THE TRANSATLANTIC INSTITUTE DEDICATION
MISSION

The Transatlantic Institute is the fifth permanent international office of the American Jewish Committee, after Jerusalem, Geneva, Berlin, and Warsaw. We were the first American Jewish advocacy organization to establish an official presence in each of these European cities. That again is the case in Brussels.

Each time we add an international address, we attempt to advance two interconnected goals: the security of Jewish life worldwide and the advancement of democracy and pluralism. Brussels is especially critical to this agenda.

Both America and Europe learned from the twentieth century of the incomprehensible brutality that human beings were capable of inflicting on one another. We resolved to work together to confront the festering ethnic, religious, and political resentments that are the incubators of hatred.

In the early infancy of the new millennium, we have been tragically and monumentally reminded that cruelty and hate are not easily eradicated and that, while working together may not always be the easiest alternative, it is the surest one.

That is why the Transatlantic Institute is so important. It is the right institution at the right time in the right location, the capital of the European Union. It is a nongovernmental venue where government leaders, academicians, journalists, and other engaged individuals can convene to examine sometimes difficult issues with frankness and encounter one another in friendship.

We at the American Jewish Committee inaugurate the Transatlantic Institute with humility and hope. It is our fervent belief that NGOs like the Transatlantic Institute have the power to help bring into being a more tolerant, safe, and just world.

Please look to the Transatlantic Institute as a constructive partner in strengthening this vital link between the two sides of the Atlantic.

Sincerely,
Harold Tanner
Chair of the Transatlantic Institute
President of the American Jewish Committee
(2001-2004)
This special publication contains official proceedings that marked the dedication of the Transatlantic Institute, which opened on February 12, 2004.

Located in Brussels, the seat of the Council of the European Union and the headquarters of NATO, the Transatlantic Institute is the fifth overseas office of the American Jewish Committee. It will facilitate diplomatic outreach to the nations of Europe and help foster ties among the European Union, Israel, and the United States.

The dedication day included colloquia on critical transatlantic issues, a briefing on European and transatlantic security issues, and a gala reception and dinner highlighted by comments from leading European and American diplomats.

The more than 450 guests who attended the dedication dinner included distinguished diplomats accredited to the European Union, NATO, and Belgium; dignitaries from the European Commission and Council of the European Union; members of the European Parliament; leaders of European Jewish communities; friends of the American Jewish Committee from government and nongovernmental institutions across Europe and the United States, including Susan Berresford, president of the Ford Foundation, and an AJC delegation comprised of leaders from the Board of Governors and other members and staff.

DEDICATION

"We must never lose sight of the larger picture of Europe and America as the likeliest of strategic allies, even when we raise tough issues with our European interlocutors," said AJC's Executive Director David A. Harris.

The Transatlantic Institute was made possible by the philanthropy of longtime AJC leaders Rhoda and Jordan Baruch, along with their children, Larry and Laurie Baruch, Marjory Baruch and Wu-te Hsiang, and Roberta (Bobi) Baruch and Jerry Ostrov, and their children's families.

"The Baruchs' foresight and friendship have enabled AJC to establish this venue for fostering constructive transatlantic dialogue," said AJC President Harold Tanner.

Members of the Baruch family, benefactors of the Transatlantic Institute, gathered around Jordan Baruch (front row, center) and Rhoda Baruch (front row, second from right).
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Sometimes I consider myself an endangered species. I am, you see, a committed transatlanticist. Until just a short time ago that was a rather unexceptional thing to be; most people I knew on both sides of the Atlantic were, to varying degrees, in the same club. Now, however, in some places it could get me in big trouble, though not here this evening, I trust.

Call me hopelessly, irredeemably naïve, but, as a son of America and grandson of Europe, I remain convinced that Americans and Europeans are joined at the hip by common foundational values and common existential threats, and thus by a common agenda.

DAVID A. HARRIS

"Our overriding goal is not simply to identify common problems but, even more importantly, to help pinpoint constructive, forward-looking solutions."

Our shared values emanate from the very building blocks of our respective societies: democracy, the rule of law, and respect for the dignity of the individual.

The ties that link this precious fraternity of kindred nations must never be permitted to fray; for they represent the best—indeed, I would argue the only—hope for the ultimate realization of a genuinely peaceful and prosperous world.
Winning one battle without the other will prove a Pyrrhic victory.

Both of us have a profound stake in unleashing the forces of genuine reform, equal protection before the law, and robust civil society in countries that, by and large, have been remarkably resistant to the breathtaking political and economic revolutions of recent times. Some of those countries are practically at Europe’s doorstep; others, though more distant, nonetheless cast a long shadow.

**Cooperation creates possibilities**

No one should underestimate the enormity of the challenge, but those who cynically argue that the real choice in such countries is between tyranny and turmoil need to be proved wrong. A third way can be found; it must be found. Our belief in the indivisibility of human dignity demands no less. And transatlantic cooperation, perhaps by jointly designing “weapons of mass construction,” creates endless possibilities.

Take Pakistan, for example. Imagine for a moment the catastrophic consequences if it descended into civil war or fell into the hands of the Islamists.

Here’s a country of 150 million with 40 percent of its population under the age of fifteen. Not only does Pakistan possess weapons of mass destruction, but the world was on edge not long ago when India and Pakistan engaged in nuclear brinkmanship.

Moreover, there are nearly one million youngsters studying full-time in madrassas, private religious schools, where the Koran and jihad, not literature and biology, are the principal educational fare, and Osama bin Laden could win his share of popularity contests. What’s the future for these young people, and how will their future impact on us? Yet many of them, we are told, are in those schools not for reasons of ideology, but simply in search of a hot lunch and a roof over their heads. Strikingly, while Pakistan spends 22 percent of its national budget on defense, less than 4 percent of the budget is allocated to education and health combined.

The unraveling of Pakistan would hit the jackpot on the political Richter scale and send massive shock waves throughout its neighborhood. Moreover, it would have staggering reverberations for both Europe and the United States.

David A. Harris
Executive Director of the American Jewish Committee

After all, the community of democratic nations has renounced war as an instrument of resolving policy disputes among themselves. The weapons of choice when disagreements arise are diplomats and lawyers, not armies and suicide bombers.

The challenges facing our countries are, to a large degree, transnational—from terrorism to weapons proliferation and from failing states to fanaticism in the name of faith, not to mention the growing economic and technological divides between rich and poor, the unrelenting march of migration, the fragility of our environment, and the merciless spread of the AIDS virus.

None of these challenges is unique to any one nation. Rather, they are overarching and demand our collective attention.

In other words, even at the risk of stating the obvious—though I’ve learned that the obvious isn’t necessarily obvious to all—the United States and Europe need each other now as much as ever.

At the end of the day, together, we must prevail in two battles, not one. We must win the war against those who threaten the fabric and fiber of our democratic societies. And we must win the peace, to extend the reach of freedom, religious and ethnic tolerance, conflict resolution, and economic empowerment.

---

Conferring during the Transatlantic Institute opening program are (l. to r.) Rockwell Anthony Schnabel, U.S. Representative to the European Union; Harold Tamar, President of the American Jewish Committee; R. Nicholas Burns, U.S. Permanent Representative to the North Atlantic Council; and David A. Harris, Executive Director of the American Jewish Committee.
The case of Pakistan, I would argue, is only Exhibit A underscoring the need for greater transatlantic policy coordination.

