, the French may have less influence
- There may be more focus on the EU or Washington
- It really may be due to domestic politics; many of the French questions were not related to the EU constitution, yet the vote was on the constitution
- The enlargement may have been one of the real problems; the French may be worried about the possibility of Turkey becoming a member. There still exist many problems within Turkey, which raise the question of security. A significant enquiry about Turkey is related to what makes Turkey European?

In all, the referendum votes will continue to be taken into consideration by the EU and discussion will be forthcoming very soon on whether to continue the votes on the EU constitution.

Meeting with Mr. Karel Kovanda, Deputy Director-General for External Relations
Friday, June 3, 2005
3:00 p.m.

Chair: Ms. Eileen Heaphy

Notes: Dr. Pat LeMay Burr

Mr. Kovanda, who has lived for twenty years in various U.S. cities and is familiar with far more U.S. cities, described his various assignments around the world and his favorite areas of the U.S. as he began his far-ranging discussion of EU issues. One of his positions was as Ambassador to the United Nations and he worked with U.S. Ambassador Madeleine Albright in that capacity. He had just this morning returned from a two-day meeting in Washington, DC with Condoleezza Rice.

“The party line is that the U.S. and EU relationship is on the up and up since President Bush visited the EU in February 2005, and the truth is that the party line is right,” he began.

Kovanda sees the depth of that relationship as strong in trade, investment and culture, and our current greatest mutual interest of seeing Iraq on a stable and healthy footing. He believes that “differences of opinion might exist but not the continuing rift that the press describes. There has been no emphasis placed on the extent to which we (the EU and the US) agree, although at times there could be a difference of opinion or approach. The press has not caught up yet,” he added, “since the greatest attraction of the press was focused on Iraq. That is over and it is now time to move forward.”

He discussed the June 2005 Summit in Washington, D.C., adding that eight documents will be adopted at the Summit. Richard Wright of the External Relations Commission who was to have been the speaker at today’s luncheon is still in Washington DC reviewing and preparing the documents for this Summit. The bilateral relationship between the EU and the US is the cornerstone. Just a few of the areas to be focused on include: elimination of any barriers for business since one major overarching issue is the economy (fourteen million people on both sides of the ocean owe their jobs to EU-US business relationships); there must be safe and secure borders and yet there must be ways to develop a “safe space” for travel for diplomats; the environment is an area of concern. In addition, the Middle East peace process with the question of the Gaza withdrawal is an area in which we must work together. The EU is a little more in favor of Palestine and a little more lenient with Syria. The EU would like to see Gaza handed over without assets demolished, and Hamas cannot have the upper hand. He also pointed out that the EU and NATO are doing what they can in supporting the African Union as it relates to Darfour.

Iraq is at a crucial juncture and on June 22, the EU and the US are co-hosting a major conference on this topic. Neighbors, donors, people who helped liberate Iraq will be included; this conference will focus on what Iraq needs and what has been already instituted and how to support the new Iraqi government.

The United Nations is in dire straits at this time; there needs to be substantive EU input into the rejuvenation of the UN and the EU has great faith in the UN; however, the EU is not a member of the UN and cannot be unless the Constitution is adopted. The EU does have a delegation in New York, though, to communicate with and stay up to date with the UN. He feels that Kofi Annan has carefully reflected on bringing in new concepts and new ideas and that it is appropriate to protect human rights and address environmental concerns.

As of this week, nine nations have adopted the Constitution, two (France and The Netherlands) have rejected it, and 14 nations' decisions remain.

Kovanda reconfirmed the EU process, which is that the 25-member EU Commission is the guardian of the issues that the EU member states have raised, and the Commission has the right to initiate projects. Then, if the EU Council agrees the issue/recommendation/policy is moved forward.

**Meeting with Mr. Kyle Scott, Political Minister-Counselor
US Mission to the European Union
Friday, June 3, 2005
4:30 pm**

Chair: Dr. Jacqueline Taylor

Notes: Ms. Eileen Heaphy

Kyle Scott, a seasoned US diplomat serving his third year at the US Mission to the EU, was our final appointment of the week and as such provided the much needed American response to all we had heard during the week. Chair of the meeting, Dr. Jacqueline Taylor, started the meeting with remarks that we had "a whale of a week" and that we were leaving with the equivalent of a graduate course in the European Union.

