

**International Workshop**  
**50 Years of European – Israeli Relations:**  
**From Perceptions to Cooperation**  
**May 4-5, 2009**  
**Konrad Adenauer Conference Center,**  
**Mishkenot Sha'ananim, Jerusalem**

**Lectures Summary**

The Konrad Adenauer Foundation, the Centre for the Study of European Politics and Society at Ben-Gurion University of the Negev in cooperation with the European Commission's Delegation to Israel and the Israeli Ministry of Foreign Affairs held on **4 and 5 May 2009** an international workshop entitled **"50 Years of European – Israeli Relations: From Perceptions to Cooperation"**.

The existence of a sound and solid set of relations between Europe and Israel is not a trivial one. Throughout the past fifty years these relations were characterized by trouble, discontent, and difference of opinion that could have led to separation, but eventually led to cooperation and understanding. This remarkable feat, which was commemorated in this workshop, has been achieved through the great diligence and dexterity of both Israeli and European decision makers. In contrast to the Venice Declaration of 1980, which marked a substantial low point in these relations, the embarkation on the European Neighborhood Policy and the EU-Israel Action Plan marked a new era in these relations, one of a much closer and tighter fit, and of more political, security, economic and cultural cooperation.

Today, both Europe and Israel face a world of challenges, both in the issues of socio-economic change, political dialogue, and security threats. In order to prevail successfully out from these circumstances, both Europe and Israel will have to utilize their international ties, including the common relations between them, which are at their historical peak today. In order to do so successfully, there must be a deepening of the dialogue and understanding between both sides.

This workshop aimed to acknowledge the great distance to which EU-Israeli relations have reached, and the significance of these relations today. Furthermore, it aimed to deepen the understanding between both sides, and to examine future ways of cooperation. Following the workshop, the organizers will submit recommendations to the relevant political leadership.

## **Opening Round Table: The EU and the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict**

### **Chair: Prof. David Newman**

The middle-east is light-years away from the situation of open borders as they do now exist in the EU, even in case of a future peace agreement. But at the same time we should not forget where Europe was 70 years ago, and therefore it is good to still dream about these things.

### **Amb. Michael Žantovský**

The Israeli-Palestinian conflict (or as the EU calls it – peace process) represents a major part of the EU-Israeli relations and it affects the whole relationship. It is the context of the relationship, due to the strategic importance of the area and the extent of the relations of the EU with both Israel and the Palestinian Authority. There is no ulterior motive, just a will to reach an agreement between the two parties. The history of the conflict indicates that the only possible resolution is a two state agreement with an independent Palestinian state beside an Israeli state with recognized and secure borders. The EU believes that the agreement should be based on the 1967 borders with any changes agreed upon by the two parties, but it is ready to accept any agreement the two parties will decide. Europe supports any action that brings closer the two-state solution and is critical of any action that makes such an agreement more difficult and less attainable.

Three issues come up in this context time and again:

- 1) Violence and destruction on both sides affect both civil societies. Israel has a right to defend itself but the consequence of exercising this right can be disputed.
- 2) Improvement of the living conditions of the Palestinians should lead to a better understanding between both sides. This is why we attach such importance to freedom of movement. Not all restrictions can be explained by security reasons and much work is needed in this area.
- 3) Unilateral changes on the ground affect the peace process: expansion of settlements and demolition of houses in east Jerusalem. This is troublesome because it defers an agreement and is contrary to past agreements that Israel agreed to. For the EU-Israeli relationship to succeed both sides have to stand up to there commitments. As for the upgrade agreement there is no need to question the EU's good will to move in this path and we should rather focus on how to continue upgrading the relationship rather than argue if it should be done faster or slower.

### **Amb. Ramiro Cibrián-Uzal**

The EU sees stability and peace in the Middle East as a top strategic priority. This was defined when the EU first established its security strategy. This is due to historic, cultural, geographical and geopolitical reasons. During the last year there have been good developments in the bilateral relations with Israel, and also with the Palestinian Authority (PA). After the second Intifada (2001-2003) there was a real downturn in the relationship but it has improved since 2004. Israel has a special status de facto with the EU as a neighbor country. Today we are at a critical point

where the relations can again turn to a negative direction ("I hope this does not happen, but it is a possibility"). In order to keep maintaining a positive relationship we need two things:

1) That Israel responds to security threats and attacks with restraint, because of the existing balance of power [where Israel is stronger]. There has been plenty of restraint which makes things easier.

