Order Code RL32342

NATO and the European Union

April 6, 2004

Kristin Archick
Analyst in European Affairs
Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division

Paul Gallis
Specialist in European Affairs
Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division

NATO and the European Union

Summary

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

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

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

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

This report will be updated as events warrant. For more information, see CRS Report RS21354, *The NATO Summit at Prague, 2002*, by Paul Gallis, and CRS Report RS21372, *The European Union: Questions and Answers*, by Kristin Archick.

Contents

List of Tables

NATO and the European Union

Background

Both NATO and the European Community (EC), now the European Union (EU), had their origins in post-World War II efforts to bring stability to Europe. NATO's original purpose was to provide collective defense through a mutual security guarantee for the United States and its European allies to counterbalance potential threats from the Soviet Union. The European Community's purpose was to provide political stability to its members through securing democracy and free markets. Congress and successive Administrations have strongly supported both NATO and the EC/EU, based on the belief that stability in Europe has engendered the growth of democracy, reliable military allies, and strong trading partners.

Evolution of NATO and the EC/EU after the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991 has brought with it some friction between the United States and several of its allies over the security responsibilities of the two organizations. These differences center around threat assessment, defense institutions, and military capabilities.

European NATO allies that were also members of the EC/EU have sought from 1990 to build a security apparatus able to respond to developments believed to threaten specifically the interests of Europe. In 1990, after Iraq's invasion of Kuwait, some European governments — led by France — concluded that they lacked the military capabilities to respond beyond the North Atlantic Treaty area to distant threats. In consultation with the United States, they sought to establish the European Security and Defense Identity (ESDI) within NATO, in which they would consult among themselves and with NATO over response to a threat. Both the first Bush Administration and the Clinton Administration asked that ESDI not duplicate NATO structures, such as headquarters and a planning staff, but rather "borrow" NATO structures for planning and carrying out operations. Initial reluctance of the Clinton Administration to involve the United States in the emerging conflicts accompanying the break up of Yugoslavia led some allies to redouble their efforts to enhance their political consultation, unity, and military capabilities. They saw a threat in the form of large refugee flows, autocratic regimes, and the spread of nationalist ideas emanating from the conflict-ridden Balkans.

In 1994-1996, NATO endorsed steps to build an ESDI that was "separable but not separate" from NATO to give the European allies the ability to act in crises where NATO as a whole was not engaged.

In 1998-1999, the EU largely adopted ESDI as its own and began to transform it into a European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP), given greater definition by more detailed arrangements for the Europeans to borrow NATO assets for the "Petersberg tasks" (crisis management, peace operations, search and rescue, and

humanitarian assistance). Britain, in a major policy reversal, joined France in moving forward discussions of these new arrangements within the EU. ESDP's principal differences with ESDI were in the effort to secure more independence from NATO tutelage and guidance in the event that the United States expressed reluctance to become involved in a crisis, a renewed discussion of more carefully outlined EU decision-making structures, and consideration of forces appropriate for potential crises. The Kosovo conflict of 1999 further spurred this effort, when most EU members of NATO conceded that they still lacked adequately mobile and sustainable forces for crisis management. All EU members express a wish to see a strong U.S.-led NATO. However, there are disputes with the United States over how or whether to involve international institutions, such as the UN, in international crises. There are also disagreements over the weight given to political versus military instruments in resolving these crises. These disputes have fueled European desires to develop a more independent ESDP.[1] The United States maintains that ESDP must be closely tied to NATO, given the large number of states that belong to both NATO and the EU (see membership chart in Appendix) and limited European defense resources.

Congress is actively engaged in the evolving NATO-EU relationship. While Congress has supported the greater political integration that marked the European Community's evolution into the European Union, many Members have called for improved European military capabilities to share the security burden, and to ensure that NATO's post-Cold War mission embraces combating terrorism and WMD proliferation. In 1998 and again in 2003 the Senate approved the addition of new members to the alliance as a means to build European stability through securing democratic governments and adding states that shared concerns over emerging threats.

During the 1998 NATO enlargement debate, Senator Jon Kyl offered an amendment to the instrument of ratification that described terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) as new threats that NATO must counter. The Kyl amendment called on the European allies to develop capabilities "to project power... and provide a basis for ad hoc coalitions of willing partners...." Member states should "possess national military capabilities to rapidly deploy forces over long distances, sustain operations for extended periods of time, and operate jointly with the United States in high intensity conflict."[2] The amendment passed by a wide margin. Its essence was apparent in NATO's Strategic Concept, the alliance's strategic guidelines, adopted at the Washington summit in April 1999, and in subsequent NATO agreements to redefine the alliance's mission and to improve capabilities.

The issues raised in the 1990s debate over European security remain the essence of the debate today. What are the missions in security affairs of NATO and the European Union? What is the proper weight to be given to political and military instruments in defending Europe and the United States from terrorism and

---

[1] For a detailed examination of ESDI and ESDP up to 2000, see CRS Report RL30538, *European Security: The Debate in NATO and the European Union*, April 25, 2000, by Karen Donfried and Paul Gallis.

[2] Executive Amendment no. 2310, *Congressional Record*, April 27, 1998, p. S3657.

proliferation? What types of military forces are necessary for NATO's role in collective defense, and for the EU's role in crisis management? Are NATO and EU decision-making structures and procedures appropriate and compatible to ensure that there is an adequate and timely response to emerging threats? What should be the role of other international institutions in responding to these threats? Issues raised by these questions are the subject of this report.

NATO's Mission and Response to Threats

There is a consensus in NATO that terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction are the principal threats facing the allies today. NATO's 1999 *Strategic Concept* states that the allied "defense posture must have the capability to address appropriately and effectively the risks" associated with the proliferation of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons. The document also describes terrorism as a threat, but indicates that political and diplomatic means should be the main instruments against both terrorism and proliferation. The attacks of September 11, 2001, on the United States led to a refinement of the allied posture on these threats.

In a May 2002 communiqué, NATO agreed that the allies must "be able to field forces that can move quickly to wherever they are needed, sustain operations over distance and time, and achieve their objectives." The communiqué marks the alliance's most explicit statement of a commitment to go "out of area," beyond the Treaty area and the European theater to combat threats.