The United States, by dint of its size, influence, and global reach, brings a great deal to the table. So does the European Union. And, I might add, so does NATO, which remains a vital collective security pact.

Working together, we increase the chances of success; working on separate tracks or, heaven forbid, at cross purposes, we only embolden our common enemies.

Let me digress for a moment. I am a long-time admirer of the European Union. The more I understand the inventive genius of Jean Monnet, the Frenchman called upon by Robert Schuman, the postwar French foreign minister, to conceptualize a structure that would prevent future wars with Germany, the more in awe I am and the more I appreciate the need for similarly bold thinking today.

The European Union's evolution over the past fifty years, based on the vision of political giants, has been nothing short of breathtaking.

In fact, I believe the European Union to be the most ambitious and successful peace project in modern history.

A European Union of fifteen nations, soon to be twenty-five, with Bulgaria and Romania poised to join a few years hence, has much to teach other regions about institution-building and integration.

Dare to dream; courage to act

I am unwilling to accept the proposition that some regions, including vast swathes of the Arab world, have no choice for the future but to live under corrupt, autocratic, suffocating regimes—with their striking deficits of freedom, human rights, women's emancipation, and academic inquiry.

Once again, as in the postwar period, these times require the vision of true statesmen. We must dare to dream and have the courage to act.

Ladies and gentlemen, leaders on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean need to emphasize our common values, common concerns, and, yes, common objectives. Some of those leaders are here this evening, and I salute their foresight and principled leadership.

To be sure, there are, and inevitably will always be, differences between Europe, or at least some European nations, and the United States, rooted in political rivalry, economic competition, and divergent assessments. In the larger scheme of things, however, and with a measure of good will, these differences ought to be quite manageable. In any case, they must never be permitted to overshadow our commonalities. Or, as Minister [Ana] Palacio aptly put it at this year's World Economic Forum, we must learn how to "build on our divides."

The American Jewish Committee has for decades been a trailblazer in building bridges between Europe and the United States. And at moments such as this, when cracks in the foundation have been revealed and younger people in particular may question the ties that bind us, the work of bridge building becomes only more important.

That is precisely why we chose to launch this initiative at this time. Talk, as they say, is cheap. It's action that is needed, and we want to do our part.

It means for us never losing sight of the larger picture of Europe and America as the likeliest of strategic allies.

It means never succumbing to the notion that Europeans and Americans may still live in the same solar system but no longer on the same planet.

It means resisting the temptation to declare that we Americans have gravitated irreversibly toward Hobbes, hard power, unilaterism, and the tug of faith, while Europeans have been hypnotized by Kant, soft power, multilateralism, and secularism, as if such sweeping generalizations could withstand close scrutiny.

And it also means facing the inevitable tough issues where we may not necessarily find a complete convergence of views, but doing so in ways that benefit friends.

For us at the American Jewish Committee, those tough issues today include, above all, Israel's standing in the community of nations, which has come under frequent and repeated assault by too many who, in their rush to assign blame, fail to understand—or, in some cases, simply refuse to understand—that genuine peace cannot be achieved absent a credible and committed Palestinian partner.

No nation on the face of this earth yearns for peace more than the nation of Israel, which has not known a single day of true peace since its founding fifty-five years ago.
No nation has demonstrated a greater willingness to take tangible territorial risks in pursuit of peace than Israel, a country barely two-thirds the size of Belgium.

And yet, as we all know, peace cannot occur in a vacuum. Tragically, for Israelis and Palestinians alike, such a vacuum does exist. What is most glaringly missing is a Palestinian leadership prepared to forswear terror and incitement, stop cynically manipulating the Palestinian people, and negotiate in good faith a two-state solution that is the only viable political answer to this heart-wrenching conflict.

The tough issues also include our dismay at the recent rise in global anti-Semitism, and especially within the Muslim world. The rise is real, it is demonstrable, and it is chilling. Violent incidents, conspiratorial theories, television shows peddling the ancient blood libel charge or dramatizing the infamous Protocols of the Elders of Zion, Nazi-like cartoons, and demonstrations at which "Death to the Jews" can be heard have become all too frequent. Once again, the anti-Semitic genie is out of the bottle.

New institute seeks solutions

Troublingly, there are some who have sought to deny or minimize this ominous development; others who have attempted to rationalize it; and even those who have tried to lay blame for the problem on the Jews themselves.

We should be absolutely clear. Yes, anti-Semitism is a non-Jewish disease that directly threatens Jews. But history has amply taught us that anti-Semitism never stops with Jews. Ultimately, left unchecked, it will enter the bloodstream of otherwise civilized societies and eventually damage, if not destroy, them.

And history has also taught us, or at least should have taught us, that anti-Semitism must be fought tenaciously, and not just by Jews. Whatever the source of the anti-Semitism, whether from the left, the right, or the Muslim world, all well-meaning people need to join in the struggle. Political leaders have a special role to play in combating anti-Semitism, as do law enforcement and judicial authorities. The voices of civic, religious, human rights, and intellectual leaders must never be silent. And in the long term, there can be no substitute for the role of education in inculcating in young people the values of mutual respect and social harmony.

We count on the European Union, the United States, other democratic nations, the OSCE, and the nongovernmental organizations represented here this evening to stand strong and resolute in the struggle against what has been called the world's most enduring hatred.

The Transatlantic Institute will, we hope, quickly become an important new venue for addressing these and other pressing issues, such as the challenges posed by migration and acculturation, fanaticism and fundamentalism, bigotry in all its insidious forms, the relationship between religion and state, and dialogue among faiths, that affect Europeans and Americans alike.

Indeed, earlier today we held our first public triadogue among European Christian, Jewish, and Muslim leaders here in Brussels.

Our overriding goal is not simply to identify common problems but, even more importantly, to help pinpoint constructive, forward-looking solutions. In this effort, we shall seek the collaboration of like-minded individuals, trusted friends, on both sides of the Atlantic, many of whom are in this ballroom tonight.

Finally, before closing I would like to express thanks to those staff who in so many ways helped to make this day possible, and in particular to Jason Isaacs, the AJC's Washington-based Director of Government and International Affairs, and to Marta Mucznik and Rosalinda Sel-dowitz, the first two members of the Transatlantic Institute's outstanding professional team.

Ladies and gentlemen, you honor us by your presence here this evening. Thank you for joining us in celebration of the opening of the Transatlantic Institute.

And once again, a very special word of appreciation to Rhoda and Jordan Baruch, the wonderful parents who gave birth to this beautiful new child.
LOUIS MICHEL

“...Washington has more to gain from having a strong rather than a weak Europe at its side.”

The aim of the Transatlantic Institute is to contribute to the reconciliation between the positions of the United States and the European Union on international questions. Because I feel that these transatlantic relations represent a crucial strategic asset, I am happy to welcome the Transatlantic Institute to Belgium as a new participant in the dialogue.

The recent past has revealed the existence of differences between the European Union and the United States. I shall return to this subject later. However, these differences should be explained rather than dramatized. On January 1, 2004, in remarks that drew wide comment, [U.S. Secretary of State] Colin Powell spoke in favorable terms of the relations of the United States with the European Union. “Our mutual agenda, ranging from support for the market economy to efforts to combat the proliferation of nuclear weapons, has never been more important...
or mutually significant," he said.