2) That the hope that the Palestinians will one day be able to live a normal life in their own state is preserved. I am convinced that the EU will maintain these two parameters which are essential for a good continuation of the bilateral relations between EU and Israel. I hope that soon there will be a formalization of the excellent relations we have with Israel as a neighbor country, not as a candidate country. Because of Israel's advanced capacities it has been able to expand its relationship with the EU very extensively. In trade and economic relations Israel is the most important partner if we consider both export and import. In science and technology Israel is fully associated. In security there is also good cooperation between the two, and also in the fields of agriculture. Today there are twin-projects in the field of transportation, and there are going to be more in other fields. All these fields of cooperation are good tools to prepare Israel for participating [one day] fully in the European single market.

### **Dr. Christian Berger**

The EU security strategy deals with three main challenges:

1) Conflict;

2) Imbalance of wealth around the world;

3) The environmental issue and climate change.

Both Israelis and Palestinians are facing these challenges. It is in the EU's interest to find a solution for these challenges. The EU has a track-record with the region – with the announcement claiming that both sides have a right to self-definition, and later with the two-state solution and its terms. This is the EU's contribution to trying to solve the conflict on the political side. On the operational side we have been trying to build the structures (government and security) and the infrastructures (transport and economy) of the future Palestinian state. There is an economic agreement not only with Israel but also with the Palestinian Authority, hoping that economic trade with the EU will create some prosperity. We want to assure security and prosperity in our neighborhood (around the EU) – this is our self-interest. We want to see a viable, democratic and stable Palestinian state, but also a predictable one. As for the important economic factor of the PA – I think it is time they start to "pick up the tab" and that the Palestinian economy should pay for their development. We need an enabling environment for better security, political development and economy.

The current situation is this: in the West Bank we still have a partner, although it is struggling to keep its credibility among the people. The PA has done a lot in improving security and services. I think that in the past year under Salam Fayad all the militant gangs have disappeared, and this achievement has been recognized by Israel as well. The issues of the settlements, return to the lines of 2000 and the freedom of movement agreements of November 2005 are very important to the PA.

In Gaza, the EU and Israel have a few shared objectives:

- 1) Supporting civilian population,
- 2) Refusing radicalization in Gaza,
- 3) Strengthening the moderate forces in Gaza.

Where we disagree is on the way to achieve these objectives, particularly as far as the flow of goods and freedom of movement are concerned. The evolving black market is strengthening the radicals in Gaza. And there is a very serious banking problem. Since 2006 we have invested a lot of money into humanitarian costs, but very little in development costs and there are more and more European voices that criticize this.

### **Dr. Joel Peters**

Commented on the "Zigzag in Israeli attitude towards the EU" in the past few years. In 2003 Europe was praised, in 2004 it was denounced for its critical view of the separation wall, and yet since 2004 it has been playing a very active role in the region; last week the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, threatened to exclude the EU from the peace process. There is a mismatch between this rhetoric and the strengthening of the ties between Israel and the EU. There are three areas that affect these relations in regards to the conflict:

- 1) The dynamics and management of the conflict;
- 2) The outcome;
- 3) The process.

The management of the peace process can be seen as either the need to contain the conflict (which can be seen as conflict management), or as the need to resolve it (i.e. conflict resolution); The outcome refers to what is the expected and wanted resolution of the peace process – there are several potential outcomes; the process means how do we get to the outcome and who is involved in this process.

Often the EU and Israel have disagreed about these three dynamics – the two-state solution and the PLO as a partner are EU ideas that Israel did not constantly agree to. The main cause of tension between the two was the Venice declaration. Since 2002 till today Israel and the EU have been more or less in agreement on the idea of the two states, the need to resolve the conflict and not manage it, and the idea of who should be involved. The question is whether this will continue. A model seems to form: Israel and the EU agree on the peace process, the EU becomes more involved which brings, improvement in the bilateral relations between the two; then the EU criticizes Israeli policy, and Israel attacks the EU. We need to break this model, and take it down from the rhetorical level, on both sides. For example, the EU cannot really be excluded from the peace process, as it is today much more active and coherent and has much to offer to this process and Israel knows this.