In November 2002, at the Prague summit, the allies made a commitment to build the capabilities necessary to go out of area. They agreed to establish a NATO Response Force (NRF) of 20,000 troops for rapid "insertion" into a theater of operations. The NRF, to be fully operational in 2006, will consist of highly trained combat units from member states, and could be used to fight terrorism. In addition, the allies agreed to a scaled-down list of new capabilities, called the Prague Capabilities Commitment (PCC), that declining European defense budgets might be able to sustain. Under the PCC, some allies have agreed to develop consortia to fund jointly such systems as strategic airlift and aerial refueling, meant to provide mobility for combat operations distant from Europe, or specialized "niche" capabilities, such as special forces or units to detect chemical or biological agents.[3]

U.S.-European Differences over Threat Response

Despite the transatlantic agreement on the new common threats, the NRF, and the PCC, there are significant differences between the United States and its allies over appropriate responses. Most allied governments contend that the Administration places excessive emphasis on military over political means to counter a threat, and that the allies have other domestic budget priorities (such as pension plans) that compete with allocations for defense.

---

[3] For a detailed analysis of the PCC, see CRS Report RS21659, *NATO's Prague Capabilities Commitment*, by Carl Ek.

The allies' response to the Bush Administration's doctrine of "pre-emptive attack" in the face of an imminent threat captures elements of the transatlantic debate over response to the threat. The Administration's *National Security Strategy* (2002) notes that the United States reserves the right to take military action "to forestall or prevent... hostile acts" by an adversary. While most allies would concede such a right, some view the doctrine as an example of U.S. unilateralism at the moment of U.S. global military pre-eminence. In general, they believe that military action must be undertaken within a multilateral framework.

The allied debate over pre-emptive attack has been affected by the U.S. decision to terminate UN weapons inspections and to go to war against Iraq in March 2003, a conflict Administration officials indicate was undertaken to prevent the Hussein regime from developing and using weapons of mass destruction against the United States and other countries. The initial refusal by France, Germany, and Belgium to approve NATO military assistance to Turkey in February 2003 in anticipation of a possible attack by Iraq sharply divided the alliance. The three allies contended that such assistance would amount to tacit approval of a U.S. belief that war with Iraq was necessary. Most allies said then, and maintain now, that a UN resolution is a requisite step, whenever possible, for NATO military action. The inability of the Bush Administration to locate WMD in Iraq has led to renewed insistence among the European allies that their opposition was correct and that a UN imprimatur should be sought for NATO operations.[4]

Allied insistence on involvement of international institutions in "legitimizing" conflict has its origins in the aftermath of the 20th century's two world wars. Europeans remain wary of arguments justifying the crossing of borders and resorting to military action. Establishment of the United Nations in 1946, under U.S. leadership, was one means to ensure that international diplomatic and public opinion could be brought to bear to enhance understanding of an impending danger and how to respond to it. The North Atlantic Treaty's (1949) reliance on the consensus method of decision-making was another.

The allied debate over pre-emptive attack, out-of-area engagement, and "legitimization" of military operations has been brought to a head by the Bush Administration's frustration with cumbersome alliance decision-making procedures. The Administration believes that NATO military actions should mostly be conducted by "coalitions of the willing." In this view, the allies, of which only a small number have deployable forces capable of high-intensity conflict, should use coalitions of member states that agree upon a threat and have the means to counter it. Most European allies believe that "coalitions of the willing" would undermine the solidarity of the alliance and the consensus decision-making principle. Their support for the principle of consensus centers upon a desire to maintain political solidarity for controversial measures. In this view, the consent of 19 sovereign governments,

---

[4] Interviews with officials from allied states, November 2003-March 2004; Jacques Chirac, "Nul ne peut agir seul," *Le Monde* (LM), September 24, 2003 (speech before the U.N. General Assembly); and General Henri Bentegeat, "Le problème des armes de destruction massive peut être résolu par des voies diplomatiques," *LM*, December 21-22, 2003. General Bentegeat is chief of staff of the French armed forces.

each taking an independent decision to work with other governments, is a formidable expression of solidarity and in itself provides a measure of legitimization for an operation. Some allies believe that this view was given weight, for example, in NATO's decision to go to war against Serbia in 1999 when Russian resistance prevented passage of a UN Security Council resolution approving intervention on behalf of Kosovo.[5]

Capabilities and "Usability"

Most allies lack mobile forces that can be sustained distant from the European theater.[6] In October 2003, former NATO Secretary General George Robertson said that "out of the 1.4 million soldiers under arms, the 18 non-U.S. allies have 55,000 deployed on multinational operations..., yet they feel overstretched. If operations such as the International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan are to succeed, we must generate more usable soldiers and have the political will to deploy more of them in multinational operations." NATO Supreme Allied Commander (SACEUR) General James Jones told Congress in March 2004 that only 3-4% of European forces are "expeditionarily deployable."[7] The Bush Administration proposed both the NATO Response Force and the Prague Capabilities Commitment in 2002 to help remedy this problem. The purpose of the two initiatives is to create forces that integrate, for example, aerial refuelers and airlift capacities that would allow troops and equipment to be moved to a conflict. The allies believe that shared funding of some of these capabilities will moderate the costs to individual governments.

By most accounts, the NRF has made good progress. NATO designated as operational a first element of the force in October 2003. Nine thousand of the NRF's 20,000 have been trained and are prepared for combat, able to deploy within 5 days and sustainable for 30 days. Spain, France, and Germany have contributed the largest contingents. The NRF is not a standing force, but is to be assembled from national units of member governments. A political impediment persists in that some countries, such as Germany and Hungary, must obtain parliamentary permission each time units are to be sent into combat, a factor that could affect the NRF's ability to deploy rapidly.[8] Progress on implementing the PCC has been more fitful, as some governments have reportedly not allocated the funds to meet their commitments.

The United States is in the early stages of altering the nature of its troop deployments in NATO Europe. The Department of Defense is reportedly considering halving the number of U.S. troops (now 71,000) in Germany, and placing part of those troops at small bases in central Europe. The new bases would be barebones, with equipment dispersed around NATO Europe. Under the proposed plan, U.S.

---

[5] See CRS Report RS21510, *NATO's Decision-Making Procedure*, by Paul Gallis.