Mr. Scott focused his remarks in two major area – US-EU foreign relations and US-EU economic relations. He started with the United States official position that the European Union is America's indispensable partner; no other region or country in the world is able to support our important goals as the EU does. Our fifty years of relations have been marked by America's long-term commitment to European unity based on a belief that such unity is a great benefit to our country, although some in America question that view right now. The historic "no" votes in France and the Netherlands meant that the EU had more media coverage during the week of our delegation's visit in more than a year. Scott cautioned that the votes did not signal a break-up of the EU; the EU is still a major power, it will continue to function, and we will continue to work with them. He described the EU as a complex railway system that looks tangled from the ground, but viewed from above, the network looks more logical and the train is always moving ahead. Switzerland's

interest in joining the Schengen Accord (free movement of people within the Schengen Accord region) demonstrates that a unified Europe is still a powerful concept.

In the area of the Common Foreign and Security Policy, which was only a dream ten years ago, the EU has managed to create consensus on 90% of issues. There is a common security policy toward Bosnia, Macedonia, Georgia, Iraq, and Sudan on the question of troop use and training of police forces. At the EU-US Ministerial in Washington the previous day, the key message was that we have a huge common agenda. We are both committed to a Europe whole, free, and at peace. The possibility of enlargement has been the greatest force for peaceful regime change as possible candidate countries try to achieve the standards of democracy set by the EU. Additionally, the EU and the US have a common approach to achieving these goals in the Balkans, Ukraine, and Belarus.

In the larger foreign policy arena, we also share the same agenda on Russia, the Caucasus, the Arab-Israeli dispute and the broader Middle East. Scott emphasized that the EU supports American efforts to make Iraq and Afghanistan a success even though the Iraq invasion is still unpopular and criticized by many EU members. He pointed out that our popularity in Europe is very low, especially with the European media. On terrorism cooperation, the commitment is strong; however the EU does not have a good mechanism for tracing terrorists. The US wants to see improvement in European capabilities. On Iraq, the EU is not united on how much help to provide. There is no EU office in Baghdad. However, the recent donor conference on Iraq was an EU initiative.

On Iran, Germany, France, the UK, and CFSP chief Javier Solana are negotiating with Iran on the issue of its nuclear program. We are glad of their efforts because it is the only process existing right now, and chances of the US involving the UN in this issue are very slim. So we are supporting the EU's efforts.

Scott pointed at the EU foreign policy process as one of consensus that is focused in the Council, not the Commission. Policy is made by delegates to the Council that travel weekly from the capitals to work out these issues. It is a process that cannot be made as easily or quickly as a single country can do. The Parliament has a negligible role in foreign policy and is usually more negative about American foreign policy than is the Council. Therefore, it is frustrating for the US at times. In addition, the EU members are more focused on international instruments of cooperation than is the US and the EU is more hesitant to use financial or military pressure to bring around countries like Iran.

Scott also reviewed economic issues on the EU-US agenda. He cautioned against too much emphasis on our disputes, pointing out the Airbus/Boeing and other headline grabbing trade disputes represent only 2% of our total bilateral trade. The entire EU-US economic relationship comprises \$1 trillion a year. He said that the next major agenda item for the relationship is to improve the regulatory climate for multinational corporations on both sides of the Atlantic. These companies want a joint EU-US regulatory regime that is predictable and will simplify trade between the two blocs. The latest stumbling block for European companies operating in the US is the Sarbanes-Oxley legislation, which has imposed costly organizational and accounting burdens on them. This is an area where the EU wants to see change.

Dr. Taylor concluded the meeting with thanks to Kyle Scott for providing the essential US view to complete the picture of America's relationship with the European Union. It remained for the WACA delegation to continue informing Americans about the European Union with programs in our individual councils.