### **Discussant: Prof. Michael Schulz**

There is a debate on what role the EU should and can play in the regional conflict. The EU has been a fore-runner in this process and proposed ideas to bring the conflict to an end. These are not always welcome by the parties on the ground, although these ideas have had their fair share of support. One case is the promotion of the two-state solution. From this process derives the question whether the EU should play a bigger role as a mediator or as partner and neighbor. Also there is the question of the relations between the EU and the USA. Some say the EU should be a soft

player or use soft power, which are two different things. We know that in order to transform a conflict we need to approach all levels of society to change the public opinion. Also I think the public is more suspicious today of EU intervention, as all the talks have been at state level. Therefore the EU needs to check what role it can play at other society levels in order to build connections between the civil societies on both sides and also between Israel and Europe. There is obviously a need for Israelis and Europeans to meet and learn more about each other. The EU must upgrade its understandings about both civil societies in Israel and in the PA. I think that for the long run this is the most important role the EU can play.

**Dr. Lars Hänsel presented the survey on "Israelis' attitudes towards the EU and its Members States".**

In the year celebrating 50 years of diplomatic relations between Israel and Europe and in view of the upcoming elections for the European Parliament, the Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung in cooperation with the Centre for the Study of European Politics and Society at Ben-Gurion University of the Negev decided to survey of the Israelis' attitudes towards the EU and its Members States.

The survey, which was conducted by KEEVON Research, was based on a large representative sample of Israeli Jews and Arabs and was carried out in Hebrew and Arabic.

Dr Hänsel confirmed that "the results show that Germany and the EU member states continue to play an important and central role in Israel. We were delighted to see significant support for EU countries and initiatives. We are looking forward to sharing the results with relevant policy makers in Israel and Europe. We are confident of the very deep German-Israeli bond and will continue to work towards strengthening it even more."

## **Day 2**

### **Culture and Society**

**Chair: Dr. Lars Hänsel**

Referred to the survey on "Israelis' attitudes towards the EU and its Members States" and noted two points: most EU supporters in Israel are 51 years old or older and there is not enough interest for the EU among the younger generation. This panel might allow a more appealing approach for the younger generation. In addition, the EU is attractive not only for its economy but also for its values and culture. The panel will focus on how to use these findings in order to develop future relations between Israel and the EU.

**Prof. Fania Oz-Salzberger**

Although the Europeans are not really defined, Israelis can fit in culturally with them due to Israel's European legacy. Tel-Aviv and Jerusalem can fit in easily in the "coffee house map" of Europe and its culture. The historical-cultural dimension of the ties between Israel and Europe goes back a very long time. The civil societies are the real owners of this legacy. The rift between Europe and Israel is not one of international relations and governments, but one of societies. In the 50's the majority of Israelis was European-born and had cultural roots in Europe and a vast acquaintance with Europe. The common history between the two has been forgotten or moved to the walls of academia and Israel today is considered aggressive and militant. There is need for a new dialogue which should focus on the younger generation.

One major topic is the centrality of Germany in the Israeli-European relations. Although Germany has done much to help build Israel, perhaps it should take a step back in order to allow a better connection between Israel and other European states and the EU itself. Germany's centrality has made the dialogue with others mainly an inter-governmental one. It has also made the memory of the holocaust so big that it overshadows a whole millennium of Jewish partnership and contribution to the construction of the European culture and values. Similarly, Israel was also founded on European values and tradition. But today Israeli civil society is often ignored by the EU representatives in favor of Israeli government officials. In conclusion, the more both Israelis and Europeans recognize their mutual heritage the more fruitful we will be in conducting ourselves internally and in the peace process.

**Mr. Eran Riklis**

Considered his cultural heritage as very complex but also filled with European culture. Europe has a keen interest in what happens in Israel, and his duty as film director is to portray the reality he sees around him in Israel to other places. This interest derives from a real belief that Israel is a part of Europe. The connection to other societies that perhaps do not know Israel so intimately is in human behavior and universal values like love and honesty. The secret of this universality is to deal with the local stories and scenes, as the more local you are the more universal you become.

