"Continuity within Change: The German-American Foreign and Security Relationship during President Clinton's First Term"

Dissertation zur Erlangung des Grades
Dr. phil.
bei dem Fachbereich Politik- und Sozialwissenschaften
der Freien Universität Berlin

vorgelegt von
Thorsten Klaßen

Berlin 2008

Erstgutachter:
Prof. Dr. Eberhard Sandschneider

Zweitgutachter:
Priv.-Doz. Dr. Peter Rudolf

Datum der Disputation: 10.12.2008

Table of Contents

For Hilary

Abbreviations

EA: Europa Archiv

FA: Foreign Affairs

FAZ: Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung

FT: Financial Times

IHT: International Herald Tribune

IP: Internationale Politik

NYT: New York Times

SZ: Süddeutsche Zeitung

WP: Washington Post

Introduction

The following analysis focuses on the German-American foreign and security relationship during Bill Clinton's first term in the White House (1993-1997). With the dissolution of the Soviet Union, policymakers and publics on both sides of the Atlantic witnessed a true moment of transition as the Iron Curtain first crumbled and then fell altogether. After several decades of confrontation between West and East on the European continent, in which Germany played a key role as a front-line state, the Bonn Republic now found itself as a player on a whole new geopolitical map. Given that the United States emerged as the sole superpower, the crucial question was whether the American and German partnership would fundamentally change or would their deep-rooted strategic relationship continue and even grow? In light of the redistribution of power on the world chess board, the key paradigm "continuity within change" reveals that during the first Clinton administration, the German-American foreign and security relationship indeed continued as a key strategic alliance during the onset of a rapidly changing world.

Although the potential for a reorientation in the German-American bilateral relationship was real due to the alleviated threat level of attack for Germany, Bonn and Washington continued their cooperation and coordination of their policies on the basis of their established track record in the last 45 years. Even though the relationship had not been conflict-free throughout the Cold War and was put under strain for instance by the Vietnam war, Willy Brandt's Ostpolitik, Chancellor Helmut Schmidt's criticism of President Jimmy Carter's economic policy, as well as NATO's twin-track decision in 1979, Bonn and Washington valued each other as reliable partners in the global concert.[1] The established underlying rationale that Germany and the United States needed each other and were stronger in a closely-knit alliance did not evaporate after the end of the Cold War. While Bonn still benefited from its economic and security partnership with the United States, given its dependency on the American nuclear umbrella, Washington was still in need of a strong partner in Europe that helped to promote shared Western values and ideas.

Both partners built on the immense trust of each other that had emerged during the period of the Cold War, even though Germany's aggression had drawn the United States twice into war in the first half of the 20th century. Two factors were decisive in establishing a level of mutual respect and dependency between Washington and Bonn after the end of the Second World War: first, West Germany's geopolitical location and role as the most eastern NATO outpost, serving as first line of defense against the communist archenemy in Europe; and second, the country's development into a democracy and thriving market economy with its strong emphasis on finding multilateral and peaceful solutions to existing international conflicts. The rapprochement between both countries was a gradual process marked by several key events that upgraded the quality of the relationship consistently throughout the post-war years.

The immediate aftermath of the Second World War played a decisive role in turning West Germany from an occupied nation to a close ally of the United States. The first major step toward a fundamental change in the U.S.-German relationship from foe to friend post-1945 came with Washington's decision to create the European Recovery Program (ERP), better known as the Marshall Plan. With General George C. Marshall's announcement of the program in his famous speech at Harvard University on June 5, 1947, the United States committed itself to the reconstruction of Europe. When the ERP program went into effect in April 1948, the U.S.

---

[1] Detlef Junker (ed.). *Die USA und Deutschland im Zeitalter des Kalten Krieges 1945-1990. Ein Handbuch* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlag-Anstalt, 2001); Wolfram F. Hanrieder. *Germany, America, Europe: 40 years of German foreign policy* (New Haven: Yale University, 1989); Klaus Wiegrefe. *Das Zerwürfnis. Helmut Schmidt, Jimmy Carter und die Krise der deutsch-amerikanischen Beziehungen* (Berlin: Propyläen, 2005).

House of Representatives allocated $12 billion to this four-year effort, in which more than 10% or $1.2 billion was earmarked for West Germany.[2] This aid was not only a substantial financial investment in the much-needed rebuilding of the German state, but was also an important political statement that attempted to stabilize and enlist the Adenauer government as a partner in the emerging Cold War against the Soviet Union.[3]

Originating from this important geopolitical motivation, the United States took additional significant steps to help Germany in the post-war years. The next highly emotional episode of American assistance for the former enemy came with the 1948/49 Berlin air lift after the Soviet Union had blockaded all entry ways to the city.[4] The successful campaign created enormous gratitude for the United States in Berlin and beyond, strengthened the German public's belief in the steadfastness of American leadership and, most importantly, resulted in an enhanced quality of the overall German-American relationship. This trend continued with Washington's strong support for the creation of West Germany in 1949, as well as the American backing for the country's admission to NATO in 1955. At the heart of the U.S. strategic rationale for these far-reaching political decisions, only within a short few years after 1945 was Washington's philosophy of "double containment."[5]

By bringing Bonn's new democracy into the fold of the West, it served as a counterweight to the communist ideology that manifested itself in the Eastern half of the country and helped contain Soviet influence on the continent. At the same time, the United States aspired to safeguard its allies and itself with this move by negating the possibility of any future aggression originating from the country in the heart of Europe. Hence, Washington actively promoted West Germany's integration into Western economic, military and security institutions throughout the following years and decades – a process that was keenly welcomed by all governments of the Bonn Republic. The result was a steady strengthening of the bilateral relationship between both countries that was based on common economic and security interests, as well as a shared values system that included the belief in democracy, freedom of the individual and the rule of law.[6]

Commonly referred to as Washington's junior partner, the Bonn Republic could always rely on American support when core national interests were at stake during the Cold War period. This

---

[2] U.S. House Committee on Foreign Affairs. *Hearings on Emergency Aid,* 80th Congress, 1st Session (Washington, DC, 1947); U.S. House Committee on Foreign Affairs. *Hearings on United States Foreign Policy for a Post-War Recovery Program,* 80th Congress*, 1st Session (Washington, DC, 1947); U.S. Senate. *Hearings on United States Assistance to European Economic Recovery*, 80th Congress, 2nd Session (Washington, DC, 1947).