[6] The United States, France, and Britain are the notable exceptions.

[7] George Robertson, "NATO's Transformation," speech in Geneva October 13, 2003, p. 1-2; "Afghanistan Stabilization and Reconstruction," 108th Congress, 2nd sess., Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearing. General Jones' testimony. January 27, 2004.

[8] "NATO inaugurates rapid-reaction military unit," *International Herald Tribune*, October 16, 2003, p. 3.

forces would be lighter and more mobile, and able to move quickly to new trouble spots. It remains unclear whether the United States would pay for the modernization or development of sites that might become new bases, or whether central European countries would be expected to bear part of the burden.[9]

Some analysts worry that NATO and the EU might "compete" for the use of more mobile, high-readiness forces. The EU is developing its own rapid reaction forces for crisis management. Some of these units are "double hatted" for use either by the EU or by NATO. The EU also has embarked on an initiative to enhance its military capabilities and equipment procurement, including, for example, greater strategic lift and weapons for suppression of enemy air defenses. The issue of which organization, NATO or the EU, could use national forces if there were simultaneous crises has not been resolved. An issue raised by the NATO and EU capability initiatives is the problem of possible overlap or wastage of resources. One analyst has urged closer consultation between NATO and the EU so that capabilities do not become "duplicative and incompatible;" in this view, the two organizations should arrange for the same governments to take the lead in developing the technologies that both wish to obtain to prevent wasted resources and to ensure that the systems being sought will mesh smoothly.[10]

The Istanbul Summit

NATO will hold a summit in Istanbul June 28-29, 2004. The allies called the last summit, in Prague in November 2002, the "transformation summit" because it specified new missions to combat terrorism and proliferation, began important changes in allied command structure, and inaugurated initiatives for improved capabilities.[11] The Istanbul summit will address NATO deployments in the Balkans, Afghanistan, and Iraq, welcome seven new member states, and discuss a Bush Administration proposal for political reform in the Middle East. Tensions persist in the alliance stemming from the U.S. decision to invade Iraq in March 2003, and will affect summit discussions.

Multinational Deployments

NATO has had peacekeepers in Bosnia since 1995. The initial Stabilization Force (SFOR) there numbered 60,000. As Bosnia has stabilized, NATO has reduced the force; by June 2004, SFOR will number approximately 7,000 troops. NATO is discussing a plan to turn peacekeeping responsibilities over to the EU by the end of 2004.[12]

---

[9] "U.S. may halve forces in Germany," *Washington Post*, March 25, 2004, p. A1.

[10] Frances G. Burwell, "The 'Enlargement' summits of Prague and Copenhagen: an agenda for transatlantic cooperation," January 2003. Burwell's paper was presented at the Wilson Center in Washington in fall 2002.

[11] See CRS Report RS21354, *The NATO Summit at Prague, 2002*, by Paul Gallis.

[12] See CRS Report RS21774, *Bosnia and International Security Forces: Transition from* (continued...)

In August 2003, NATO assumed command of the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Afghanistan. NATO Secretary General Jaap de Hoop Scheffer has said that stabilization of Afghanistan is the alliance's first priority. ISAF controls only Kabul and the provincial city of Kunduz, with a force of approximately 6,500 soldiers, but NATO decided on March 11, 2004 to extend ISAF to other parts of the country. (The United States, aided by several allies, continues a non-NATO combat operation with 12,000 troops against al Qaeda and Taliban remnants in the eastern and southern parts of the country.) NATO offered no new figure for the necessary number of forces for this task. ISAF's effort is overtly one of nation-building. Several sites have "Provincial Reconstruction Teams" (PRTs), composed of 80-200 troops and civil affairs officers, that protect projects to rejuvenate the Afghan economy, provide security, and extend the geographic control of the central government. Some PRTs are under a national flag, and not part of ISAF. The Afghan government wishes to hold presidential elections in June 2004, a task that could prove difficult without increased stability. The PRTs would also provide security for the elections.[13]

Finding the NATO forces necessary to extend ISAF in Afghanistan is proving difficult. Opinions in the alliance differ over whether member governments have a sufficient number of deployable forces for such an extension, or such forces exist but the political will to send them is lacking. NATO Supreme Allied Commander (SACEUR) General James Jones has expressed caution in discussions to extend ISAF out of concern that allied forces will overstretch themselves. He supports a "graduated, phased approach tiered to a properly resourced and capability-based approach" to create new PRTs to build "an environment that allows for reconstruction and nation-building to proceed." Yet moving from planning such a force to putting it in the field has been a slow process. In General Jones' view, "The political will has been stated. The alliance is agreed. The donor countries [for forces] have been identified. And yet we find ourselves mired in the administrative details of who is going to pay for it, who is going to transport it, and how it is going to be maintained...." Some representatives of allied governments reportedly do not believe that there is a sufficient threat of terrorism now emanating from Afghanistan to warrant such forces.[14]

The Bush Administration has also proposed that NATO assume responsibility for the southern central sector of Iraq now being stabilized by Polish-led forces. Secretary General de Hoop Scheffer said in January 2004 that Afghanistan must be NATO's principal priority, and some senior military officers at allied headquarters have indicated that insufficient forces and political will might prevent NATO from fulfilling both missions in 2004. France and Germany have expressed reluctance to send their troops to Iraq, but Berlin has said that it would not block a NATO decision

---

[12] (...continued)
NATO to the European Union in 2004, by Julie Kim.

[13] "NATO ready to take wider role in Afghanistan," *Financial Times* (*FT*), March 11, 2004, p. 4.

[14] Interviews of officials from NATO governments; "Afghanistan Stabilization and Reconstruction," op.cit.

to assume greater responsibility there, following the return of Iraqi sovereignty. French President Chirac, however, reportedly told a Hungarian newspaper on February 23, 2004, that "we do not yet see in what conditions a NATO commitment in Iraq would be possible." The French government reportedly wants the UN to take a concrete role in governing Iraq, and not simply serve as a fig leaf for U.S. power and control. At the same time, some French officials are concerned that U.S. forces may withdraw prematurely from Iraq, resulting in civil war and an increased presence of terrorists.[15]

Enlargement

On March 29, 2004, seven countries (Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia, and Slovenia) became the newest members of NATO upon submission of their instruments of ratification in a ceremony in Washington, D.C. Most of the governments have already been participating in NATO peacekeeping operations, and have had observer status at some NATO meetings. NATO will not extend new invitations to candidate states at the NATO June 2004 summit in Istanbul, although Albania, Croatia, and Macedonia aspire to membership. H. Res. 558 (introduced by Rep. Doug Bereuter, passed March 30, 2004) welcomes the accession of the seven new members of the alliance, and calls on NATO leaders at the Istanbul summit to agree to review the applications of Albania, Croatia, and Macedonia at a summit meeting to be held no later than 2007.