**Mr. Eldad Beck**

Most Israeli media do not give their readers the news they [the readers] want, but the news they think an imaginary "average reader" would want. The result is Israelis know enough about the member states but almost nothing of the EU institutions. Beck believes most Israelis want Israel to join the EU but do not really realize the consequences (like the issue of Israel's sovereignty). Israelis consider Europe as an Economic power and investment opportunity but not as a political power. In addition they think of Europeans as mostly anti-Semitic or anti-Israeli (which in Beck's eyes is also quite true). Beck claims the EU is a boring enterprise that in today's shallow media world does not draw enough attention (the EU does not have enough "stars"). Europe appears in the sports and economic sections but not in the headline. There is no permanent correspondent in Brussels (which exemplifies the importance Israeli media attributes to the EU

institutions) and the coverage of European items focuses on the states and not the EU institutions. The EU officials, on their part, aim to Israeli elites and not to more common parts of society. The EU does not acknowledge the changes that have happened in Israel. European media depicts Israel as an aggressive and threatening society in a very exaggerated and one-dimensional way. The European media molds the unfavorable view Europeans have on Israel. Israelis are pictured as the new Nazis while the holocaust is being belittled in European media (he pointed out the Spanish press as a very extreme example). It is not that Israel does not deserve critique, it is just that this critique should be balanced and fair and this is not the case. The Israeli media needs to open itself to Europe and the European media needs to open itself to Israel as it is, not as it wishes it to be.

### **Energy, Environment and R&D**

#### **Chair: Mr. Robert Krengel**

These areas of interest, although a bit more technical, represent a core subject in EU-Israeli relations which are both very developed in these fields.

#### **Keynote Speaker: Mr. Daniel Jacob**

The cooperation between Israel and the EU in the area of research is a real success story. This cooperation is not restricted only to the EU research framework program (FP7), although this is a major part of it. The FP7 budget represents 54 billion Euros over 7 years, and the research topics are very wide. Israel is one of the countries that are the most closely linked to the program and to the EU (of the 12 associated countries). This means that "when it comes to research Israel is practically a member of the EU", in regard to funding and participation. The results of this cooperation have been extremely positive both for Israel and the EU. Most of the funds going to Israel went to the universities, which makes FP7 the second largest contributor to Israeli academic research. Israel's strong areas of research are ICT, health, nanotechnology, environment and energy. More important than the funding are the links and ties made by researchers on both sides, which contribute to the existence of future programs. In the first two years of FP7 Israeli scientists have secured already more than 100 million Euros in funding. FP7 has introduced new factors as the European research council, the joint technology initiatives, and in both there are opportunities to be seized by Israelis. In environmental research Israel is renowned for its abilities, and in energy research it is doing very well (solar power projects).

The benefits for Israel in the FP7 are:

- 1) Valuable contacts to European researchers and research companies;
- 2) Access to intellectual property and know-how;
- 3) And more access to European markets.

Israel today has achieved and even excelled goals that the EU had set for itself 10 years ago and has yet to achieve (enlarging the percentage of research in GDP and the percentage of private research in total research). This good cooperation can also help in the overall relationship between

the two. A place where these relations could still develop is in the new areas of research, for example the joint programming initiative (linking research programs to limit overlaps).

### **Dr. Shlomo Wald**

A major sentiment among Israeli researchers is a feeling of isolation that dictates the research policy. The difference between Europe and America in supporting research is that the EU asks how it is going to help Israel, and America asks how it will help the American market. Once the connections with other research groups were made they were mostly kept and developed, and in this view it is really a success story. Most of Israel's energy sources are not local, and even in renewable energy there is not much that can be harvested in Israel (the most optimistic assessment speaks of producing a max 20% renewable energy out of the total energy needed and this percentage will decline with time). This situation caused Israeli government to make three major decisions in the field of energy during the last year:

- 1) The construction of a 5 year R&D program on renewable energy;
- 2) R&D program on energy efficiency;
- 3) The declaration of the Negev and Arava as renewable energy preferred areas.

Israel devotes 2 million NIS a year to promote participation of Israeli companies in international markets because of the great will to participate in global markets. Israel constructed a new collaboration with the US as well, and this should promote Israeli energy related industry. Israel wants to be a part of Europe when it comes to the implementation of new technologies, and there is an Israeli program ("Intelligent Energy Europe") intended on implementation of new technology in Europe.

Israel hoped that the cooperation would promote the peace process, but this has not happened and mainly causes frustration. For example, the trilateral cooperation between Israel, the EU and the Palestinians is a fiasco. There is no definition for budgets for these programs and therefore no real encouragement to construct them. If Europe wishes to be influential they should build a bridge between Israel and the Palestinians. Israel is willing to take the step to more courageous enterprises.