While differences do exist, they are, in fact, "differences of opinion among friends." It is true that a shared history does not in and of itself suffice to prevent or overcome such differences. However, we share common political and economic values: those of freedom, democracy, and the market economy. In a still largely unstructured world, it is therefore in our joint interest to cooperate and organize to ensure that this cooperation will be more productive. I am definitely not a partisan of the oft-heard contention that the Atlantic collaboration belongs to the past and that in the future Europe and the United States will be taking different routes. For me, transatlantic relations are still of strategic value, but they need to be recast.

Transatlantic relations must, in fact, be recast and reoriented. I am struck by the extent of the changes wrought by time in the foundations of our partnership. This unobtrusive change is often underestimated. The two traditional pillars on which our partnership was based have disappeared: The Soviet threat has ceased to exist, and the internal stability of the European continent is now secured by the European Union.

After the two world wars, the United States ensured stability in Western Europe, with Washington acting as the mainstay of Europe through the Marshall Plan, the OECD, NATO, and similar institutions. This role of "great reunifier" is now being played increasingly by the Europeans themselves. The European Union has not only instituted a lasting peace among its members; it also serves, thanks to its power of attraction, as an influence for stabilization and development among its neighbors. For a long time, the United States played the role of primary guarantor in the face of the Soviet threat. Now this second foundation of Atlantic solidarity is also part of the past, and NATO is actively working on the recast and reorientation of its tasks and objectives.

Values and power gaps

In addition to this external factor, I also see an internal factor that explains the disruptions in international relations: In some ways we are, in fact, different. We must have the courage to accept this reality and to take the first step toward demystification. I am talking here about the "values gap" and the "power gap."

It is often said that Europe and the United States are founded on a base that is in every way identical. I am not so sure. It is true that we have to a great extent a shared history, and that we have many political and ethical principles in common. However, there are differences in our ways of thinking and acting, or what we might call a "values gap." In Europe, political democracy has been enriched by the development of a model of social democracy. The United States and Europe differ in their approach to the concepts of social solidarity and economic growth. This explains transatlantic differences on such questions as the IGOs (international intergovernmental organizations), aid to the Third World, environmental protection policy, and energy.

There is also a "power gap." The United States is a superpower; the European Union is not. Therefore, whereas the United States tends to position the direct-intervention threshold at a fairly low level, Europe places more emphasis on coordination, compromise, and negotiation. What has just happened in Iran proves that this method can produce results.

This culture of coordination makes us convinced multilateralists. Robert Kagan claims that the reason why the European Union does not consider a broad multi-
“In our new dialogue on strategy, we must define our strategic objectives with greater precision.”

lateral approach to threats is that it is powerless. I beg to differ. The day-to-day operation of the European Union has accustomed us to the processes of negotiation and compromise and the use of influence rather than force. This approach is part of the European political culture. So it not surprising that public opinion in our countries supports it fully.

Undoubtedly, the American style of action is also explicable by internal and historical factors. It must be kept in mind that the United States gained its independence by force. As a young nation, it sought to preserve its democratic specificity at any price, and it developed the concept of “national security” as the basis of its foreign policy. The spectacular economic, social, and technological development of the country, followed by the two world wars, completed the process that placed the United States at the pinnacle of the Free World. Since the fall of the Berlin Wall, its [America’s] influence has spread over the entire world. This extremely rapid development, completed in only two centuries of history, has created within the American nation an unusual confidence in its own values, methods, and resources.

To be effective, the exercise of power must rest on a legitimate base. In this connection, the question of Iraq has been in the forefront of the profound differences among the member states of the European Union on the one hand, and between these states and the United States on the other. It has also given certain people the impression that Europe is weak, divided, and unable to speak with one voice, that it has been forced to yield in the face of unilateral intervention by a powerful United States. Above all, this crisis has raised a certain number of difficult questions for which constructive answers must be found. These questions relate to the challenges and threats of the twenty-first century and also to ways of approaching them. Paradoxically, they are at the core of the remodeling of the transatlantic partnership.

Principles of equality, predictability

The crumbling of the reliable foundation of our Atlantic solidarity is not a reason to stop moving forward—on the contrary.

The new challenges facing us include weapons of mass destruction, failed states, terrorism, the expansion of democracy and the rule of law, and the fight against the poverty gap that separates the north from the south. These are problems that can be successfully resolved only in the context of the transatlantic partnership. Only the United States and Europe can form the combination of forces needed in order to meet these challenges. Just as the geographic focus of the Soviet threat to Europe reinforced transatlantic links, so, too, the new thematic challenges of the twenty-first century can form the new basis for a strong alliance. Thanks to the excellent work done by Javier Solana, the European Union now has a strategic concept that, in terms of its analysis of the global context, accords in large part with the American analysis. The few differences with respect to methods to be used do not mean that a common ground cannot be found, because when it comes to strategic challenges, what is true for Europe also holds true for the United States: What we do together, we do better.

I believe that this reorientation must be based on two principles: first, the principle of equality of the transatlantic partners, and second, the principle of predictability of their policies.

First, it is important for Washington to recognize the new Europe as a full partner. I am firmly convinced that Washington has more to gain from having a strong rather than a weak Europe at its side. This is primarily a task for us Europeans. If we have been unable to convince our American partners of our point of view in the Iraq crisis, it is undoubtedly because they still accord too little credibility to a specifically European strategy concept. They undoubtedly feel, and rightly so, that a concept limited to a virtual exercise of geopolitical analysis carries too little weight when it becomes necessary to move matters forward.
From this point of view, it is urgent that the European Union create a military capability sufficient to make a difference. Today I am convinced that the United States will listen to us when we have demonstrated our ability to assume our proper share of responsibility for ensuring our security and that of the Free World. Meeting this challenge seems to me essential if we wish to reestablish a strong link between Europe and the United States. This is a long-term process. The United States can encourage, boycott, or neglect this emancipation. The alternatives are a Europe that is strong or weak, a “fellowship” or a “fellowship.”

This leads me to plead in favor of making the European Union better known to U.S. policy decision-makers, Congress, and public opinion. I am persuaded that lack of understanding is in large part responsible for the misunderstandings that have arisen between us. The aim of the exercise is “more Europe,” not “less America.” The European Union must be viewed as a partner of the United States, not as a counterforce.

Second, I plead for more predictability. I often find among my U.S. contacts a profound lack of knowledge of Europe. And the reverse is equally true: We Europeans as well underestimate the infinite complexity of the political and social landscape of the United States. All of us, Americans and Europeans alike, fall into the trap of caricature and take the wrong course. I therefore plead resolutely in favor of strengthening our forms of strategic dialogue, in terms of the frequency of our meetings, their format, and above all their agenda, all of which must be oriented more in the direction of a search for tangible results. Formalism must be replaced by a more in-depth coordination with respect to genuinely strategic questions.

Seeking a new consensus

In light of the foregoing, I plead for a new consensus, the key elements of which are the following:

1. The United States must encourage the continuation of European unification, including agreements on European defense policy. The interest of the United States itself is at stake here.
2. The European Union must further develop its ability to act and to assume its responsibility for the management of international security and peace.
3. In our new dialogue on strategy, we must define our strategic objectives with greater precision. I am referring here to the peace process in the Middle East, the fight against terrorism and the proliferation of nuclear weapons, events in Africa and Russia, and other situations. Obviously, it is not enough simply to list them. New “common strategies” must be worked out on all these questions.
4. Above and beyond setting objectives, we must agree on a way of achieving them. This applies particularly in connection with the United Nations, relations between “hard” and “soft” power, and, for example, the use of preventive intervention.
5. The United States and the European Union must envisage new forms of strategic dialogue. On the political level, the formulas for summits and ministerial meetings must be redesigned to make them more effective. There should also be a place for more direct contacts between our peoples, contacts that will be, in a sense, secondary routes, a kind of “traffic monitoring service,” linking Europe with the United States. In this context, think tanks like the Transatlantic Institute play a preferential and important role.