[3] See Michael Hogan. *The Marshall Plan. America, Britian and the Reconstruction of Western Europe, 1947-1952* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1987) and Immanuel Wexler. *The Marshall Plan Revisited. The European Recovery Program in Economic Perspective* (Westport: Greenwood, 1983).

[4] W. Phillips Davison. *The Berlin Blockade. A Study in Cold War Politics* (Princeton: Princeton University, 1958); Ann Tusa /John Tusa. *The Berlin Airlift* (New York: Atheneum, 1988) and Avi Shlaim. *The United States and the Berlin Blockade, 1948-1949* (Berkeley: University of California, 1983).

[5] Wilfried Loth, "Die doppelte Eindämmung. Überlegungen zur Genesis des Kalten Krieges 1945-1947," *Historische Zeitschrift* 238 (1984), 611-631; Thomas A Schwartz, "Dual Containment. John J. McCloy, the American High Commission, and European Integration, 1949-1952," *NATO. The Founding of the Atlantic Alliance and the Integration of Europe.* Francis Heller / John R. Gillingham (eds.) (New York: St. Martin's, 1992), 193-212; Rolf Steiniger et. al (ed.). *Die doppelte Eindämmung, europäische Sicherheit und deutsche Frage in den Fünfzigern* (München: Hase & Koehler, 1993).

[6] U.S. denazification and democratization efforts post-1945 played a crucial role in establishing a synchrony of values and beliefs between both countries. An important role fell to cultural and educational programs that praised the United States as role model and highlighted the benefits of a market economy for the wealth creation of its citizens and the society's overall prosperity. This process was also informed and supported by a variety of exchange programs between students, young professionals as well as academia in later years that helped strengthening the backbone of the bilateral relationship. Finally, the U.S.' role as cultural magnet in the 1960s enhanced the positive attitude of many Germans toward the partner on the other side of the Atlantic.

was visible, for instance, in the U.S. reaction to the build-up of the Berlin Wall starting in August 1961, being symbolized by President John F. Kennedy's famous "Ich bin ein Berliner" speech during his visit in Berlin in June 1963.[7] The American engagement in West Berlin and West Germany throughout the 1960s to 1980s resulted in an even stronger overall bond between both nations.[8] The most pronounced and outstanding example of this special relationship is arguably the U.S. involvement in Germany's reunification in 1989/90 which can be seen as the culmination point of American efforts on the European continent after 1945. In the volatile environment after the fall of the Berlin Wall, the Bush administration was the key promoter of the initiative backing Chancellor Kohl's strategy for reunification.

Washington's support was crucial in three areas: first, the U.S. administration embraced the Chancellery's approach of pushing for rapid reunification against the opposition of other European nations; second, President Bush was essential in shaping the political framework that finally led to the successful two-plus-four negotiations between East and West Germany, the United States, Great Britain, France and the Soviet Union; third, Washington succeeded in anchoring the reunified Germany in the West through the country's continued membership in NATO.[9] Undoubtedly, Germany's reunification would not have happened the way it did without the crucial involvement of the United States.[10] After several decades of division, this monumental event healed the rift that had run through Europe, cresting a legacy of U.S.-German partnership that President Bill Clinton could build on in his first term.

Even though many commentators and historians predominantly have described the 1990s through the lens of the fall of the Berlin Wall and as a watershed event in international relations, this study will show that despite the altered security environment in Europe, Germany and the United States continued to rely on each other in foreign affairs and served as promoters of a strong transatlantic bond just as during Cold War times. The bilateral relationship between both countries remained irreplaceable and constituted a remarkable element of continuity in the post-Cold War world.

This is not to downplay the monumental structural changes in the post-1990 world that manifested itself for instance in the process of a more intertwined Europe symbolized by the Maastricht Treaty and the enlargement of the Western military alliance to the East. Although the thinking in Cold War categories had been engrained in two generations of political elites, the new unique situation allowed stakeholders on both sides of the Atlantic to seize the existing window of opportunity and to secure the stability and freedom in Europe. The new economic and security policies put in place in Europe in the 1990s changed the lives of millions of people, giving East Germans the opportunity to visit their families in the West, prepared for the use of a

---

[7] See for instance Willi Brandt's assessment (at the time mayor of Berlin) on the importance of Kennedy's visit: Willi Brandt. *Begegnungen mit Kennedy* (München: Kindler, 1964).

[8] Klaus Hildebrand. *Von Erhard zur Großen Koalition 1963-1969* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1984).

[9] See Stephen F. Szabo, "Die USA und die deutsche Wiedervereinigung. Ein amerikanischer Erfolg," *Die USA und Deutschland.* Junker (ed.), 163-173.

[10] Siegrid Westphal / Joachim Arendt (eds.). *Uncle Sam und die Deutschen. 50 Jahre deutsch-amerikanische Partnerschaft in Politik, Wirtschaft und Alltagsleben* (München: Bonn Aktuell, 1995), 259-276; Josef Joffe, "Putting Germany Back Together. The Fabulous Bush and Baker Boys," *FA* 75.1 (January/February 1996), 161/162; Philip Zelikow/Condoleeza Rice. *Germany unified and Europe transformed: a study in statecraft* (Cambridge: Harvard University, 1995); Tony Judt, "New Germany, Old NATO," *New York Review of Books* (29 May 1997); Elizabeth Pond. *Beyond the Wall. Germany's Road to Reunification* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 1993);
Michael R. Beschloss / Strobe Talbott. *Auf höchster Ebene. Das Ende des Kalten Krieges und die Geheimdiplomatie der Supermächte 1989-1991* (Düsseldorf: Econ, 1993); Helmut Kohl. *Ich wollte Deutschlands Einheit* (Berlin: Propyläen 1996); Werner Weidenfeld. *Außenpolitik für die deutsche Einheit. Die Entscheidungsjahre 1989/90* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1998).

single currency for a number of European countries by the end of the century, as well as extended the Western security umbrella to former Warsaw Pact states. While the German-American relationship needed to naturally adjust to these different circumstances, the crucial point remains that Bonn and Washington continued to see special value in their partnership not only for bilateral reasons, but also as a problem solving alliance internationally.