### **Mr. Thomas Stammen**

Scientists and businessmen can be excellent bridge builders between societies and the impression of the cooperation between Israel and Europe is a positive one. Germany is suffering from an innovative deficit and more specifically from an R&D cooperation deficit in industry. German companies are very knowledgeable in good production of renewable energy. The world faces global economic crises and it seems that it is not possible to build an economy that is not so dependant on export, innovation and R&D. The crisis will change our world and industries but it will not change the need for innovation.

### **Ms. Valerie Brachia**

In Europe almost all discussions on energy are linked to climate change, but in Israel we are just not there. Although we have ratified the Kyoto treaty, we are not obliged to reduce greenhouse effect gasses. Because Israel wants to be recognized as a developed country it has to regard



environmental issues more seriously, and combine them in the energy policy. Europe has gone strongly to energy efficiency in all parts of society, while Israel has stayed behind and is nowhere near where it should be today. The future holds more natural gas and a structural change in energy production that will be better environment-orientated. At the same time it promotes another coal power plant, and the renewable energy production is under 1% of total energy. In addition the only source of renewable energy we can use is solar energy, but there is not enough land for this, and not enough governmental subsidization. In order to improve our situation we will need more energy efficiency, more natural gas, cleaner coal technologies and higher intervention in energy and environment policy. In the ME the major issues are the energy question [who can participate in energy production], management of environmental infrastructure [nature conservation and waste in waters]. One example of an environmental topic used as a bridge is that of sand flow, a common resource to all countries on the seashore. This topic brought about a dialogue with Palestinians and produced a real bridge between the two societies.

#### **Adv. Gidon Bromberg**

Spoke on the issue of water from a regional perspective and from the perspective of the regional organization, "Friends of Earth - Middle East". Water has not united people in the region. It is characterized as scarce, as all water sources in the region are shared. It is also divided unequally and very polluted. The Jordan River is a good example for these problems and although there were secret negotiations in the 50's, the river suffers from water grab from all sides and a high amount of pollution. This has caused a situation where no fresh waters are flowing into the Dead Sea, which - as a result - is rapidly shrinking. The proposed solution is the Red Sea – Dead Sea canal, which is very controversial and environmentally problematic. The mountain aquifer is another example of failure to deal with pollution and failure to meet Palestinian water needs. Governmental attempts to resolve the problems are very lacking on both sides, are very secretive and tend to be kept out of the public eye.

Civil society has advanced instead and has received EU support. In local government levels we see progress in management of water supplies, and an awareness to the fact that the water is shared. This leads to leadership being brought into the programs. Once you build trust based on shared water you can take it to the peace process. Conflict resolution should be integrated into development assistance programs. People to people programs should be expanded, to build this trust among peoples in order to back a future peace agreement.

#### **Economics – The EMU and the Financial Crisis**

##### **Chair: Dr. Joel Peters**

The economic crisis is going to change everything in a very fundamental way. It causes people to reappraise values and priorities, and this will clearly influence the EU-Israeli relations.

**Mr. Jonathan Claridge**

The Financial crisis is the worst crisis since 1929, and there is going to be a fall in GDP of 4%. Israel has been somewhat resilient but the export from the EU has dropped by over 20%, which of course has an impact on the relations. The EU has been trying to produce a fiscal stimulus, and countries in the EU have been taking 3-4% of GDP. The EU has a fairly developed social welfare system and this is an automatic stabilizer. The fiscal stimulus has to be sustainable and temporary and cannot be very wide. One idea is a peer review between member states to help each other with their fiscal program. The EU has also cut interest rates, mainly in the European Central Bank. Another area, in which the EU has been active, is in reviewing the global financial institutions, and looking at the global financial architecture [rules, regulations and financial supervision] where it is actually doing very well, but there is still a long way to go. Another contribution is emphasizing the importance of avoiding protectionism. This means trying to stop the erection of new trading barriers on behalf of our partners. On international trade policy the EU speaks in one voice, and this is an area where the integration has worked very well.

EU-Israel relations are not going to solve the global crisis but it can have a role to play, particularly in trying to keep our very close and open economic relationship. We have a free trade in industrial products, and there are still a lot of ongoing negotiations on the economic front. The negotiations on services are going pretty slowly but potentially these could have a huge impact on Israel. There are also negotiations on Israel joining the internal market (Israel is interested in specific parts of it) that are advancing reasonably well.