This is, therefore, an opportune time for the establishment of the Transatlantic Institute.

Thank you.

Ambassador Edward B. O’Donnell, Jr. (C.), U.S. Special Envoy for Holocaust Issues, represented Secretary of State Colin Powell at the Transatlantic Institute dedication event, where he spoke, during the dedication reception, with Julie and Roger Baskes. Julie Baskes serves as chair of AIC’s Community Services Commission.
R. NICHOLAS BURNS

"The United States, Canada, and Europe are natural allies. We share a common history, common democratic values, and an interconnected economy."

Distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is an honor to join you in welcoming the American Jewish Committee's Transatlantic Institute. I congratulate you on your initiative, and I am sure that the institute will play an important role in strengthening ties across the Atlantic.

Your new institute is born at a time when we need another transatlantic bridge—a private one—to support the official one we have had for fifty-five years in NATO. Two thousand and three was a stormy and turbulent year in transatlantic relations, with allies divided over Iraq, both within Europe and across the ocean.
There is nothing more important for all of us in NATO in 2004 than healing the rift from the Iraq crisis, reenergizing the alliance, and moving forward together, as we have begun to do successfully in rebuilding Afghanistan and, now, Iraq itself.

While some in Europe and in my own country believe that the Iraq crisis was a fundamental turning point away from our half-century alliance, I do not agree that we are heading for a separation, much less a divorce. When all is said and done, the United States, Canada, and Europe are natural allies. We share a common history, common democratic values, and an interconnected economy. Europe and North America are the only two completely democratic regions on earth. NATO will stay together—in a not always harmonious or easy marriage, but in a strong one—because we need each other to confront the great transnational challenges that nations cannot hope to fight unilaterally: international crime, narcotics, climate change, human trafficking, weapons of mass destruction, and terrorism. Europe and North America can only succeed by facing these twenty-first-century threats together in NATO and with a close NATO-EU relationship.

Mutual obligations

We can do so ultimately by recognizing that our two sides of the Atlantic have serious obligations to one another: for Europeans, to resist the call for Europe to become a counterweight to the U.S. That would separate the U.S. from Europe. For Americans, our obligation is to participate fully in NATO and other multilateral institutions and to promote “effective multilateralism,” as President George W. Bush has argued. We are always stronger when working with our allies and our friends. In fact, the U.S. together with our allies is building a new NATO, one with new members, new missions in Afghanistan and Iraq, new partners, and a new outward focus on the greater Middle East.

In mid-March, we will add seven new members to the alliance. Thank you for the strong endorsement that the American Jewish Committee gave to NATO enlargement. David Harris testified before the U.S. Senate in support of this historic seven-nation enlargement, which he called a “significant step to extend the reach of democratic values and respect for human rights.” I could not agree more. To Harold [Tanner] and David [Harris], and all of AJC, we appreciate your support, foresight, and leadership.

The United States has led the historic effort to create the new NATO. For the first time in its history, NATO has new missions beyond the transatlantic region. In Afghanistan, our task is to reinforce NATO’s long-term peacekeeping role and to extend security beyond Kabul. The United States and most of the allies also believe NATO should take on a collective military role in Iraq in 2004. There is an emerging consensus within NATO that we should take this step at the request of a sovereign Iraqi government. Whatever our disagreements over Iraq in 2003, all of us have a long-term interest in helping the people of Iraq to build a democratic future. All of us should be involved.

And the new NATO is continuing to
improve its cooperation with that other great institution responsible for Europe’s future—the EU. Both NATO and the EU will admit new members from Central Europe this spring. This twin enlargement will advance our most vital strategic goal of a Europe whole, free, and at peace, and will do more than any other initiative to integrate Europe—eastern and western—for the very first time in Europe’s long history. This is an achievement that will ensure no more continental wars in Europe. It is the achievement of a lifetime for everyone in this room.

NATO also has a new partnership with Russia, through the NATO-Russia Council. We have a special relationship with Ukraine, and we are placing greater emphasis on our partners in Central Asia and the Caucasus. Europe cannot be whole and peaceful without Russia, the Ukraine, and the states to their east.

Expanding NATO in the Middle East

Finally, NATO will also be looking for ways to expand its long-term engagement with Israel and the Muslim world. The U.S. knows, and NATO knows, that profound threats to transatlantic security come from that arc of countries stretching from Morocco across North Africa to the Levant, the Gulf and to South Asia. Secretary of State Colin Powell has suggested that we transform NATO’s Mediterranean Dialogue—a program that includes Israel and six Arab states—into a true and larger partnership, including Muslim countries on the Gulf and beyond.

We know that the road to a genuinely secure and more peaceful world runs through the greater Middle East. Long-term change in that vast region will, over time, wither the twisted roots of terrorism and give the seeds of democracy, civil society, and prosperity the soil in which to take root.

One of AJC’s missions is to strengthen the principle of pluralism around the world as the best defense against anti-Semitism and bigotry. The U.S. is concerned by the continued high number of anti-Semitic incidents in the world, and especially in Europe. David spoke elo-

Nicholas Burns argued that America and Europe have obligations to one another: for Europeans to resist the call to become a counterweight to the U.S.; for Americans to participate in multilateral institutions.
quently to the U.S. Congress of his personal experiences with anti-Semitism while living in Europe. We are gratified that European leaders are denouncing such incidents and taking actions necessary to protect synagogues and Jewish community buildings. But much more needs to be done. A recent poll shows that a disturbing number of Europeans believe Israel is a threat to world peace. Our perception is fundamentally different, and we find such statistics astounding and worrisome. Our friendship with Israel remains unshakeable, and our commitment to Israel's security has never been firmer.

For Europeans and Americans, Christians, Jews, and Muslims, the challenge of peace in the greater Middle East is perhaps the greatest foreign policy challenge of our time. We look forward to working with the AJC and the Transatlantic Institute, and to building a more peaceful and secure future. In the words of Secretary of State Colin Powell, "We fight terror because we must, we seek a better world because we can, because it is our desire and our destiny to do so."

"For Europeans and Americans, Christians, Jews, and Muslims, the challenge of peace in the greater Middle East is perhaps the greatest foreign policy challenge of our time."
It is a great pleasure for me to take part in the opening of the Transatlantic Institute here in Brussels. The initiative taken by the American Jewish Committee to set up this institute must indeed be praised. If I were to make a wish over the cradle of this new baby being born, it would be that it become a convincing force to dispel misunderstandings, because a lot of work is needed in that regard; and that is precisely why I plan to visit the United States at the end of the month.

NOËLLE LENOIR

"Europe is certainly not building itself up against America. Such an analysis would be nonsense."

As you are aware, Europe [i.e., the European Union] is a unique form of integration and cooperation among nation-states. The goal of pooling the strengths of a whole continent is a great challenge, first for the Europeans themselves, but also, as I understand, for our international partners. But this challenge is not a threat. Let me stress, first, that the main idea is for Europe to strengthen our vital partnerships with other international players. And secondly, in order to achieve that goal, we are striving to pool the strengths, not only of our countries, but also of our people.
The creation of the EU aims at strengthening the vital partnerships of our nations with our key partners.