The Greater Middle East Initiative

Some Administration officials describe the Middle East as the "strategic center of gravity for the United States," and wish to persuade NATO allies to adopt the same view. The Bush Administration has proposed a controversial Greater Middle East Initiative to encourage reform in 22 Arab countries, Turkey, Pakistan, and Afghanistan. Israel will also be included in elements of the initiative. The Administration hopes to discuss, and have adopted, elements of the initiative at three spring summit meetings: the G-8 summit, the U.S.-EU summit, and the NATO summit. The proposal has met with criticism from some allied governments, and with hostility from several key Arab governments. Some press reports indicated that such criticism has led the Administration to withdraw the initiative, but U.S. officials say that the initiative has in fact not been withdrawn or altered.[16]

A draft of the Administration's proposal cites three deficits in the "greater Middle East": freedom, knowledge, and "women's empowerment." The Administration believes that terror, crime, and extremism in the region will increase as long as the number of people who are "politically and economically disenfranchised" grows. The purpose of the initiative is to promote "democracy and

---

[15] Interviews of officials from allied governments, November 2003-March 2004; "Rumsfeld urges NATO to take on Iraq role," *FT*, February 7-8, 2004, p. 3; "Irak: Washington veut charmer les Européens," *LM*, November 22, 2003, p. 7; and "Iraq/NATO/France," *Atlantic News*, February 25, 2004, p. 2.

[16] Interview, March 17, 2004; see "U.S. muffles sweeping call to democracy in Mideast," *New York Times (NYT)*, March 12, 2004, p. A13.

governance," expand economic opportunity, and encourage the development of civil society, human rights, and free media. The Administration would like to see the G-8 summit supply funds, for example, to promote literacy and help develop small enterprises, and the U.S.-EU summit to provide political impetus to reform, as well as a modest amount of new funding. As now considered, the allied initiative might borrow elements from the Helsinki process and NATO's Partnership for Peace, such as promoting greater transparency in defense budget processes and civilian control of the military, as well as possible programs to combat trafficking in narcotics and to fight terrorism.[17]

The initiative remains in a draft stage. The reaction of the allies has been mixed. German foreign minister Fischer has endorsed the initiative and has said that his government will lend concrete support. Most other allied governments are cautious. A constant theme in their critique of the initiative is that the Arab-Israeli peace process must be the priority if stability and reform are to take hold in the Middle East, and that the initiative ignores this priority. They contend that the Administration backs Israel too strongly, and that the Administration must persuade the Sharon government to grant more concessions to the Palestinians. Some European officials criticize the initiative as an extension of the Administration's plan to "democratize" Iraq; most European governments contend that democracy must take root from within a society, and that governments from other regions cannot bring it into a country and press it to evolve. Other European officials appear wary that the Administration is seeking to absorb the EU's Barcelona Process, a Union effort to foster regional development, free trade, and more open economies in the Maghreb.[18] Some critics contend that the initiative is more suitable for a civil institution, such as the EU, rather than a security institution like NATO.

Administration officials counter that they wish to see Middle Eastern governments or reform organizations develop key elements of the initiative themselves, such as a charter outlining the rights of individuals. These officials contend that they have no intention of taking over the EU's Barcelona Process, and that they are instead seeking new funds and new programs to modernize the region.

Initial reaction to the outline of the initiative has been sharply negative from several key Arab governments, such as those of Egypt, Jordan, and Saudi Arabia. Egyptian president Hosni Mubarak, for example, has called the initiative "delusional," and believes that reform cannot be imposed from outside by societies that do not understand the Arab world.[19] Specialists on Middle Eastern affairs cite several other potential weaknesses of the initiative. They concur with European officials that progress in the Arab-Israeli peace process must precede any effort to modernize the region and bring stability there; they add that no Arab government is likely to join in an initiative that includes Israel unless Israel establishes a viable

---

[17] For a draft of the initiative, see "U.S. working paper for G-8 sherpas," *Al Hayat* (London), February 14, 2004; "U.S. readies push for Mideast democracy plan," *Washington Post*, February 28, 2004, p. A18.

[18] Interviews with European officials, February-March 2004; "A big idea that Europe won't buy," *FT*, February 5, 2004, p. 13.

[19] "U.S. plan for Mideast reform draws ire of Arab leaders," *NYT*, February 27, 2004, p. A3.

peace with the Palestinians. They further note that some Arab states, such as Jordan and Syria, are hostile to each other, and are unlikely, for example, to make their defense budgets transparent and thereby expose key elements of their defense structure and strategy. Finally, in a region where autocratic and authoritarian regimes predominate, few governments are likely to be enthusiastic about programs that imply existing leadership should cede power.[20]

U.S. Leadership under Challenge

The Bush Administration's effort to shift NATO's mission to combating terrorism and proliferation, with a strategic center of gravity in the Middle East, has led to uneasiness and a series of challenges by some allies. While all allies view terrorism and proliferation as serious threats, and all have embraced the need for more "expeditionary" forces, several key allies nonetheless have questions about the Administration's leadership and its commitment to NATO.