**Dr. Tal Sadeh**

The currency union was undertaken against the odds in a great show of political determination, but the problems present before the crisis have been enhanced. The main problem is that the EU puts together countries with very different features (cultural, political environmental), with different economics specializing in different areas and which have different macro-economic cycles producing different macro-economic needs. One Monetary policy does not fit all, although over time things even out if the cycle is not too extreme. This was known and there were three broad solutions for this:

- 1) That countries should change - the framework for this change being the single market. The single market, though, is not completed, the most striking example being the incompleteness of the market of financial services.
- 2) The establishment of a large fiscal mechanism that would transfer money from one country to the other. However this did not really come into existence and the European common budget is tiny and cannot play this role.
- 3) Consultation among the European countries on the proper monetary policy with the ECB giving voice to all the countries. In the past 10 years the ECB has chosen interest rates that fit very much Germany, the Netherlands and Belgium. There is a core of countries to which the ECB caters more than to others.

One obvious way in which the crisis can affect the currency area is that money is dear, meaning that you need a good reason to get funding. In the past, countries in the European single currency area with lousy debt histories could still get money to finance themselves pretty well. These meant that differences between the countries in interest rates on debt were small, and have grown considerably now. This raises the question whether there is a bail-out option in this area (meaning coverage of national debt by other countries). The Maastricht agreement says no, but today countries (like Germany) say differently. This would be politically challenging, though it could be argued that there are complicated connections between the economies that force the area to indeed bring forth the option of bail-out. This might bring forth a case where a default on behalf of one of the member states would implicate leaving the Euro. Another issue is the asymmetric shock issue. Different sectors of the economy are being affected differently. This means that countries which are very reliant on one sector of the economy might be hit differently than others.

The single currency will not collapse but it is a softer commitment than one might think. It is quite conceivable that the Euro-zone will grow, as a consequence of the will to "absorb shocks" of the crisis. But it is also conceivable that member countries might leave the Euro-zone. Italy is a great threat to the European economy as it is very unstable now, and its fall might be a devastating blow to the entire area.

### **Prof. Alfred Tovas**

Over the last few decades there has been a convergence of EU-Israeli economy and society. This has happened without any political planning and will lead eventually to one of the sides to ask for membership of Israel in the EU. Israel is different from Turkey in this respect, as Turkey did not prepare itself before requesting admission into the EU. There is an Europeanization of Israel, but also an Israelization of Europe. In the first case there is a social-economic and demographical change that fits a "typical" European country. There is also an institutional convergence between the two. Israel, if all goes well, will be in the next two years an OECD member, and the OECD is made up mostly of European countries. There are two ways to think of Europeanization: A transformation of identities as becoming more European-like or becoming more EU-like (approximation of laws, and adoption of the "Acquis Communautaires"). This is not to be confused with the European characteristics of Israel. This Europeanization has less to do with what the EU has done and more with Globalization (actually the Americanization of both Europe and Israel). On the other hand, The Israelization of Europe is expressed mainly in the changing demographics of Europe, and the increasing amount of Muslims among it. Europe is becoming an immigrant society like Israel and the US, and Europeans are facing the fact that their society is becoming multi-cultural, coping with the resulting problems, as Israel has been doing for a long time. The two last enlargements have brought the EU closer to Israel mentally and culturally.

All our air-traffic to the West flies over the EU and issues of air space and security have to be discussed with the EU.

The impact of the economic crisis on this would be a slight economic disintegration, but this is true of all the countries of the world. This does

not affect, however, the trade to the East. There might be a decrease of FDI from the West, but this effect is true mainly for the US and less for the EU. The role of Israel as a bridge between East and West will increase as the weight of the big eastern countries will increase.

Another result of the crisis is the fading of the EU within itself, which leads to conducting relations with Israel directly from the European capitals and less from Brussels. This favors Israel-EU relations because three of the four main European leaders are pro-Israeli. The crisis has also hit the attempts of the EU to create regional foreign projects. In addition, dealing with the Eastern European countries will draw more attention and less time will be left for the Middle East. The crisis might also lead the Obama administration, dealing entirely with the crisis itself, to push the joining of Israel to the EU as a member, as it has proclaimed with Turkey.

In civil societies, it is a question whether the societies will become more protectionist in their economy. In addition it is clear that there will be less time for normative Europe.