In order to describe the German-American relationship in its full complexities, the study is driven by a series of underlying questions: How did the U.S.-German partnership continue to flourish after 1990? How did the relationship change? What implications did the end of the Cold War have for the formulation of foreign policy on both sides of the Atlantic? In which areas did American and German national interest concur or differ? Who were the key stakeholders and decision-makers in Germany and the United States during President Bill Clinton's first term? What role did the proliferation threat, the war in the Balkans and NATO's enlargement play for the quality and durability of the U.S.-German relationship? These important issues are addressed in the subsequent seven chapters that are structured thematically as follows:

I.   The first chapter focuses on the debate within the United States about the course of its foreign policy after the end of the Cold War. Presenting various foreign policy schools of thought in the American debate, the analysis puts special emphasis on outlining the diverging ideas on how Washington should work together with its allies in order to protect its own national interests. An important subset of this intense discussion in the early 1990s is the question about an adequate U.S. military strategy after the fall of the Iron Curtain.

II.   The second chapter sheds light on Germany's foreign policy orientation as a reunified nation in the heart of Europe. Of special relevance is the Bonn Republic's role as a promoter of European integration as well as its positioning in the international community due to its new security situation.

III.   The third chapter elaborates on U.S. President Bill Clinton's background and his first term in office. The analysis outlines the White House's priority on domestic reform projects and gives a comprehensive overview of the President's policy initiatives in order to showcase his agenda and policy style. As the last remaining superpower in the post-Cold War world, the Clinton administration's foreign policy outlook in theory and practice is naturally discussed at greater length as well.

IV.   The fourth chapter addresses various elements that are considered the backbone of the German-American relationship, such as the public's attitude toward the ally on the other side of the Atlantic, the depth of shared interests and values, as well as political efforts to substantiate and upgrade the bilateral relationship.

V.   The fifth chapter depicts the proliferation threat of weapons of mass destruction and know-how emerging predominantly from former Soviet Union arsenals. The case study outlines German and American efforts to counteract this development and assesses the value of non-proliferation regimes in this process.

VI.   The topic of the sixth chapter is the war in Bosnia-Herzegovina in the early to mid 1990s. The origins, major developments and conflict resolution efforts, as well the successful peace negotiations in Dayton, are the building blocks of this case study. The German and American contributions to the process of bringing peace to the Balkans are highlighted.

VII.   The seventh and final chapter takes an in-depth look at NATO enlargement as a transatlantic initiative. After an overview of the pro- and anti-enlargement rationale, the analysis focuses on presenting the major stepping stones toward opening the alliance's doors to new members. With Washington and Bonn as key promoters of the initiative, the study describes how both partners worked together to see the project come to fruition. As the observations will show, a decisive factor for the transatlantic success on this issue was the need to overcome Russia's active opposition to the initiative.

Despite a strong trend in publics and political elites on both sides of the Atlantic to focus on domestic issues after the fall of communism, the above outlined case studies necessitated a continued involvement and leadership of the United States and Germany in international affairs. In addition to the historic partnership between both countries after 1945, a key asset in jointly tackling the issues at hand was the level of trust between U.S. and German decision-makers. This was nowhere more true than between President Bill Clinton and Chancellor Kohl, who were able to build an excellent personal relationship through a series of phone conversations and visits on both sides of the Atlantic during their joint time in office.[11] The friendship between both leaders would prove to be helpful in creating a functioning U.S.-German channel of communication at the very top that gave both countries a prime opportunity to coordinate their foreign and security policies.

---

[11] To get an insight of the Kohl-Clinton relationship, even friendship, see for instance William J. Clinton. *Remarks by the President at Luncheon with German Officials* (Bonn: The White House, Office of the Press Secretary, 10 July 1994); *Background Briefing by Senior Administration Officials* (Bonn: The White House, Office of the Press Secretary, 11 July 1994); "The President's News Conference with Chancellor Helmut Kohl of Germany in Milwaukee," *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States Book 1 – January 1 to June 30, 1996*. William J. Clinton (Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office, 1997), 805-812; Ruth Marcus, "'I agree with Helmut': Clinton finds a friend abroad in food-loving Chancellor Kohl," *WP* (12 July 1994); "Helmut Kohl, digging in; At the White House a familiar face at the dinner table," *WP* (10 February 1995).

A Note on Sources

The purpose of this study is to analyze the German-American foreign and security relationship during U.S. President Bill Clinton's first term in order to inform an English speaking audience about the nature of the bilateral partnership during this timeframe. Unique in its comprehensive overview of the main issues facing Washington and Bonn in the early to mid 1990s, this dissertation strives to be a valuable addition to other in-depth analyses of the relationship between both countries in the 20th century.

Based on intensive research on both sides of the Atlantic, the study draws from a multitude of monographs, autobiographies, essays, journals and newspaper articles that focus on particular aspects of the U.S.-German relationship as presented in the subsequent seven thematic chapters. Conducted interviews with European and American policymakers and think tank representatives give additional validity to the presented findings.[12]

At this point, it is also appropriate to thank a number of additional sources that were essential in the completion of this manuscript. The German Marshall Fund of the United States (GMF) is a source of knowledge, networks and inspiration for anybody interested in the promotion of transatlantic relations – I cannot imagine a more stimulating environment to operate in while working on a dissertation. I would like to express my gratitude for numerous conversations on the U.S.-German relationship with GMF colleagues and am especially indebted to Craig Kennedy and Dr. Ronald D. Asmus for their crucial support at the early stages of the project.

At the Free University of Berlin, I was also more than fortunate to find in Professor Eberhard Sandschneider an excellent advisor for this project. I would like to convey my sincere gratitude for all his support and advice during the last three years.

Last but not least, this manuscript would not have seen the light of day without the unconditional and continuous moral support of my family and friends on both sides of the Atlantic. Nobody deserves more praise in this regard than my wife Hilary, to whom this book is dedicated.

---

[12] I am grateful to the following individuals for granting an interview request: Ronald D. Asmus, Jim Goldgeier, Dan Hamilton, Armin Hasenpusch, Hans-Ulrich Klose, John Kornblum, Dušan Reljić, Peter Rudolf, Stephen Szabo, Karsten Voigt, Jenonne Walker and Ulrich Weisser.