International political considerations play an important role in some allies' questioning of U.S. leadership. Most allies are members of the European Union, or soon will be. They place great importance on international institutions as a means of solving transnational problems, from economic dislocation to narcotics trafficking to prevention of conflict. The legacy of two world wars in Europe remains a central factor in shaping governments' policies; prevention of illegitimate violations of sovereignty was a principal reason for their support of the establishment of the UN, the EU, and NATO. This view lies behind the general European opposition to the Bush Administration's doctrine of "pre-emptive action." Some European observers today believe that there is an "absence of anything that could be called an international security architecture," in part because the United States, in this view, avoids reliance on the UN. U.S. global leadership was once "embedded in the international rule of law that constrained the powerful as well as the weak." However, in this view, the U.S. resort to force in Iraq, without clear support from the UN, has made the United States "a revolutionary hyperpower."[21]

Some U.S. officials counter that there is good cooperation with the allies on the use of law enforcement to combat terrorism,[22] but that there are moments when the danger of impending catastrophic developments or an imminent attack justifies the use of force without "legitimization" through the often time-consuming process of obtaining a UN resolution. The Clinton Administration (and ultimately all the allies) reached this conclusion when it decided that NATO must act to prevent ethnic cleansing in Kosovo without explicit U.N. authorization in light of a threatened

---

[20] Interviews, February-March 2004.

[21] Philip Stevens, "A fractured world remains a very dangerous place," *FT*, December 19, 2003, p. 15.

[22] See CRS Report RL31509, *Europe and Counterterrorism: Strengthening Police and Judicial Cooperation*, by Kristin Archick; and CRS Report RL31612, *European Counterterrorist Efforts since September 11*, coordinated by Paul Gallis, and prepared for Rep. Doug Bereuter and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Russian veto, and the Bush Administration reached this conclusion when it went to war in Iraq in the belief that the Hussein regime possessed a WMD arsenal.

The terrorist bombing in Madrid on March 11, 2004, which killed approximately 200 people, has led to severe repercussions for the Administration. Approximately 90% of the Spanish population had opposed Prime Minister Aznar's support for the invasion of Iraq, and his subsequent decision to send forces as part of the U.S.-led coalition.[23] Spain held scheduled elections three days after the bombing. Voters turned out the sitting government and elected a Socialist-led coalition. Some analysts attribute this result to the belief among some voters that the government's Iraq policy invited the terrorist attack. Others assert that the perception among many voters that the Aznar government badly mishandled the bombing aftermath — by sticking to claims that the Basque terrorist group ETA was behind the attacks in the face of mounting evidence of an Al Qaeda link — was a key factor in the election's outcome. Regardless, the Socialists have sharply criticized U.S. Iraq policy. The Socialist Prime Minister-designate, José Luis Rodriguez Zapatero, reportedly said, "The war in Iraq was a disaster and the occupation continues to be a disaster." He accused President Bush and British Prime Minister Blair of "lies" over leading a coalition to war on the basis of inaccurate intelligence information. Zapatero said he would withdraw the 1300 Spanish forces from Iraq by June 30 unless the UN is given clear authority to replace the U.S. occupation.[24] Zapatero has not indicated what his government will do if the United States requests a NATO deployment in Iraq.

Some allies contend that the United States is seeking to use NATO as a "toolbox." They object to Defense Secretary Rumsfeld's repeated advocacy of "coalitions of the willing" to fight in conflicts as a means of using allied resources and supportive NATO governments to endorse U.S. interventions on foreign soil. They argue that the Administration's contention that "the mission drives the coalition" undermines allied solidarity; such a doctrine weakens the long-held view that all member states must believe that they have a stake in allied security operations. Some French officials have contended that the NRF is an element of such a U.S. strategy: the Europeans would supply the forces (the United States has only a small contingent in the NRF), and the United States would use them. U.S. officials counter that the United States already possesses high-readiness combat forces, and that the NRF was proposed specifically to prod the Europeans to develop similar forces.[25]

Most allies have been critical of Secretary Rumsfeld's division of Europe into "old" and "new," a formulation that chastised the former (such as France and Germany) for having opposed the U.S. invasion of Iraq and lauded the latter (such as Spain under Aznar, Poland and the Baltic states) for having supported it. The criticism has come, quietly, even from countries such as Poland because Warsaw objects to any division of the continent. Central European governments view both

---

[23] "Those awkward hearts and minds," *The Economist*, April 1, 2003.

[24] "Spain prepares to pull out of Iraq," *FT*, March 16, 2004, p. 1.

[25] See the proceedings of a French American Foundation conference, *The Military Role in Countering Terrorism at Home and Abroad: U.S. and French Approaches*, November 2003.

NATO and the EU as means to unite the continent and to promote stability, and object to any attempts to divide the Europeans.[26]

Some allies believe that the United States relies too heavily upon military power to resolve issues that may have a political solution. They place the issue of proliferation in this realm, and cite the long-term economic pressure of sanctions against Libya, followed by U.S. and British negotiations with Tripoli, as evidence that a patient policy based on political initiatives can be effective.[27]

At the same time, all allies underscore the importance of their strategic relationship with the United States. While the European Union, including its nascent defense entities, is of great value to them, they nonetheless contend that the transatlantic partnership remains vital to countering global threats.

A New Security Actor: The European Union

For decades, there has been discussion within the EU about creating a common security and defense policy. Previous EU efforts to forge a defense arm foundered on member states' national sovereignty concerns and fears that an EU defense capability would undermine NATO and the transatlantic relationship. However, U.S. hesitancy in the early 1990s to intervene in the Balkan conflicts, and UK Prime Minister Tony Blair's desire to be a leader in Europe, prompted him in December 1998 to reverse Britain's long-standing opposition to an EU defense arm. Blair joined French President Jacques Chirac in pressing the EU to develop a defense identity outside of NATO. This new British engagement, along with deficiencies in European defense capabilities exposed by NATO's 1999 Kosovo air campaign, gave momentum to the EU's European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP).[28]

EU leaders hope ESDP will provide a military backbone for the Union's evolving Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP), a project aimed at furthering EU political integration and boosting the EU's weight in world affairs. They also hope that ESDP will give EU member states more options for dealing with future crises. The EU stresses that ESDP is not aimed at usurping NATO's collective defense role nor at weakening the transatlantic alliance. Most EU members, led by the UK, insist that ESDP be tied to NATO — as do U.S. policymakers — and that EU efforts to build more robust defense capabilities should reinforce those of the alliance. At the NATO Washington Summit in April 1999, NATO welcomed the EU's renewed commitment to strengthen its defense capabilities, and acknowledged the EU's resolve to develop an autonomous decision-making capacity for military

---

[26] Interviews of European officials.