There has always been a dilemma in international relations: Whenever a country or a group of countries grows stronger, others around it worry to what end that newfound strength will be applied.

I hope your institute will help convince Americans, Europeans, and others that Europe is not building itself up against anybody. It aims at promoting a “more equitable, more secure and more united world,” to quote the EU Security Strategy document proposed by Javier Solana and adopted at the last European Council.

Europe is not building itself up, for instance, against any culture or religion. I mention this here for historical reasons. As you may know, the first use of the word European was to designate a group of people that united to fight against the invading Moors in the eighth century. Today, on the contrary, Europe’s purpose is to engage its southern neighbors, for the same reasons that America does so with its own southern neighbors, through NAFTA.

That is the whole point of a policy that France sees as vital: the Euro-Mediterranean partnership. Thanks to the Spanish government, and then to the Greek and Italian presidencies, a new impetus has been given to that process through the creation of a Foundation for Dialogue among Cultures, the strengthening of financial cooperation, and the establishment of an advisory parliamentary assembly. But we still have more to do.

More central to the work of this institute, I would like to stress that Europe is certainly not building itself up against America. Such an analysis would be nonsense. With our historical links, common values, and largely common interests, a strong Europe is definitely a good bet for America’s own interests.

A strong Europe benefits the U.S.

Think, for instance, about European defense: After decades of discussions about the “sharing of burdens,” who can object to Europe taking defense seriously—especially when, in so doing, Europe is able to make a positive contribution to the stabilization of the Balkans (in this case, relieving NATO for other tasks)? Who can criticize the EU when it deploys soldiers in support of peacekeeping efforts, such as recently in Africa? Look at the breakthroughs reached in the last European Council [meeting of heads of state of the EU]: the creation of an operational cell in the EU headquarters and an EU cell at SHAPE [Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe in Casteau, Belgium, one of NATO’s two main military command centers], and in the drafting of a chapter on defense within the negotiations for the future constitution, on the other hand. These should be hailed as proofs of the vitality of our transatlantic security dialogue.

Minister Lenoir suggested that America, while an imprecise model, could be a source of inspiration for Europeans attempting to create a sense of Continental citizenship.
But it is not enough merely to say what the EU is not about. Let me now come to what the EU is about:

The creation of the EU is about the establishment of a political Europe by and for its citizens.

Most international organizations are important, yet most are concerned with only official diplomatic endeavors. The EU is different: It places the implications for its citizens at the heart of its project. To be blunt, one could say the European Union is about bringing people together to such an extent that governments would no longer be able to consider war between themselves as an option. Bringing citizens into the diplomatic calculus is quite a novel approach to international relations. It remained rather virtual [than real] for a while, as the opening of our internal borders was mostly about the free flow of goods and capital. But now, things are changing, with the establishment of the Euro and with Europe tackling issues such as sustainable development, security and justice, defense, and foreign affairs.

If today's challenge is how to build Europe for its citizens, America can be a source of inspiration. It is not quite a model, because Europe, with the strength of its nation-states, differs in its essence from American federalism: One can feel Texan and American much as one can feel French or Spanish and European, but the balance between these identities is far from being the same. Yet America can be a source of inspiration as to how to blow the winds of Continental patriotism into the hearts of Europeans. This is the purpose of the future European constitution, also drafted by a convention, but here in Brussels, not in Philadelphia!

**Increasing “European-ness”**

With regard to France, as minister of foreign affairs, I try to increase a feeling of "European-ness," drawing upon examples of what makes America so strongly felt by its citizens: its educational system, internal mobility, flags, and other symbols.

Will those be sufficient to make Europeans accept that they are all citizens of a political unit? Certainly not. We need also to assure them that their diversity is respected, indeed better protected and nurtured, within Europe. The principle of diversity of cultures and languages within Europe is therefore appropriately proclaimed in the opening of our future European constitution.

Let me then ... say a few words about the issue of laïcité [secularism] in France. I'm aware that this issue arouses passions. First, there was the debate over whether Europe would profess Christian roots in its constitution. Most of the French think it not appropriate. Secondly, the issues of the Muslim veil and its prohibition in
school have recently come to the fore in France. I want to stress that, in the heat of the arguments exchanged, many commentators confused the general issue of laïcité and this particular application of it to the schools.

Let me point out that the veil and other so-called “ostensible” religious signs are regulated only in primary and secondary schools, therefore affecting only younger pupils, and especially young girls, whom we feel it necessary to protect. This policy is for us a matter of reconciling the free expression of private faith and the neutrality required in the French educational system. The law voted upon this week was largely backed by both the majority and the opposition parties, because of its moderate and reasonable prescriptions. We do not pretend that our system is the best; nevertheless, that’s our way of doing things—to ask the French legislators to clarify fundamental values.

Secularism is a principle that goes far beyond the particular issue of the veil in public school. This same principle is also behind the recent vigorous response of the French legislature to forge, among others, tougher criminal laws to fight the scourge of anti-Semitism, which, of course, is still, unfortunately, present.

On this issue and on so many others, I am glad to see the establishment of a place where thinkers, commentators, diplomats, scholars, and even politicians can bring together analyses and viewpoints, and thereby help foster a better understanding between both our continents. An enlarged Europe and confident transatlantic links remain for us to build on a day-to-day basis. Much like America, as a great nation, was born on the rough but healthy experience of the frontier, we too, as Europeans, have our destiny in our hands. Let me conclude with words taken from John Steinbeck’s East of Eden. Referring to the myth of Cain and Abel, Steinbeck uses the Hebrew word tīmshol, which means “you may rule” (in this case, over sin). In so doing, Steinbeck emphasized the will of man at the heart of the human experience. Much the same, it is up to us to build a strong and democratic Europe, which cannot be conceived without a strong and confident transatlantic relation.
I promise you that I am going to keep my remarks very short. I found the speeches tonight most interesting, and found that parts of my speech were in some of those speeches, so I want not to repeat what has been said. I am delighted and very honored to be here tonight with this distinguished group of people, talking about an issue that is very close to my heart.

ROCKWELL ANTHONY SCHNABEL

"When the U.S. and Europe work together, we can move the world."

Representing the United States to Europe today is a challenging position. We have had a very interesting period since I have been here, and I can report to you that there has been a rather substantial turn of events since the last summit we had in Washington. Recently I was at the Davos Conference. There was a distinct change of attitude, which the press reported upon, and we are delighted that it is happening.

What you are doing here tonight is extraordinarily important, and that is to start a new institution that is going to
work on the transatlantic relationship as we know it today. I see this every day here in Brussels, which, of course, is the capital of Europe, representing some 500 million people, and an $8 trillion economy. When the U.S. and Europe work together, we can move the world. When we don’t work together, it means that important global problems don’t get solved. It means that hungry people around the world don’t get the help and support they need for better lives. It means the principles of tolerance and pluralism are inadequately defended. It means we aren’t living up to our shared responsibility for the world.

So we can, here together tonight, make something happen. We are committed to building the strongest possible partnership between the United States and Europe. One issue that we can work on together is overcoming anti-Semitism, which was mentioned earlier, and is indeed, as I understand it and have read, getting to a point where it is as bad as it was in the ’30s. The U.S. administration is very concerned about the issue, as are the leaders here in Europe. There is no room for any form of tolerance of hatred around the world.

Tonight we have the great pleasure of welcoming into our midst a new voice to keep our partnership strong. Again, that you have taken the initiative to form and to open in Brussels the Transatlantic Institute is not only timely, but courageous, and absolutely the right thing to do at the right time.