I. The United States After the End of the Cold War

I.1. Looking for the Next Paradigm: Theoretical Considerations in the 1990s

With the collapse of the Soviet Union at the beginning of the 1990s, the United States found itself in the unprecedented situation as the sole superpower in international politics. While several U.S. administrations, foreign policy establishments and the American public at large had worked toward the demise of Soviet power in previous decades, it nevertheless came as a surprise how quickly the archenemy entered a phase of rapid disintegration. The two pillars of U.S foreign policy after the end of the Second World War – containment[13] and nuclear deterrence – had delivered the envisioned effect: The United States clinched the unchallenged position as most powerful country in the world. While this outcome was certainly a reflection of the steadiness of U.S. foreign policy in the second half of the 20th century, the question soon arose how the United States should use its new role in this changed environment of international politics. Just as a certain Chinese character symbolizes challenge and opportunity simultaneously, the U.S. found itself in this dual state and a truly fluid moment of history to set a new course for its foreign policy.

In search of a new paradigm that could rationalize the world as simply and clearly as containment had done in previous years, several ideas were brought forward in political and academic circles in the early 1990s, trying to structure what Richard N. Haass called "a period of history that can be characterized as one of 'international deregulation.'"[14] Even though these theories lost significant traction among an inward-looking American nation at the time,[15] they are an important backbone for understanding how foreign policy experts looked upon the question of power and order in the international system after the end of the Cold War. Three theoretical constructs are especially noteworthy for our purpose of exploring the debate over the next paradigm in international politics that would also have implications for the U.S.-German foreign and security policy.

I.1.1 The End of History

In 1989, Francis Fukuyama proclaimed in an article published in the journal *The National Interest* the end of the progression of human history. In his distinguished view, mankind had arrived at the final point of its evolution, i.e. the inevitability of Western liberalism as the structuring principle in world affairs. Fukuyama states:

---

[13] See George Kennan's famous article in Foreign Affairs in which he outlines this strategy under his pseudonym "X": X, "The Sources of Soviet Conduct," *FA* (July 1947).

[14] Richard N. Haass. *Intervention. The Use of American Military Force in the Post-Cold War World* (Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1994), 5.

[15] In the domestic debate of the early 1990s, foreign policy was put on the backburner in order to give the U.S. the opportunity to tackle its mounting economic problems. The U.S. was only able to divert its attention in this way, due to the public belief at the time that no external threat was facing its borders. In Robert Lieber's words: "The absence of a threat reduces the priority and urgency of foreign affairs for most Americans and makes it significantly more onerous for the administration to gain agreement with the Congress and even within the executive branch itself on coherent foreign policy measures." Robert J. Lieber, "Eagle without a Cause: Making Foreign Policy without the Soviet Threat," *Eagle Adrift. American Foreign Policy at the End of the Century*. Robert J. Lieber (Washington, DC: Georgetown University, 1997), 4.

> What we may be witnessing is not just the end of the Cold War, or the passing of a particular period of post-war history, but the end of history as such: that is, the end point of mankind's ideological evolution and the universalization of Western liberal democracy as the final form of human government.[16]

His thesis rests on two arguments, which complement each other in a unique way. The first is an empirical one, as Fukuyama claims that all other theories – fascism, communism, religion, and nationalism − that had potential to serve as a structuring principle in the 19th and 20th centuries have become discredited. Fascism in its German and Japanese form was extinguished through the atrocities of the Third Reich and the drop of atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki respectively, just as communism lost its appeal through the collapse of the Soviet Union. Even though communism is still holding on strong in China, Fukuyama is convinced that liberalism will pull China into its corner as "economic power devolves and the economy becomes more open to the outside world."[17]

In the case of religion, only the Islamic model of a theocratic state poses a danger for Western style liberalism. However, its potential as an overarching principle on the international stage is considered minimal, as it only appeals to people of Muslim faith and runs contradictory to the division of religion and state which is well established in many parts of the world. Finally, nationalism, while certainly being a potential cause for conflicts, challenges liberalism only in its systematic form as witnessed, for instance, in National Socialism when it attacks man's universal right to freedom. The reason for ethnic and national tensions in the future "does not arise from liberalism itself so much as from the fact that the liberalism in question is incomplete."[18] For the most part, however, nationalism and liberalism are two sides of the same coin and work complimentarily.

The discredits of the other structural principles in the course of the 19th and 20th centuries went hand in hand with the quantitative rise of democracies. Historically speaking, democracy was only one among many other government forms in the late 19th century and has since risen as the preferred governing principle that peoples in different nations around the world have given themselves.[19] On the basis of this empirical fact, Fukuyama builds his case and presents his definition of success for the lasting victory of Western style liberalism over all other ideologies: "But at the end of history it is not necessary that all societies become successful liberal societies, merely that they end their ideological pretensions of representing different and higher forms of human society."[20]

This statement has its foundation in the second – this time philosophical – argument for the end of history. Fukuyama has his intellectual home with the theories of Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel and his French interpreter Alexandre Kojève, both believing in the concept of history as a dialectical process. This theoretical framework also constituted the basis for Karl Marx's famous philosophy of history: dialectical materialism. In this line of thinking, Fukuyama sees the world strained by dichotomies such as master and slave or have and have-nots. The only way to cut the Gordian knot of thesis (master) and antithesis (slave) is to be found in the governing form of a

---

[16] Francis Fukuyama, "The End of History," *The National Interest* (Summer 1989), 4.
[17] Ibid, 11.
[18] Ibid, 15.
[19] Compare Samuel P. Huntington's award winning book: Samuel P. Huntington. *The Third Wave. Democratization in the late Twentieth Century* (Oklahoma: Oklahoma University, 1991).
[20] Fukuyama, *End of History,* 13.

liberal society (democracy) which would enable both parties to live together in a conflict-free environment (synthesis). Hence, it is inevitable that liberalism will triumph – and with that the progression of human history has come to an end. In Fukuyama's words:

> Human history and the conflict that characterized it was based on the existence of 'contradictions': primitive man's quest for mutual recognition, the dialectic of the master and slave, the transformation and mastery of nature, the struggle for the universal recognition of rights, and the dichotomy between proletarian and capitalist. But in the universal homogeneous state, all prior contradictions are resolved and all human needs are satisfied.[21]

Fukuyama's theory of the end of history is an excellent example for the pertinent notion shortly after the end of the Cold War that the great (foreign policy) battles and wars were over. The U.S. at the time no longer expected to confront larger questions like war and peace, but a diffused international environment that was characterized by details, technicalities and minor problems. While most Americans were optimistic about this at the outset – after having lived through decades of the Cold War – Fukuyama himself deemed the future as a "very sad time," as mankind would only be left with a "powerful nostalgia for the time when history still existed."[22]