[27] Interviews; *Military Role in Countering Terrorism*, op. cit.

[28] For more information on Blair's decision to reverse the UK's traditional opposition to ESDP, see CRS Report RS20356, *European Security and Defense Policy: The British Dimension*, October 7, 1999, by Karen Donfried.

actions "where the Alliance as a whole is not engaged."[29] Nevertheless, France and some other countries continue to favor a more independent EU defense arm. French officials have long argued that the EU should seek to counterbalance the United States on the international stage and view ESDP as a vehicle for enhancing the EU's political credibility.

U.S. support for ESDP and for the use of NATO assets in EU-led operations has been conditioned since 1998 on three "redlines," known as the "three D's:"

- No decoupling from NATO. ESDP must complement NATO and not threaten the indivisibility of European and North American security.
- No duplication of NATO command structures or alliance-wide resources.
- No discrimination against European NATO countries that are not members of the EU. The non-EU NATO members were concerned about being excluded from formulating and participating in the EU's ESDP, especially if they were going to be asked to approve "lending" NATO assets to the EU.

ESDP's Progress to Date

At its December 1999 Helsinki summit, the EU announced its "determination to develop an autonomous capacity to take decisions and, where NATO as a whole is not engaged, to launch and conduct EU-led military operations in response to international crises." At Helsinki, the EU decided to establish an institutional decision-making framework for ESDP and a 60,000-strong rapid reaction force to be fully operational by 2003. This force would be deployable within 60 days for at least a year and capable of undertaking the full range of "Petersberg tasks" (humanitarian assistance, search and rescue, peacekeeping, and peace enforcement), but it would not be a standing "EU army." Rather, troops and assets at appropriate readiness levels would be identified from existing national forces for use by the EU. In addition, EU leaders at Helsinki welcomed efforts to restructure European defense industries, which they viewed as key to ensuring a European industrial and technological base strong enough to support ESDP military requirements.

The EU has also sought to bolster its civilian capacities for crisis management in the context of ESDP. In June 2000, the EU decided to establish a 5,000-strong civilian police force, and in June 2001, the EU set targets for developing deployable teams of experts in the rule of law, civilian administration, and civilian protection.

New Institutions and NATO-EU Links. On the institutional side, the EU has created three new defense decision-making bodies to help direct and implement ESDP. These are: the Political and Security Committee (composed of senior national representatives); the Military Committee (composed of member states'

---

[29] See Article 9 of the NATO Washington Summit Communiqué, April 24, 1999 [http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/1999/p99-064e.htm].

Chiefs of Defense or their representatives in Brussels); and the Military Staff (consisting of about 130 military experts seconded from member states).

The EU has also established cooperation mechanisms with NATO, intended to enable the EU to use NATO assets and meet U.S. concerns about ESDP. These include regular NATO-EU meetings at ambassadorial and ministerial level, as well as regular meetings between the EU and non-EU European NATO members. This framework allows for consultations to be intensified in the event of a crisis, and permits non-EU NATO members to contribute to EU-led operations; the EU agreed to establish ad hoc "committees of contributors" for EU-led missions to give non-EU participants a role in operational decision-making. The NATO-EU link was formalized in December 2002; this paved the way for the implementation of "Berlin Plus," an arrangement allowing the EU to borrow Alliance assets and capabilities for EU-led operations and thereby prevent a needless duplication of NATO structures and wasteful expenditure of scarce European defense funds. "Berlin Plus" gives the EU "assured access" to NATO operational planning capabilities and "presumed access" to NATO common assets for EU-led operations "in which the Alliance as a whole is not engaged."[30]

The EU's Rapid Reaction Force and Capability Challenges. Enhancing European military capabilities has been and remains a key challenge for the EU as it seeks to forge a credible ESDP. As noted above, the 1999 NATO war in Kosovo demonstrated serious deficiencies in European military assets and the widening technology gap with U.S. forces. European shortfalls in strategic airlift, precision-guided munitions, command and control systems, intelligence, aerial refueling, and suppression of enemy air defenses were among the most obvious. In setting out the parameters of the EU rapid reaction force and its capability needs, EU leaders sought to establish goals that would require members to enhance force deployability and sustainability, and to reorient and ultimately increase defense spending to help fill equipment gaps. The most ambitious members envisioned the EU's rapid reaction force developing a combat capability equivalent, for example, to NATO's role in the Kosovo conflict.

In 2000 and 2001, the EU held two capability commitment conferences to define national contributions to the rapid reaction force and address the capability shortfalls. Member states pledged in excess of 60,000 troops drawn from their existing national forces, as well as up to 400 combat aircraft and 100 naval vessels as support elements. In 2001, the EU also initiated a European Capability Action Plan (ECAP) to devise strategies for remedying the capability gaps. In May 2003, the EU declared that the rapid reaction force possesses "operational capability across the full range of Petersberg tasks," but recognized that the force would still be "limited and constrained by recognized shortfalls" in certain defense capabilities.[31] As a result, ESDP missions in the near to medium term will likely focus on lower-end Petersberg

---

[30] "Berlin Plus" was originally outlined at the 1999 NATO summit in Washington, D.C. See Article 10 of the Washington Summit Communiqué, April 24, 1999 [http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/1999/p99-064e.htm].

[31] See the Conclusions from the EU's May 19-20, 2003 General Affairs and External Relations Council Meeting [http://ue.eu.int/pressData/en/gena/75857.pdf].

tasks rather than higher-end peace enforcement operations. EU officials maintain that enhancing European defense capabilities remains an ongoing, long-term project.

Many military analysts assert that overall levels of European defense spending are insufficient to fund all ESDP requirements. European leaders are reluctant to ask legislatures and publics for more money for defense given competing domestic priorities and tight budgets. In light of the dim prospects for increased defense spending in the near term, EU officials emphasize that they do not need to match U.S. defense capabilities exactly — which they view as increasingly impossible — and stress they can fill critical gaps by spending existing defense resources more wisely. EU leaders point out that rationalizing member states' respective defense efforts and promoting multinational projects to reduce internal operating costs have been key goals of ECAP. Some options under consideration in ECAP include: leasing commercial assets (primarily for air transport); sharing or pooling of national assets among several member states; "niche" specialization, in which one or more member state would assume responsibility for providing a particular capability; and more joint procurement projects.