I want to thank the American Jewish Committee, and the Baruch family in particular, for taking the initiative to found this institute here in Brussels and for taking an active part in keeping this partnership strong and healthy, as it is, as mentioned earlier, vitally important to the world. Together we—Europe and the United States—represent 60 percent of the world’s GDP. Together we need to achieve those things that we are set on achieving. One of those is the issue of world poverty, which, of course, is the key issue around the world today.

On both sides of the Atlantic, people have spilled a lot of ink talking about what is wrong with the transatlantic relationship. By creating this institute, you are not just talking, you are actually doing something, and that is what is needed. It is the right thing to do and the right time to do it. I want to congratulate you sincerely. I look forward to working with you and am delighted to have been here as a participant in this event tonight. Thank you so much.

Ambassador Schnabel said that the partnership between the United States and Europe is vitally important to the world and that the atmosphere has improved noticeably during the past year.

“‘There is no room for any form of tolerance of hatred around the world.’”
It is my very great pleasure to be here with you tonight. I have a written address, but I won’t take it as my guide, because many things have already been said. Allow me just a few comments on what has been said.

ANA PALACIO

“In order to be a harmonious Europe, we Europeans have to remain anchored to the Mediterranean. We cannot forget the Mediterranean.”

This is a very timely initiative. May I congratulate the Baruch family for being patrons of such an initiative! This is a very timely initiative because we need a strong transatlantic dialogue. We Europeans are facing a moment of “refoundation,” by which I mean “refoundation” of the European Union, because of all the tensions in the debate about the constitution, which have to be put into the framework of this moment, as we are refounding the union.

There are, in my view, three major challenges: The first is that we are going from a union linked to a market to a union linked to a constitution, because
our citizens have asked us [to do so]. Now this has great significance. A few years ago, very few would have dared to say Europe and constitution [in one breath], because they would be looked upon as a fanatic or an unrealistic person. Now, everybody assumes that Europe is not any more linked to a market, but is now linked to a constitution. Therefore, we have to deepen our common basket. We have to deepen the policy matters that we are doing together. And we have to deepen ties on security matters, on fighting common threats, beginning with the terrorist [threat] and fighting international crime or just seeking a higher standard of liberties in Europe. Of course, just making progress is a foreign policy, but this I leave to Javier Solana—making progress in having a more structured, better-coordinated defense policy—may I add, within the framework of NATO. Any other venture outside NATO is just bound not to [be in] the interest of us Europeans. That is our first challenge.

The second challenge—and this flows from NATO in a very natural way—is why Europe [i.e., the EU] was born. Let’s remind ourselves why Europe was born. Europe was born in order to avoid new bloodshed between the French and the Germans, and you cannot understand Europe if you do not understand the importance of this relationship. We need a very good, strong relationship between the French and the Germans, but we need an inclusive relationship, not an exclusive one—a relationship that builds within Europe and that is not afraid of this new Europe. This Europe was born out of the conditions of the Cold War; and, of course, during the Cold War, there was a false but nevertheless pervasive feeling of security, because of the balance of mutual threat, with mutual destruction being assured. Europe was born and built upon this feeling of security, but nowadays Europe—as the figures mentioned before demonstrate—is a great economic power that cannot rely any more on this feeling of security. We have to address other issues; we have to address them with an instrument that has proven to be essential for Europe—that is, NATO. By the way, NATO is an instrument that has proven able to adapt to new threats and challenges in a fantastic way. The reform of NATO is something worth looking at, to see how an institution that was conceived in a very different world can adapt itself to meet the challenges and the threats of the new twenty-first century.

There is a third area in which we have a big challenge, and that is in going from a safe, cozy, homogeneous Europe of six rich members to a Europe of the twenty-five-plus members, as David said, with Bulgaria and Romania, and, may I add, because it is very important for us Europeans, Turkey. This is our next challenge. This is the reality about which we Europeans have to think. This is our Europe—twenty-five countries plus Bulgaria, Romania, and Turkey.

**Neighborhood policy needs change**

Of course, there is a vertigo to this new Europe, which is in contrast to the old Europe, the divided Europe—the Europe of the Berlin Wall. This [new balance] is the difference between the old Europe and the new Europe that so many generations of Europeans have dreamt about and is today a reality. Of course, there are symmetries and there are challenges that
have to be met, but we cannot indulge in nostalgia for the time—I can’t even say “we” because we were not in; we Spaniards are newcomers—when Europe was different. We have to face this challenge fully and with confidence, as David said, that Europe is a success story. Europe will remain a success story, I’m absolutely sure. The idea of having a Europe of the twenty-five [states] plus Bavaria, Romania, and Turkey means that we have to think of ourselves in a different way.

**Importance of the Mediterranean**

The first issue that has changed is our neighborhood policy. Until now, Europe had two neighborhood policies—and rightly so. We had one neighborhood policy for Europeans, and a different, less integrated neighborhood policy for, to be politically correct I’ll say, Mediterraneans. Now, it doesn’t make much sense, because until now, our neighbors in Europe were members-to-be of the European Union. Now it's not likely that in the near future that we will have to address Belarus or Ukraine as belonging to the European Union. Therefore, it is our desire to have a homogeneous neighborhood policy that treats on equal terms Morocco and Algeria, Belarus and Ukraine. This is very important for us because it is our belief—and this is a belief shared by many Europeans—that now Europe's center of gravity goes north and east. In order to achieve a harmonious Europe, we Europeans have to remain anchored to the Mediterranean. We cannot forget the Mediterranean. We have to assume that the enlargement will take a lot of energy, resources, and strength, but we cannot forget the Mediterranean. We have to remain anchored to the Mediterranean. Therefore, this approach of a neighborhood policy is very important. We Europeans have a long tradition of relationship to the Mediterranean that was structured into the Barcelona process. This long tradition has to be enhanced and encouraged now because, living as we do in a globalized world, geography counts. This region, the most volatile region of the
planet, is much closer to us Europeans than to you Americans.

Let me conclude with some very brief remarks about an area where I'm sure this institute will prove an absolutely crucial instrument—that is, the new challenge of the greater Middle East. In this challenge, we all have a common interest. To meet this challenge, we have to understand that it is by going hand in hand with the United States, with whom—by the way, this I strongly believe—we share principles and values. If we want to build up a healthy identity in Europe, we have to build it on the principles and values that we share with Americans, which, in the end, come to this: the idea of the value of the human being as the center of our political and social system, in contrast to other systems which have the group as the political and social center. This, in the end, is what it means that we fight together and that we share the same attitude toward democracy, freedom, and prosperity as our American friends and allies. We have to work with them, hand in hand, to meet the challenges that we have in this region of the world.

We need NATO

Let me add just three more comments: First of all, we cannot have security as the driving aspect. We need NATO. We need to work in a partnership in NATO to secure a better structured dialogue with the Mediterranean countries and with other countries that belong to the greater Middle East.

But this cannot be the standard-bearer, the flagship. We need to push forward issues like prosperity, democracy, human rights, the rights of women, and other social issues. In so doing, we Europeans have to preserve the tools we already have that have proven to be usable and effective and, especially, to preserve the Barcelona process.

My last remark is that, unless we make progress in the Palestinian-Israeli peace process, any project in the greater Middle East context will be very difficult to push forward. The peace process, as has been said before, is the biggest challenge, socially and politically, to us all. I strongly believe that this institute will, in this arena, also be instrumental.