I.1.2 The Clash of Civilizations

In contrast to Francis Fukuyama, the American political scientist Samuel P. Huntington believes in the continuation of history and predicts that a clash of civilizations will be the decisive pattern in international politics in the forthcoming years and decades.[23] Huntington is convinced that conflicts based on cultural heritage will surpass economic or ideological motivations, thereby becoming the core structuring principle in the post-Cold War world. Arguably, these struggles will emerge on the fault lines of seven or eight civilizations in global politicsand have their roots in six fundamental reasons.[24]

First, the differences among civilizations go to the core of their existence, i.e. each civilization is imbued with regulations on the relation between the individual and the state as well as views on religion and the role of liberty and equality in a society. All of these factors constitute a civilization's identity, which as the product of centuries cannot be easily disregarded. If two civilizations with different answers to the fundamental questions of life meet each other – the potential for a clash is eminent. Second, the success of modern technologies and communication has made the world a smaller place, thereby intensifying civilization consciousness and potential animosities among members of different civilizations. Third, the rise of fundamentalism is an indicator that the world is seeing a re-emergence of religion as a defining element of a person's identity. This element transcends national boundaries and is a potential source of conflict as different views on the relationship between God and man collide.

---

[21] Ibid, 5.
[22] Ibid, 18.
[23] In his Foreign Affairs article, Huntington defines a civilization as "the highest cultural grouping of people and the broadest level of cultural identity people have short of that which distinguishes humans from other species." See Samuel P. Huntington, "The Clash of Civilizations?" *FA* 72.3 (Summer 1993), 22-49.
[24] These include: "Western, Confucian, Japanese, Islamic, Hindu, Slavic-Orthodox, Latin America and possibly African civilization." Ibid, 25.

Fourth, the predominant position of the Western civilization leads to a growth of civilization-consciousness, as non-Western societies look inward and go through a phase of de-Westernization and indigenization. Fifth, a person's cultural identity cannot be altered in contrast to a political view or an economic status. One simply cannot change certain parameters of one's identity, such as nationality, physique/skin color, religious upbringing and belief, which constitute unchangeable axioms in the way one is judged by outsiders. Sixth and finally, Huntington sees in the increased importance of regional trading blocs a further reason for his theory, as forceful economic competition between members of different civilizations can also lead to significant animosities and potential acts of violence.

These six reasons exemplify the growing importance of civilizations in a post-Cold War world and give insights into the potential minefields that could disrupt the international peace and stability. As Samuel Huntington outlines:

> The clash of civilizations thus occurs at two levels. At the micro-level, adjacent groups along the fault lines between civilizations struggle, often violently, over the control of territory and each other. At the macro-level, states from different civilizations compete for relative military and economic power, struggle over the control of international institutions and third parties, and competitively promote their political and religious values.[25]

At the macro level, the 1990s presented an unparalleled power of the Western civilization which is why Huntington labels global public policy in the dichotomy "The West versus the rest."[26] It is here where the main focus of international politics will be for the time to come, especially if one takes into consideration the kin-country syndrome, i.e. the concept of civilization commonality, which will ensure that the West will be united in its goal to maintain, if not extend, its wealth and power. Non-Western civilizations in their efforts to deal with this challenge can choose from three different strategies. These policy options range from isolation vis-à-vis Western influences, to accepting Western values and norms, to finally balancing the West through development of military and economic power. As the West tries to strengthen its position by (aggressively) promoting its way of life through the tools of globalization, it is in the shapes and manifestations of these policy options where the potential conflicts of the future lie.

Samuel Huntington's clash of civilizations theory was a decisive factor in the academic and public debate of the 1990s. Its argument was echoed especially in conservative circles of the United States, which were attracted by Huntington's underlying thesis of the exceptionalism and superiority of Western power. Less convinced audiences accused him of exaggerating the Islamic threat and attacked his theoretical concept of the 'West versus the rest' as the re-ideologization of foreign policy. For the topic of this thesis, Huntington's deliberations are of importance as they make a strong argument for the durability of the Western alliance as natural allies on the basis of their shared cultural heritage.

---

[25] Ibid, 29.
[26] Ibid, 39.

I.1.3 Bipolar, Multipolar, Unipolar?

A third influential debate among the foreign policy elites in the United States circled around the concrete organization of power in the international system after the collapse of the Soviet Union. This approach was occupied with the existence of power centers in the 1990s being deemed important in order to give strategic policy recommendations for U.S. foreign policy in a changed global environment. The natural departure point of the analysis was a comparison of the Cold War phase and the new era, with special emphasis on the probability of stability and security respectively. In this line of thinking, the American political scientist John J. Mearsheimer attacked the common view at the time that the Western world could start thinking about spending its peace dividends for various domestic initiatives. In his article "Back to the Future. Instability in Europe after the Cold War,"[27] he argues that the bipolar structure of the Cold War was, in addition to the rough equality in military structure and the appearance of nuclear weapons, the decisive factor in keeping the postwar era (in a Western context) peaceful.

The reasons for the superiority of a bipolar structure compared to a multipolar one are the reduced possibilities of war on the basis of fewer conflict dyads. There are less miscalculations of an opponent's strength, thereby making deterrence as a military/political tool a common practice. Therefore, Mearsheimer paints a rather bleak picture for the remainder of the 20th and the beginning of 21st centuries, as the emergence of a multipolar structure was considered, a commonplace by most foreign policy experts. In his own words:

> In a multipolar system, by contrast, three or more major powers dominate. Minor powers in such a system have considerable flexibility regarding alliance partners and can opt to be free floaters. (…) A multipolar system has many potential conflict situations. Major power dyads are more numerous, each posing the potential for conflict. Conflict could also erupt across dyads involving major and minor powers. Dyads between minor powers could also lead to war. Therefore, *ceteris paribus*, war is more likely in a multipolar system than in a bipolar one.[28]

Proponents that favor the multipolar power arrangement counter Mearsheimer's argument on numerous levels. To begin with, they emphasize the role of international institutions as a stabilizing element in global politics, i.e. multilateral institutions foster an agreed-upon framework within which competing national interests can be dealt. Charles W. Kegley and Gregory A. Raymond outline four major reasons why multipolarity can produce relatively greater stability than bipolarity. [29] First, through multiple players on the international chessboard, the likelihood of a bipolar stand-off with disastrous consequences is diminished. Second, the potential for mutually beneficial trade-offs on different levels of the political spectrum is enhanced, thereby strengthening the interaction among the different players and making war less likely. Third, actors cannot focus their attention on a singular opponent/enemy in areas such as alliance policy and military build-up, so that the potential for escalation is reduced. Fourth, players are more risk averse and less likely to start a war in a multipolar world where they cannot calculate the strength of their opponent(s).