I very much admire the role of the World Affairs Council in the U.S. It plays a critical role in enhancing the U.S. consciousness of world affairs.

The EU and U.S. have a huge common agenda right now.

— Kyle Scott, Minister Counselor for Political Affairs, U.S. Mission to the EU

Belgian Contacts

Dr. Ronald D. Asmus
Executive Director
TC Transatlantic Center,
The German Marshall Fund of the
United States
Résidence Palace
Rue de la Loi 155 Wetstraat
1040 Brussels
Belgium
Tel: +32 2 235 2225
Email: Erasmus@gmfus.org

Mr. Fabrizio Barbaso
Directeur Général f.f.
Commission Européenne
Direction Générale Elargissement
Commission Européenne
Bureau: CHAR 04/116
B-1049 Bruxelles
Rue de la Loi 170,
B-1040 Bruxelles
Tel: + 32-2-295.67.39
Fax: + 32-2-296.84.90
Email: fabrizio.barbaso@cec.eu.int

Mr. Christian Burgsmuller
Transatlantic Dialogues, US and Canada
Market Access
European Commission
Directorate-General for Trade
European Commission
Office: CHAR 08/41
BE-1049 Brussels
Rue de la Loi/Wetstraat 170,
BE-1040 Bruxelles/Brussel

Mr. Georges H. de Veirman
President & Chief Executive
The American European Community
Association
AECA-Belgium, Europe

Brussels, Strasbourg, Geneva
Avenue de Messidor Iaan 208 – box 1
B -1180 Brussels, Belgium
Tel: +32 (0) 2 344 59 49
Fax: +32 (0) 2 344 53 43
aeca@aeca-europe.org

Mr. John Disharoon
Director Public Affairs, Europe
Caterpillar Group Services S.A.
Humbeeksesteenweg 98
B-1850 Grimbergen – Belgium
Tel: 32 (0) 2 254 44 77
Fax: 32 (0) 2 254 45 13
Email: JTD@cat.com

Mr. Carles Esteva Mosso
Head of Unit Merger Policy
European Commission
Competition Directorate-General
European Commission
Office: J-70 03/94 - BE-1049 Brussels
Rue Joseph II/Jozef II-straat 70,
BE-1000 Bruxelles/Brussels
Tel: + 32 2 296 97 21
Fax: + 32 2 296 95 83
Email: carles.esteva-mosso@cec.eu.int

Mr. Henrik Fallesen
Head of DI's Brussels Office
Permanent Delegate
European Affairs
M.A. Political Science
Dansk Industri
Confederation of Danish Industries
Avenue de Cortenbergh 168
B-1000 Bruxelles
Tel: +32 2 285 05 50
Fax: +32 2 285 05 55
Email: hef@di.dk

Ms. Janice George-MaCormack
Priority Visits
European Commission
Directorate-General for Education and
Culture
European Commission
Office: VM-2 03-05
B-1049 Brussels
Office: Rue Van Maerlant/Van
Maelanstraat 2,
B-1040 Bruxelles/Brussel
Tel: + 32-2-299.91 04
Fax: + 32-2-299.92.13
Email: janice.george@cec.eu.int

Mr. Douglas Gregory
Vice President
Governmental Programs
IBM
IBM Europe, Middle East and Africa
Avenue du Bourget 42
B-1130 Brussels, Belgium
Tel: +32 2 225 27 67
Fax: +32 2 225 22 64
Email: doug_gregory@be.ibm.com

Mr. Paul Hatry
Ancien Ministre
Senteur Honoraire
Professure emerite, Université Libre de
Bruzelles
President et Administrateur de sociétés
Senat
Avenue de Colombie 8
B-1000 Bruxelles
Tel: +32 2 660 00 67
Fax: +32 2 660 72 27

Ms. Carola Kaps
Economic Correspondent
Central and South East Europe
Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung for
Deutschland
Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung GmbH
Rue Belliard, 197
B- 1040 Brussels