Critics, however, charge that promises to spend existing defense resources more wisely have not yet materialized in any substantial way. They doubt that EU member states will be willing to make the hard choices that could ultimately produce more "bang for the euro" because these could infringe on national sovereignty or entail difficult political decisions. For example, they point out that "niche" specialization would require some member states to forego building certain national capabilities, while proposals to pool assets may require members to relinquish national controls. These skeptics also criticize European leaders' continued devotion to the increasingly expensive but still non-existent Airbus' A400M military transport project, in which eight European allies are investing large portions of their procurement budgets. They argue that it would be cheaper and quicker for these countries to buy U.S.-built transporters such as the C-130 or C-17, but many European leaders resist this option because European defense industries create European jobs.[32]

ESDP Missions. Despite the capability challenges still facing European militaries, the EU has sought to keep up momentum for ESDP. In 2003, the EU launched several missions in the Balkans, an area long assumed by EU observers to be the most likely destination of any EU-led operation. In January 2003, the EU's civilian crisis management force took over U.N. police operations in Bosnia as the first-ever ESDP mission. With "Berlin Plus" arrangements finalized, the EU launched in March 2003 its first military mission — Operation Concordia — that replaced the small NATO peacekeeping mission in Macedonia. Operation Concordia was supported by NATO headquarters (SHAPE) in Mons, Belgium and NATO operational reserves already located in Macedonia. In December 2003, Operation Concordia ended, but the EU established a police mission to help train Macedonia's police forces. The EU also aspires to take over the NATO-led peacekeeping force

---

[32] The first A400Ms are not scheduled for delivery until 2008 at the earliest. Belgium, France, Germany, Luxembourg, Spain, Turkey, and the UK remain committed to the A400M, but Italy and Portugal have withdrawn and may buy new C-130Js instead.

in Bosnia by the end of 2004; NATO and EU officials are currently discussing potential arrangements within the "Berlin Plus" framework.[33]

Additionally, from June to September 2003, the EU led an international peacekeeping force of 1,400 in the Congo that sought to stop rebel fighting and protect aid workers. The Congo mission was requested by the United Nations and headed by France in a "lead nation" capacity. This mission came as a surprise to many EU observers, NATO officials, and U.S. policymakers because it was geographically farther afield than they had thought the EU would venture, and because it was conducted without recourse to NATO assets. The Congo operation was planned by French military planners in national headquarters. Some NATO and U.S. officials were annoyed, asserting that the EU should have first formally asked NATO whether it wished to undertake the Congo operation. EU officials did consult with NATO about the mission, but maintain they were not obliged to ask NATO for its permission given that the EU was not requesting to use NATO assets.[34]

The Future Shape of ESDP

European Viewpoints. EU leaders view ESDP as one of the next great projects on the road to European integration, and will likely seek to enhance ESDP further over the next decade. As noted above, most EU members assert that EU efforts to boost defense capabilities should complement — not compete with — those of the alliance. The UK hopes that bringing more and better military hardware to the table will give the European allies a bigger role in alliance decision-making. Italy and Spain, among others, hope that ESDP's military requirements will eventually provide the necessary ammunition to pry more defense funding out of reluctant legislatures and publics more concerned with social spending and struggling economies. Incoming EU member states from central and eastern Europe, such as Poland and the three Baltic states, back ESDP but maintain that it must not weaken NATO or the transatlantic link. The EU's four neutral members (Austria, Finland, Ireland, and Sweden) prefer to concentrate their efforts on ESDP's civilian side.

Germany, given its size and wealth, is considered critical to the success of ESDP, but has played a rather passive role in much of ESDP's development. Although always supportive of the initiative, Berlin was keen to tread carefully in light of U.S. concerns. However, some analysts suggest that Germany and other states that opposed the U.S.-led war in Iraq may be increasingly receptive to French efforts to forge a European defense arm independent of NATO. They point to the April 2003 meeting of French, German, Belgian, and Luxembourg leaders to discuss creating a separate European military headquarters, planning staff, and armaments agency. Although not under EU auspices, this four-power meeting suggests that France is still intent on slowly developing a more autonomous European defense identity; whether Germany will support this position in the future remains an open question.

---

[33] For more information, see CRS Report RS21774, *Bosnia and International Security Forces: Transition from NATO to the European Union in 2004*, by Julie Kim.

[34] Interviews of U.S. and EU officials, July 2003.

Recent Developments. As part of ongoing efforts to further develop ESDP, the EU in December 2003 adopted a new agreement on enhancing the EU's military planning capabilities. This agreement represents a compromise negotiated by the UK, France, and Germany. It entails:

- Establishing a British-proposed EU planning cell at NATO headquarters (SHAPE) to help coordinate "Berlin Plus" missions, or those EU missions conducted using NATO assets.
- Adding a new, small cell with the capacity for operational planning to the existing EU Military Staff — which currently provides early warning and strategic planning — to conduct possible EU missions without recourse to NATO assets.
- Inviting NATO to station liaison officers at the EU Military Staff to help ensure transparency and close coordination between NATO and the EU.

Some observers criticize the British for agreeing to this deal, accusing UK Prime Minister Blair of bowing to French demands for a more independent ESDP to help burnish his European credentials following the rift with Paris and Berlin over Iraq. UK officials are keen to point out that the deal considerably scales back the early proposals in April 2003 for a separate European headquarters. They claim that language in the agreement reaffirms NATO as Europe's preeminent security organization. They stress that the new cell will "not be a standing headquarters," and that national headquarters will still remain the "main option" for running missions without NATO assets, such as the French-commanded EU mission in the Congo. UK officials likely judged that if they had blocked this initiative, Paris and Berlin would have gone ahead with some sort of European headquarters outside of the EU structure, which would have been even more objectionable to UK and NATO interests.[35]