---

[27] John J. Mearsheimer, "Back to the Future. Instability in Europe after the Cold War," *International Security* 15.1 (Summer 1990), 5-56.
[28] Ibid, 14.
[29] Charles W. Kegley, Jr. / Gregory A. Raymond, "Must we Fear a Multipolar Future? *A Multipolar Peace? Great-Power Politics in the 21st Century.* Charles W. Kegley, Jr. / Gregory A. Raymond (eds.) (New York: St. Martin's, 1994), 46-53.

Kegley and Raymond summarize the debate about the merits of bipolarity versus multipolarity adequately:

> In summary, advocates of bipolarity assert that a world containing two centers of power that are significantly stronger than the next tier of states will be stable because the heightened tensions accompanying a great-power duopoly encourages the bloc leaders to exercise caution, to assume greater responsibilities for their actions, and to restrain the crisis-provoking, aggressive actions of their subordinate allies. Conversely, those favoring multipolarity believe that the parity of a great-power oligopoly will be stable because a rise in interaction opportunities and a diminution in the share of attention that can be allocated among many potential adversaries reduce the rigidity of conflicts. In rebuttal, the former submit that because of its ambiguous nature, multipolarity will promote war through miscalculation. The latter retort that bipolarity, lacking flexibility and suppleness, will deteriorate into a struggle for supremacy.[30]

While there is obviously substantial disagreement about the advantageous nature of multipolarity, the debate in the 1990s among foreign policy elites and the broader U.S. public displays that multipolarity is expected to become a reality in international relations in the post-Cold War era. With the economic rise of Japan at the time, as well as the reunification of Germany and the emergence of Europe as a global player, the U.S. is forced to split its attention both eastward and westward. A notable exception to this consensus view is Charles Krauthammer's conviction of witnessing a truly unipolar moment after the end of the Cold War.

The conservative policy analyst Charles Krauthammer diagnoses in his article "The Unipolar Moment" that the U.S. foreign policy establishment has committed the fallacy of mistaking second-rank powers such as Germany and Japan for coequal partners that could be helpful in organizing the new world order.[31] For Krauthammer, the United States is the unchallenged superpower in a unipolar time that only pretends to exist in a multipolar world because it causes less problems on the domestic front. He is highly critical of the UN, deeming it "the guarantor of nothing"[32] and believes that the post-Cold War era will find its decisive feature in the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. In his influential view, the United States needs to exercise its hegemony in a policy of robust interventionism carefully, wisely and only where it serves its own national interests. For him there is no other option than American leadership as "the alternative to unipolarity is not multipolarity but chaos."[33]

The discussion about bi-, multi-, or unipolarity in the early 1990s exemplifies the search for a new structuring principle in international relations. The debate over these theoretical constructs and terminology mirrors the larger U.S. foreign policy debate at a time that needed to combine two diametrically opposed efforts in order to come up with a new paradigm. On the one hand, there was the justified urge to revert back to the classical approaches of foreign policy manifested in the different international relations' schools of thought long before the 1940s. On the other hand, the political elites needed to keep an open mind in order to reflect the new, unprecedented developments after the end of the Cold War. In Joseph Nye's warning words:

---

[30] Ibid, 52.
[31] Charles Krauthammer, "The Unipolar Moment," *Rethinking America's Security. Beyond Cold War to New World Order.* Graham Allison and Gregory F. Treverton (eds.) (New York: Norton & Company, 1992), 295-306.
[32] Ibid, 297.
[33] Ibid, 306.

The world order after the Cold War is sui generis, and we overly constrain our understanding by trying to force it into the procrustean bed of traditional metaphors with their mechanical polarities. Power is becoming more multidimensional, structures more complex and states themselves more permeable.[34]

The combination of both – learning from the experiences of the past while taking into consideration the conditions of the present – was at the heart of the debate over the future course of U.S. foreign policy. While the daily political decisions on foreign and security policies of the first Clinton administration will be analyzed at a later stage,[35] the following chapter gives an overview of the most influential schools of thought and policy outlooks in the 1990s.

I.2. The U.S. Strategic Debate

On the most basic level, the United States has always been a torn country in terms of foreign policy thinking. The tension of two very different ambitions can be traced back to the very beginning of its existence. While this is not the place to go into a detailed historical debate, it is sufficient to mention that there have always been Americans that would favor a pragmatic, power and fact-oriented course of foreign policy, while at the same time there have been proponents of a promotion of universal values such as democracy and the rule of law. Both theories evolve out of a strong moral streak in American thinking that considers the United States as an exceptional country – this belief is plastically described in the metaphor of a "shining city upon a hill."[36] The question of how to maintain this exceptionalism in the eyes of the American people, while realizing the need to engage with the outside world, has been central in American political debates and has led to two different schools of thought: realism and liberal internationalism.

In order to understand the evolving strategic debate in the 1990s and the eventual foreign policy decisions that the Clinton administration took during the first term, it is important to outline the most basic and important assumptions of both theories. One of the most influential proponents of realism is Hans J. Morgenthau, who wrote an almost manifest-like explanation of a realist theory of international politics.[37] Morgenthau's departure point is a world that is shaped by forces inherent in an imperfect human nature. Human interaction is characterized by the struggle between opposing interests and potential conflicts. In a world like this, there cannot be a full realization of universal values, but only a temporary settlement of different points of view through a balancing act. On the (international) policy level, "this school, then, sees in a system of checks and balances a universal principle for all pluralist societies."[38] This balance, however, is constantly shaken by the main paradigm that Morgenthau identifies in his six principles of political realism, in which he states that in the "landscape of international politics the concept of interest is defined in terms of power."[39]

---

[34] Joseph S. Nye, Jr., "What New World Order?" *FA* 71.2 (Spring 1992), 83-96.

[35] See chapter III.5.

[36] The term is ascribed to the early pilgrim John Winthrop who used it in 1630 close to the Massachusetts coast to describe the America that he imagined upon his arrival in North America. In modern times, it was used prominently by President Ronald Reagan during his last speech in office summarizing the success of his eight years as President of the United States.