I thank you for allowing me to make these remarks.

"We need a very good and strong relationship between the French and the Germans, but we need an inclusive relationship, not an exclusive one."
Allow me to thank David Harris for his kind words of introduction, and the Board of Governors of the American Jewish Committee for giving me the honor to speak to you this evening.

JAVIER SOLANA

"Today, it is not just Israel’s peace and security that is at stake. It is ours, too....
The Middle East is on Europe’s doorstep."

One year after the attacks of 9/11, I was in New York to attend the United Nations General Assembly. I had the honor and pleasure to be the dinner guest of the Executive Committee of the American Jewish Committee. We talked late into the night about history, geography, politics, and the problems of the world. On some things we disagreed. But on one thing we were all agreed. There needed to be a better, broader dialogue between the two sides of the Atlantic. I am delighted that, thanks to the generosity of the Baruch family, the American Jewish Committee has acted in very concrete fashion to contribute to that dialogue by establishing the Transatlantic Institute here in Brussels.

For my many Jewish friends here this evening the Magen David—the Star of David—is a symbol of their religious faith. For my many Israeli friends it is a symbol of their nation. In its two inter-
locked triangles I see also a symbol of two other triangles. These are two triangles that, in the decades to come, will have a major bearing on the fortunes of us all. The first triangle is that between America, Europe, and Israel. The second triangle is that between Judaism, Christianity, and Islam.

Let me begin by talking about that first triangle. In the bonds that link America, Europe, and Israel we find the foundations of our civilization. What are these bonds? What do we share?

To begin with, we have a common political heritage. We share certain convictions about human rights. We place a high value on the freedom of conscience. We are guided by the importance of evidence in the search for truth. We believe that ideas should be tested through criticism, dialogue, and debate. These things are the pillars of our civilization. Although founded in religion, all these ideas have their secular expression. They are the foundation of our modern democracies.

We have a shared culture, thanks in no small part to the massive Jewish contribution to the arts, literature, philosophy, music, and science. The richness and diversity we see in all these fields owes much to Jewish creativity.

And, of course, we have a shared history. It is a history of both the best and the worst that mankind is capable of. In that history we see inspiring episodes of mutual enrichment and progress, of liberty and liberation, of the sharing and development of ideas that have shaped the world we live in today. But we see also shameful episodes of expulsions and Diaspora, of pogroms and emigration, of discrimination and persecution. And in the Holocaust we see a crime of unparalleled proportions that has forever scarred the heart and the conscience of Europe.

What Winston Churchill described as "the tragedy of Europe" provided the impetus, not only for the creation of the State of Israel in 1947, but also for the transformation of Europe. The Europe that has grown and developed into the European Union has embraced reconciliation and turned away from nationalism. It has rejected the idea of Carl Schmitt that the fundamental organizing principle of politics should be the antithesis between friend and foe.

Today, we are less than 100 days away from achieving an historic unification of Europe. With American help, a continent in ruins, a continent divided by war and ideology, has been transformed into what Kofi Annan described last month as "a shining light of tolerance, human rights, and international cooperation."

**An obligation to remember**

Simone Veil, Auschwitz survivor and first president of the European Parliament, has said that the witnesses to the Holocaust have no right to forget. I believe that no European has the right to forget. All Europeans have the obligation to remember. It is in that spirit that this new Europe has been built: a Europe of tolerance, of peace, of human rights; a Europe with the obligation to remember, but also with the capacity to act. Europe is aware of its responsibilities—those of the past and those of the future.
Europe's special responsibility—both moral and historical—creates a unique relationship with Israel. We are committed to Israel's right to exist as a Jewish state, where all Israeli citizens have a right to live in peace, security, and dignity. And we respect the Israeli government's right and duty to protect its citizens. But we are also convinced that the best way to secure these rights, the only lasting way to secure them, is through the creation of an independent, democratic Palestinian state.

Today, it is not just Israel's peace and security that is at stake. It is ours, too. Israel is our friend and our neighbor. The Middle East is on Europe's doorstep. War and terror, if allowed to continue, will not be contained to the streets of Jerusalem and Tel Aviv. With every new atrocity, we must become more determined, not less, to find lasting peace and security.

To a people traumatized by more than three years of sickening terrorist attacks, the European message of peace may sound naive. It is meant as the practical advice of a candid friend. Experience— not theory—tells us that the bitterest of enemies can be reconciled. It was a peace based on justice and political compromise, together with the active and generous support of America, that allowed Europe to replace conflict with coexistence.

Of course, the Arab-Israeli conflict does not present the same diagnosis. But some of the prescription is the same. The idea that violence will prevail—whether it is blind and bloody, or organized and uniformed—must be dismissed. Those moderate voices that reject violence must be given encouragement. Reform and openness to compromise must be rewarded. And there must be a sustained, determined international involvement. Europe is ready to play her part—not as a sponsor of one side or the other, or as a counterweight, but as a partner of all parties in the search for lasting peace.

This brings me to the second triangle of which I spoke—that between Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. The three sides of this triangle are present in all of our societies today: in the United States, in Europe, and in Israel and the Palestinian territories. The capacity of our societies to flourish, perhaps to survive, depends on finding the means of coexistence.

**Common Abrahamic roots**

It is a triangle with common roots. Abraham is the common ancestor for Jews, Christians, and Muslims. But successful coexistence is not guaranteed by shared origins. It will be achieved only through mutual respect and tolerance. That means attacking ignorance and promoting reason. It means attacking injustice and promoting human rights. And it means recognizing the equal worth of all people, whatever their nationality, color, or religion.

Simon Wiesenthal once noted that "tolerance and human rights require each other." A climate of tolerance succeeds best where the human rights of all are guaranteed, and the best guarantee of the respect of human rights is where tolerance prevails.

Tolerance and mutual respect must begin in our own societies. None of us must show the slightest complacency about racism—in any form. Europeans, more than anyone else, must be alive to the dangers of anti-Semitism. I will repeat what I have stated before. Recent acts and expressions of anti-Semitism in Europe are outrageous. The burning of synagogues, the physical and verbal abuse of Jews in the streets, the desecration of cemeteries—this must stop. It is an attack, not just against Jews, but against the Europe of which we are so proud—the Europe of tolerance, of peace, of human rights.

But let us not confuse two very different things. Acts and expressions of anti-Semitism within the European Union are
not acts and expressions of anti-Semitism by the European Union. The policies of the European Union are neither anti-Semitic nor anti-Israel.

I think that Jonathan Sacks, the chief rabbi of Britain, got it right when he said, “No nation is perfect. No nation is above criticism. A democracy must welcome criticism—and Israel is a democracy. Indeed it was the prophets of ancient Israel who invented the institution of self-criticism three thousand years ago. To this day, Jews are gold medalists in the art of self-criticism.”

Former Israeli Foreign Minister Abba Eban made the same point when he said, “We are the nation who can’t take yes for an answer.”

Yes, there are boundaries to legitimate criticism, which I recognize. We have a duty of vigilance. We must draw a line between legitimate criticism and vilification.

Suspicion and antagonism are not inevitable between religions. The Jews expelled from my home country, Spain, lived in peace and harmony in the Muslim countries where they settled for many centuries. In the Palestinian territories, towns that today are synonymous with communal strife and violence were for centuries a model of peaceful coexistence between Jews and Muslims. And if centuries of coexistence can be overturned, then so can centuries of prejudice. In our own lifetimes, we have witnessed a remarkable reconciliation between the Catholic Church and the Jews.