Tel: +32 2 235 07 82
Fax: +32 2 230 08 32
c.kaps@faz.de

Mr. Karel Kovanda
Deputy Director General
European Commission
External Relations Directorate-General
European Commission
Office: CHAR 12/122
BE-1049 Brussels
Rue de la Loi/Wetstraat 170,
BE-1040 Bruxelles/Brussel
Tel: + 32 2 298 07 65
Fax: +32 2 298 0765
Email: karel.kovanda@ce.eu.int

Mr. Edward McMillan-Scott, MEP
Vice-president
European Parliament
Rue Wiertz B – 1067 Brussels
Tel: +32 2 298 07 65
Fax: +32 2 284 99 59
Email: emcmillanscott@callnetuk.com

Mr. Bill Newton Dun, MEP
Liberal Democrat MEP for Derbyshire,
Leicestershire, Lincolnshire,
Northamptonshire,
Nottinghamshire & Rutland
Liberal Democrats
10 Church Lane
Navenby
Lincoln LN 5 0EG
Tel: +32 2 284 77 12
Email: wnewton@europart.eu.int

Mr. Joaquim Nunes de Almeida
Head of Unit
Fight against terrorism, trafficking
And exploitation of human beings,
And law enforcement cooperation
European Commission
Directorate-General Justice and Home
Affairs
European Commission

Office: LX46 03/98
B-1049 Brussels
Rue du Luxembourg/Luxemburgstraat
46,
B-1000 Bruxelles/Brussel
Tel: +32 2 295 54 28
Fax: +32 2 296 76 16
Email: joaquim.nunes-de-
almeida@cec.eu.int

Mr. David O' Sullivan
The Secretary General
European Commission
Office: BERL 13/173
BE-1049 Brussels
Rue de la Loi/Wetstraat 200,
BE-1040 Bruxelles/Brussel
Tel: +32 2 295.09.48
Fax: +32 2 299 32 29
Email: david.o'sullivan@cec.eu.int

Mr. Jan-Peter Paul
Adviser to the Deputy Director-General
European Commission
Directorate-General for Health and
Consumer Protection
European Commission
Office: B232 09/01
BE-1049 Brussels
Rue Belliard/Belliardstraat 232,
BE-1040 Bruxelles/Brussel
Tel: + 32 2 299 50 64
Fax: + 32 2 292 1879
Email: jan-peter.paul@cec.eu.int

Mr. Jean-Paul Perruche
Général de corps d'armée
Conseil de L'Union Européenne
Secrétariat Général
visiteurs
Avenue de Cortenbergh, 150
B-1040 Bruxelles
Rue de la Loi, 175
B-1048 Bruxelles
Tel: +32 2 285 59 90
Fax: +32 2 285 59 91

Email: jean-
paul.perruche@consilium.eu.int

Ms. Luana Reale
Development Policy, Coherence and
Forward Studies
European Commission
Development Directorate-General
Office: G-12 07/79
B - 1049 Brussels
Rue de Geneve/Genevestraat 12,
B-1140 Bruxelles/Brussel
Tel: + 32 2 296 96 86
Fax: + 32-2-299.29.15
Email: luana.reale@cec.eu.int

Mr. Kyle Scott
Political Minister Counselor
United States Mission to the European
Union
Rue Zinner 13
1000 Brussels
Tel: +32 2 508 2111
Fax: +32 2 513 1477
Email: scottkr@state.gov

Mr. Claus Sorensen
Head of Cabinet
European Commission
Cabinet of Mariann Fischer Boel
Commissioner for Agriculture and Rural
Development
European Commission
BERL 09/374
BE- 1049 Brussels
Rue de la Loi/Wetstraat 200,
BE-1040 Bruxelles/Brussels
Tel: + 32 2 298 66 44
Fax: + 32 2 298 86 06
Email: claus.sorensen@cec.eu.int

Mr. Gerhard Stahl
Advocaat
Generalsekretär
Europäische Union
Ausschuss der Regionen

Rue Belliard 101
B-1040 Brussel
Tel: +32 2 282 20 05 06
Fax: +32 (0) 2 282 20 07
Email: gerhard.stahl@cor.eu.int