Press reports indicate that the deal to enhance the EU's planning capabilities is also linked to a compromise in the EU's draft constitutional treaty on two defense provisions that aim to further the development of a common EU defense policy. The UK had initially strongly opposed the French-German-backed proposals in the draft treaty for a "mutual assistance clause," and for "structured cooperation" to permit a smaller group of member states to cooperate more closely on military issues. British (and U.S.) officials worried that the "mutual assistance clause" would undermine NATO's Article 5 defense guarantee, and that "structured cooperation" could weaken EU solidarity as well as that of the alliance given the large number of overlapping members. The UK reportedly acquiesced on both of these provisions, however, after securing some revisions. The "mutual assistance clause" will now include stronger language reiterating that NATO remains the foundation of collective defense for those EU members that are also NATO allies. "Structured cooperation" activities have apparently been refocused mostly on efforts to boost military capabilities rather

---

[35] "Straw defends joint Euro force," BBC News, November 29, 2003; Charles Grant, "Europe can sell its defence plan to Washington," *FT*, December 2, 2003; also see the text of the EU agreement,"European Defence: NATO/EU Consultations, Planning, and Operations," on the EU's website [http://ue.eu.int/pressData/en/misc/78414.pdf].

than on conducting operations. The EU's constitutional treaty has not yet been finalized, however, because of a separate dispute over voting rule changes.[36]

EU leaders are also considering a British-French-German proposal to enhance ESDP by creating battle groups of 1,500 troops — capable of being deployed within 15 days — for crisis management missions primarily in failing African states. The plan envisions that these battle groups would be ready by 2007, and would operate under a UN mandate; they would seek to "prepare the ground" for a follow-on UN peacekeeping force, similar to the French-led EU mission in the Congo in 2003. EU officials stress that the battle groups would not compete with the new NATO Response Force, which is intended for higher intensity operations.[37]

ESDP Post-September 11. Following September 11, 2001, the EU struggled with whether to expand ESDP's purview to include combating external terrorist threats or other new challenges, such as countering the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. In June 2002, EU leaders agreed that the Union should develop counter-terrorism force requirements, but stopped short of expanding the Petersberg tasks. Increasingly, however, EU member states appear to recognize that ESDP must have a role in addressing new challenges in order to remain relevant and to bolster the EU's new, broader security strategy developed by the EU's top foreign policy official, Javier Solana. The description of the Petersberg tasks in the text of the draft constitutional treaty states that "all of these tasks may contribute to the fight against terrorism;" many analysts assert that once the draft treaty is finalized, this language would effectively expand the Petersberg tasks to include combating terrorism. In the wake of the March 11, 2004 terrorist bombings in Spain, EU leaders on March 25-26, 2004 announced a new "Declaration on Combating Terrorism;" among other measures, it calls for "work to be rapidly pursued to develop the contribution of ESDP to the fight against terrorism."[38]

U.S. Perspectives

Successive U.S. Administrations, backed by Congress, have supported the EU's ESDP project as a means to improve European defense capabilities, thereby enabling the allies to operate more effectively with U.S. forces and to shoulder a greater degree of the security burden. U.S. supporters argue that ESDP's military requirements are consistent with NATO efforts to enhance defense capabilities and interoperability among member states. They point out that the EU has made relatively quick progress on its ESDP agenda, and its missions in the Balkans and in

---

[36] "Arguments on defence further complicate negotiations on an EU constitution," *The Economist*, December 6, 2003; Centre for European Reform, "The CER Guide to the Brussels Summit," December 9, 2003.

[37] "EU's big three propose crisis battlegroups," Reuters, February 10, 2004; "Military Committee to give opinion on proposal," Agence Europe, February 14, 2004.

[38] For the text of the EU's draft constitutional treaty, released in July 2003, see the website of the European Convention on the Future of Europe [http://european-convention.eu.int/docs/Treaty/cv00850.en03.pdf]. Also see the text of the European Council's Declaration on Combating Terrorism, March 25-26, 2004 [http://ue.eu.int/pressData/en/ec/79637.pdf].

the Congo demonstrate that the EU can contribute effectively to managing crises, both within and outside of Europe. As noted previously, U.S. policymakers and Members of Congress insist that EU efforts to build a defense arm be tied to NATO.

The United States remains concerned, however, that France and some other EU members will continue to press for a more autonomous EU defense identity. Washington grudgingly approved the December 2003 agreement to enhance the EU's planning capabilities, but some U.S. officials still fear that the new EU planning cell of 20 to 30 officers could grow over time into a larger staff, which could duplicate and compete with NATO structures. They also worry that the "mutual assistance clause" and "structured cooperation" in the EU's draft constitutional treaty could ultimately lead to a multi-tiered security structure that could destroy the indivisibility of the transatlantic security guarantee.[39]

Overall, critics of ESDP contend that it will mean less influence for the United States in Europe. They suggest that the possible development within NATO of an "EU caucus" — pre-negotiated, common EU positions — could complicate alliance decision-making and decrease Washington's leverage. As noted previously, EU plans for its rapid reaction force may depend on double- or triple-hatting forces already assigned to NATO or other multinational units, thus potentially depriving NATO of forces it might need if a larger crisis arose subsequent to an EU deployment. Furthermore, if EU missions overstretch European militaries, ESDP could compete with NATO efforts to develop its quick-strike Response Force, impede the sustainability of NATO forces in Afghanistan, or hinder the deployment of a possible NATO-led mission in Iraq. Others fear that the EU's success in establishing defense decision-making bodies has not been matched by capability improvements, potentially leading to a situation in which the EU gets bogged down in a conflict and requires the United States and NATO to bail it out.

---

[39] Judy Dempsey, "EU big three in deal over defence," *FT*, December 12, 2003; Interviews of U.S. and European officials, December 2003-February 2004.

Appendix:
Membership in NATO and the European Union

COUNTRY	NATO	EU
Austria		x
Belgium	x	x
Bulgaria	x	
Canada	x	
Cyprus		x
Czech Republic	x	x
Denmark	x	x
Estonia	x	x
Finland		x
France	x	x
Germany	x	x
Greece	x	x
Hungary	x	x
Iceland	x	
Ireland		x
Italy	x	x
Latvia	x	x
Lithuania	x	x
Luxembourg	x	x
Malta		x
Netherlands	x	x
Norway	x	
Poland	x	x
Portugal	x	x
Romania	x	
Slovakia	x	x
Slovenia	x	x
Spain	x	x
Sweden		x
Turkey	x	
United Kingdom	x	x
United States	x	

Note: This chart indicates membership in the EU after its enlargement on May 1, 2004.