**Christian and Jewish dialogue**

The dialogue achieved between Jews and Christians must be extended to Islam. This dialogue must begin with a rejection of violence. I welcome the statements of religious leaders of all three great faiths condemning violence in the name of religion as a desecration to religion. A united rejection of incitement, hatred, and misrepresentation are essential beginnings.

But, at a political level, dialogue cannot end with the fact of violence. It must also address the sources of this violence. Replacing the current matrix of hatred and hurt, of humiliation and injustice, is a daunting task. It is one that demands that Jew, Christian, and Muslim afford each other mutual respect. It is one that will require the combined energies of the United States, Europe, and Israel—and of Israel’s neighbors.

Ladies and gentlemen, I applaud the work done by the American Jewish Committee in strengthening the links between all the elements of these two interlocking triangles. You have worked in the best traditions of that shared political heritage of which I spoke—openness, dialogue, and respect for the views of others. I am sure that these values will guide the important work of the Transatlantic Institute. I wish the institute every success.

---

“Acts and expressions of anti-Semitism within the European Union are not acts and expressions of anti-Semitism by the European Union.”
Government officials and international diplomats on both sides of the Atlantic commended the establishment of the Transatlantic Institute as an important contribution to constructive international dialogue. Expressions of congratulations and support included these letters from Colin Powell, Secretary of State of the United States; Silvan Shalom, Minister of Foreign Affairs and Deputy Prime Minister of Israel, as well as Dominique de Villepin, Minister of Foreign Affairs of France, and Joschka Fischer, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Germany, whose letters are shown with English translations.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE
WASHINGTON

February 5, 2004

I extend my congratulations to the American Jewish Committee on the opening of its office in Brussels -- The Transatlantic Institute. The State Department's Special Envoy for Holocaust Issues, Ambassador Edward B. O'Donnell, Jr., will represent me at this important and timely event. I know the Institute will enable the AJC to continue to play an effective role in deepening America's transatlantic ties, as it has done over the past years.

Since its founding in 1996, the AJC has sought to promote human rights and inter-religious dialogue, and has contributed effectively to efforts to achieve peace in the Middle East. I have great faith in the work of your Committee and am quite certain that the new Transatlantic Institute will be a valuable resource for strengthening bonds with our partners in Europe.

Congratulations, AJC!

Colin L. Powell

Deputy Prime Minister
and Minister of Foreign Affairs

Jerusalem, 8 February 2004

Dear Mr. Tanner,

I write to you to express my admiration and support on the occasion of the opening of The Transatlantic Institute, a new non-governmental organization affiliated with the American Jewish Committee.

Over the years the American Jewish Committee has played a key role in the field of international relations, bringing a measured voice, backed by informed research and analysis, to the discussions of the day.

This initiative will surely strengthen trans-Atlantic understanding on a range of issues, and I hope that it will help to reinforce the bonds between the various states who will be the Institute's main interlocutors. Today the democratic world faces many challenges, including terrorism, proliferation of WMD, and a resurgence of anti-Semitism. As the only genuine democracy in the Middle East, Israel is forced to confront these challenges on a daily basis. Therefore, I am sure that you understand our deep satisfaction with this endeavor and I convey to you, and through you to all who have brought this project to fruition, my best wishes for its every success.

Yours Sincerely,

Silvan Shalom

Mr. Harold Tanner
President
American Jewish Committee
1156 Fifteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
USA
Monieur le Président,

Je vous remercie de votre lettre du 9 mars, par laquelle vous avez bien voulu me faire part de l’importance que vous attribuez à la mise en place de l’Institut Transatlantique.

Comme vous, je considère que cet institut doit jouer un rôle très précieux dans le sens du renforcement du dialogue transatlantique, au service de la communauté profonde de valeurs et de destin qui nous unit.

Mr. Harold Tanner, President
American Jewish Committee
Dear Mr. President,

I thank you for your letter of March 9, in which you told me of the importance you attach to the establishment of the Transatlantic Institute.

Like you, I believe that this institute must play an important role to reinforce the transatlantic dialogue, to the benefit of the community of values and destiny that unite us so profoundly.

That is why I so deeply regretted I could not participate at the inauguration of the Transatlantic Institute on February 12. Ambassador Jacques Huntzinger, responsible for dealing with these questions in my office and who participated in this important gathering, gave me a very positive report. Ambassador Huntzinger will go to Brussels in mid-April in order to establish a working relationship with the staff of the institute.

More generally, I am pleased about the development of a close and trusting dialogue between the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the American Jewish Committee, a dialogue which warrants further strengthening and deepening.

Please accept, Mr. President, the expression of my best wishes.

Dominique de Villepin
Minister of Foreign Affairs
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
France

March 30, 2004

March 30, 2004

Sehr geehrter Herr Tanner, sehr geehrter Herr Harris,

Ich gratuliere Ihnen sehr herzlich zur Eröffnung des neuen „Transatlantic Institute“ in Brüssel.

Das „American Jewish Committee“ und die Bundesregierung verbinden heute eine vertrauensvolle und konstruktive Zusammenarbeit. Es freut mich sehr, dass Sie sich entschlossen haben, mit dem „Transatlantic Institute“ eine weitere Brücke nach Europa zu schlagen.

Ich bin überzeugt, dass das Institut in Brüssel einen wertvollen Beitrag zur Vertiefung der Beziehungen zwischen Amerika und Europa leisten wird. Gerade dem Dialog der Zivilgesellschaften auf beiden Seiten des Atlantiks wird es durch seine Arbeit wichtige Impulse geben können.

Dem „American Jewish Committee“ und allen Mitarbeiterinnen und Mitarbeitern des Transatlantic Institute in Brüssel sei meinen herzlichen Glückwunsch zum Erfolg übermittelt.

Translation

The Federal Minister for Foreign Affairs

Berlin, May 2004

Dear Mr. Tanner, dear Mr. Harris:

Please accept my warmest congratulations on the opening of the new Transatlantic Institute in Brussels.

For decades the American Jewish Committee and the Federal Government have been cooperating constructively in a spirit of mutual trust. I am delighted therefore that with the new Institute you are building yet another bridge to Europe.

Based as it is in Brussels, I am convinced the Institute will make a valuable contribution to intensifying the ties between America and Europe. Through its activities the Institute will be able to make a significant contribution to the civil-society dialogue across the Atlantic.

For the work ahead I wish the American Jewish Committee and all Transatlantic Institute staff a sure touch and every possible success.

Sincerely,

Dr. J. Fischer

Mr. Harold Tanner

Mr. David A. Harris,
President and Executive Director
of the American Jewish Committee
The Jacob Blaustein Building
166 East 56 Street
New York, NY 10022
Colloquia: Inaugurating the Transatlantic Dialogue

The work of the Transatlantic Institute began in earnest on the day of its dedication, with three colloquia about current issues of the transatlantic dialogue, followed by a briefing on European and transatlantic security at NATO military headquarters.

At the first session, Ambassador Rockwell Anthony Schnabel, U.S. representative to the European Union, and other American diplomats, briefed American Jewish Committee members and guests about the state of U.S.-European relations. The gathering then heard about the religious dimension of European and transatlantic issues from a panel of international faith leaders chaired by Rabbi David Rosen, AJC International Director of Interreligious Affairs. In the final forum, leaders from the Jewish communities of Europe discussed anti-Semitism, anti-Zionism, and other concerns of European Jewry.