[37] Hans J. Morgenthau. *Politics among Nations. The Struggle for Power and Peace*, 5th edition (New York: Alfred A Knopf, 1973).

[38] Ibid, 3.

[39] Ibid, 5.

If nations want to be strong and powerful on an international level, they need to have a powerful state that represents their national interests in the world. This basic fact leads to two further main conclusions that realists have pointed out again and again. First, states are the major actors in world affairs and are constantly struggling for power and a better position within the international community to acquire more leverage over other nations. The most important tool in this regard is the acquisition of military might as a means of power projection. Second, the international system is, in essence, anarchic as it lacks an authoritative government that can enact and enforce rules of behavior. Realists claim that states are very well aware of the lack of such an overarching government body that conditions their behavior and diplomacy on the global stage. The synthesis of both observations leads to a general trend in world politics that "states are preoccupied with their security and power; by consequence, states are predisposed toward conflict and competition, and they often fail to cooperate when they have common interests."[40]

This realistic rationale toward international politics is attacked from liberal internationalists. To begin with, they fundamentally disagree with numerous parameters and assumptions just presented. Most notably, they define power in less absolute terms than realists and argue that power is not a tangible good comparable to money, which can be handed from one person or state to another. On the contrary, the concept of power is a much more complex and complicated issue in their mind, as power is shared by various policy areas or within government bodies, so that a detailed analysis is necessary to understand how the distribution of power influences international relations.[41]

Another charge against the realist school of thought is that it leads to a mechanistic perspective on international relations, as the theory operates with many general assumptions. For instance, realism does not outline which institutions within a state are in charge of foreign policy and also has a hard time explaining why there are fundamental shifts of policies in the case of a new government (even though national interests have remained the same). Stanley Hoffmann characterizes the realist school as follows: "The study of international relations tends to be reduced to a formalized ballet, where the steps fall into the same pattern over and over again, and which has no story to tell."[42]

Moreover, liberal internationalists reject the notion of the centrality of states within the global world of the late 20th century, as additional actors such as labor unions, political parties and trade associations have claimed their share of power within the political process, thereby diversifying the power structures. Finally, the role and importance of international organizations as a structuring force in world affairs is evaluated as more positive and sustainable by liberal internationalists than realists. Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye argue that "in a world of multiple issues imperfectly linked, in which coalitions are formed transnationally and transgovernmentally, the potential role of international institutions in political bargaining is greatly increased."[43]

Positively speaking then, liberal internationalists argue for a closer review of the internal structure of states as they see a direct link between those elements and the decision on respective foreign policy initiatives and goals. Furthermore, they stand for the promotion of American values and norms most notably the export of a democratic system and the rule of law, as this will minimize

---

[40] Joseph M. Grieco. *Cooperation among Nations. Europe, America and Non-Tariff Barriers to Trade* (Ithaca/New York: Cornell University, 1990).

[41] On the nature of power, compare for the realist position E.H. Carr. *The Twenty Years' Crisis* (New York: Harper & Row, 1939), 108ff. For the liberal position see Robert O. Keohane/ Joseph S. Nye. *Power and Independence. World Politics in Transition* (Boston: Little Brown, 1977), 159.

[42] Stanley Hoffmann. *Contemporary Theory in International Relations* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1962), 35.

[43] Keohane/Nye. *Power and Interdependence*, 35.

the potential for threats and conflict that could eventually harm the United States. They do not have a unilateral approach in this effort, but advocate working through international organizations in an attempt to make the world safe and secure. The promotion of universal values does not stop for them at their national borders, but is an international task.

The early 1990s saw a heated debate in both academic and political circles on these theoretical deliberations. The speedy break-down of the Soviet Union brought the pendulum of the debate in motion and gave the liberal internationalists a chance to put their convictions to the forefront after the Cold War. While the stalemate between the two superpowers during the Cold War seemed to have proven realists right in their definition of power and the nation state, the ensuing developments presented a window of opportunity for liberal internationalists to advocate a new course in U.S. foreign policy, which was tilted more toward their beliefs. Realists continued to criticize the position of their alter egos as not only idealistic, but also dangerous for U.S. national interests. They saw in the idea of promoting universal goals through international relations a disastrous potential for overstretch of national capital and loss of control over one's own actions at the same time. However, the playing field for a re-evaluation of U.S. foreign policy maxims and openness for new ideas was levelled at the beginning of Clinton's first term. The next chapter describes the four most prominent camps in which foreign policy thinkers distinguished themselves.

I.2.1 Collective Security

At the heart of the collective security theory is the notion that the security dilemma of states can best be overcome not through national self-help and the balance of power, but through the institution of communal commitments whereby each state joins in common actions against those who threaten the territorial integrity or political independence of others. This theory is strongly influenced by the convictions of liberal internationalists and has its main objective in peace and not the acquisition or use of power. Proponents of the collective security model see U.S. leadership as indispensable for an envisioned international system as a guide of justice and the rule of law. Advocates of this model find it appealing as morally right, but also see its benefit by freeing up U.S. resources through international burden-sharing.

Moving toward a closely-knit system of international cooperation in the security field is even more important in light of the non-proliferation issue at the beginning of the 1990s. Even the United States as the sole superpower on the global stage is dependent on cooperation among its allies in order to maximize the success of arms control mechanisms. In this regard, collective security proponents are in favor of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and would like to see a strengthening of its regulations. For them, it is obvious that a successful foreign and security policy in a post-Cold War world needs to address the proliferation issue as priority number one.

Hence, the strategy for success in this effort is twofold: On the one hand, the United States needs to work through international frameworks, most notably the United Nations, in order to achieve strict controls and regulations in the non-proliferation game using all retaliatory measures at its disposal if states do not comply with the demands of the international community. On the other hand, the U.S. needs to pay more attention to the smaller and medium, non-democratic states in the world community, as one can expect that these nations will compete for security means

among themselves. This could have serious repercussions for U.S. regional and security interests.[44]

While the proliferation issue and the general trend in the early 1990s presented a window of opportunity for the renewal of collective security ideas, proponents of this school of thought were only a minority in the larger U.S. public debate. Over fifty years of Cold War had left its mark on the foreign and security elite thinking in that a somewhat radical shift toward a pure collective security streak in U.S. policy was outside the realm of imagination. Critics of the theory deemed it as idealistic and unrealistic, fundamentally underestimating the ambitions of political leaders and nations in their desire to obtain more power in the international system. In addition, the policies and fate of Woodrow Wilson, who is seen as the figure head of this approach in an American framework, caused majorities of experts inside the Beltway shy away from endorsing a course into this direction.