Mr. Yves Tavernier
Advocaat
Coudert Brothers LLP
Coppens Van Ommeslaghe & Faurès
Louizalaan 81 (B. I) - B - 1050 Brussel
Tel: +32 2 542 88 88
Fax: +32 2 542 89 89
Email: ytavernier@belgium.coudert.com

Mr. Geoffrey Van Orden, MEP
Email: gvanorden@europarl.eu.int

Mr. Noel White
Counsellor
Permanent Representation of Ireland
to the European Union
Rue Froissart 89-93
1040 Brussels
Tel: +32 02 282 32 27
Fax: +32 02 230 31 88
noel.white@iveagh.irlgov.ie

Mr. Patrick Wielemans
President de la L.A. Hotel Metropole
L.A. Hotel Metropole
77 avenue Hamoir
1180 Bruxelles
31, place de Brouckere
1000 Bruxelles

American Contacts

Mr. Fred Ameri
Chairman, Board of Trustees-Executive
Board
World Affairs Council of Orange
County
2102 Business Center Drive
Irvine, CA 92612
Tel: (949) 253-5751
Fax: (949) 253-5752
Email: wacoc@hotmail.com

Colonel W. Wayne Benson
President
The Global Group
318 Delaronde Street
New Orleans, LA 70114
Tel: (504) 697-2548 (v)
Fax: (504) 697-2693
Email: wayde.benson@navy.mil

Mr. Martian Charwat
President
World Affairs Council of the Mid.
Hudson Valley
75 Washington St
Poughkeepsie, NY 12601
Tel: (845) 546-2118
Fax: (845) 485-5164
info@hvworldaffairsCouncil.org

Ms. Eileen Heaphy
Executive Director
World Affairs Councils of America
Executive Committee
National Board of Directors
111 Prospect Street, Suite 310
Stamford, CT 06901
Tel: (203) 356-0340
Fax: (203) 348-7130
eheaphy@worldaffairsforum.org

Dr. Pat LeMay Burr
Distinguished Chair
International Business
H-E-B School of Business &
Administration
University of the Incarnate Word
4301 Broadway, Box 5
San Antonio, Texas 78209
Tel: (210) 805-5806
Fax: (210) 805-3564
Email: burr@universe.uiwtx.edu

Michael Maibach
President & CEO
European-American Business Council
1331 Pennsylvania Avenue NW # 600
Washington, DC 20004-1790
Tel: (202) 637-3434
Email: m@Maibach.us

**Ms. Deanna K. W. Pelfrey, APR,
Fellow PRSA**
President
Pelfrey Associates, INC
National Board of Directors
World Affairs Councils of America
730 W. Main Street
Louisville, KY 40202-4244
P.O. Box 406820
Louisville, KY 40204
Tel: (502) 581-1455
Tel 2: (502) 584-0371
Fax: (502) 581-1458
Fax 2: (502) 584-0207
Email: dpelfrey@guthriemayes.com
Email 2: dkwp@pelfreyassociates.com

Mr. Phillip Michael
Vice President Senior Financial Advisor
Merrill Lynch
300 Esplanade Drive, Suite 2150
Oxnard, California 93036
Tel: (805) 981-3210
Fax: (805) 485-2692
michael_a_phillip@ml.com

Dr. John Rielly
Adjunct Professor
Center for International and
Comparative Studies
Northwestern University
1902 Sheridan Road
Evanston, IL 60208-4005
Tel: (847) 491-2580
Fax: (847) 467-1996
Email: jrielly@northwestern.edu

Dr. Jacqueline Taylor
Vice President of Development
Davenport University
415 East Fulton Street
Grand Rapids, MI 49503
Tel: (616) 233-3418
Fax: (616) 233-3462
Email: jacqueline.taylor@davenport.edu

Ms. Linda Trout, J.D.
Executive Director
International Relations Council
2600 Commerce Tower
911 Main St.
Kansas City, MO 64105-2049
Tel: (816) 221-4204
Fax: (816) 221-4206
Email: ltrout@irckc.org