I.2.2 Multilateralism

The second, and well-established, camp in American political thinking is the multilateralist school. The central idea here is that the globalized world is more and more intertwined and interdependent, which calls for multilateral solutions negotiated preferably within international frameworks. Hence, multilateralists desire to work through the typical platforms of cooperation such as the G-7, the World Bank, IMF, the UN and regional security organizations, such as NATO. However, they also include bilateral and trilateral arrangements in their tool box to achieve their national interests, most notably with Germany and Japan in the 1990s.

Compared to proponents of collective security, they consider the UN only one of many available options and even are sceptical about the effectiveness of working through this world body. From a theoretical point of view, they are less informed from liberal internationalism than collective security advocates, as they are in favor of promoting peace in the world, but simply not as priority number one for U.S. foreign policy. The framework in which they operate is much more limited to pure U.S. national interests that should be promoted in a changing global environment. However, they agree with the impulse of the collective security school to work through international arrangements where possible, with the goal of achieving greater legitimacy for policy. Further benefits of this strategy are the promotion of Western values and market economies, as well as the positive effects of burden-sharing.[45]

Critics of the multilateralist approach of foreign and security policy argue that this conceptual framework runs the risk of undermining core U.S. national interests, by restricting U.S. leadership and its decision-making processes. This charge is especially prominent when the negotiation processes that are imminent for any multilateral arrangement stand in the way of a timely and collective response to an issue at hand. Viewing the U.S. as an indispensable nation being bogged down in a lengthy consultation process runs diametrically opposed to its image as an exceptional people that needs to show leadership at all times. In practical policy terms, this notion is a danger and risk for any President and administration in office, which is why it is counterweighted and

---

[44] The notion that democracies do not go to war with each other is an important underlying hypothesis in this line of thinking.

[45] Compare Joseph Nye's assessment in this regard: "The United States correctly wants to avoid the role of world policeman. The way to steer a middle path between bearing too much and too little of the international burden is to renew the American commitment to multilateral institutions that fell into abeyance in the 1980s." Nye, "What New World Order?" 96.

complimented by unilateralist approaches that are at the Commander in Chief's disposal at all times.

I.2.3 Unilateralism

In Richard N. Haass' definition, "unilateralism is an approach to U.S. involvement in the world that minimizes and wherever possible excludes the participation of other governments and organizations."[46] This approach has its intellectual home in the realist school of thought and is widely spread among conservative circles in the United States. Its primary objective is power, in order to ensure American predominance, if not hegemony, after the end of the Cold War. In that sense, proponents of unilateralism do not shy away from using the term "American primacy," in order to describe the power structure on a global scale and work on maintaining this unrivalled status in the world.

Arguing their case, unilateralists point toward the advantageous speed and secrecy of a decision-making process that only needs to be coordinated within one administration. At the same time, proponents of this school of thought also recognize the need for strong bilateral ties as they are perceived as an added bonus on the level of credibility and leverage, while at the same time keeping the management of the relationship reasonable. For exactly this reason, unilateralists are highly sceptical of the collective security position and also view multilateral frameworks with a critical eye. As American sovereignty, in its definition of making decisions in Washington and nowhere else, is of utmost importance, any deflection of power to another body needs to be avoided. Finally, in their desire to remain in an unchallenged position in the world, they see the need to stay (militarily) involved in Europe and Asia, in order to prevent the rise of a dominating regional power that can eventually challenge the United States.

Many critics have attacked unilateralism for being in dissonance with the American ideal of being an exceptional role model for the international community. It has always been a self-inflicted claim of American foreign policy to pursue a moral course in their external relations based on the belief of the superiority of the American model. If unilateral actions on the part of the United States were to become the standard, much less than the exception, the international order would be shaken to its very foundation, as every nation could feel legitimized to pursue a unilateral course in pursuit of its own national interests. The consequences of such a development would severely undermine the very institutions that the United States created after the end of the Second World War as a response to the two world wars in the first half of the 20th century.

Furthermore, the pursuit of such a policy on an ongoing basis would tie up a substantial amount of American resources and manpower and would be in the long-run very costly and almost unsustainable. Even though strong bilateral ties could cushion the effects of a unilateralist approach vis-à-vis foreign and security policy – they would not be able to provide similar burden-sharing effects as created by multilateral institutions on the political and economic level. Finally, in some policy areas a purely unilateral approach is deemed to fail from the beginning, as the post-Cold War world requires international approaches, for instance, in the fields of non-proliferation and climate change.

---

[46] Richard N.Haass, "Paradigm Lost," *FA* 74.1 (January/February 1995), 50.

I.2.4 Isolationism

The fourth, and final camp, that shapes the strategic debate during the early 1990s is isolationism. Looking back on a long history in American political thinking, isolationism reemerges after the end of the Cold War as a potential influence in the foreign policy course.[47] With the lack of a rival on the global stage and mounting economic problems at home, a distinguished part of the foreign policy establishment and the public at large advocate a return to ultimate freedom of action and strategic independence by back-pedalling from engaging in multilateral, or even bilateral, frameworks. In this line of thinking, alliances are no longer perceived as helpful tools in solving issues on a common international agenda, but are calculated as risks that could lead to U.S. involvement in military conflicts outside of its national borders. Isolationists, however, are not advocating a complete retreat to the North American sphere of influence, but insist on ultimate control if and when the United States takes action. The impulse is to become active only if core U.S. national interests are at stake.

Obviously, this approach significantly simplifies the U.S. foreign policy agenda by the sheer reduction of engagement in international affairs and consequently leads to a reduction of military forces. This proposal serves a twofold purpose: it does not only aim at reducing America's traditional leadership role in international affairs, but also desires to free up funds for domestic priorities. As Patrick Buchanan, U.S. presidential candidate in 1992, proclaims in his "America First" campaign: "What we need is a new nationalism, a new patriotism, a new foreign policy that puts America not only first, but second and third as well."[48] What this means for long-standing foreign commitments of the United States outlines political scientist Ronald D. Asmus:

> Buchanan has called for an end to all foreign aid, the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Europe and Asia, the dissolution of Washington's mutual security treaty with Tokyo, and an end to American contributions to the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. He has argued that the United States no longer has any interests to defend abroad and thus national defense should end at our national borders.[49]

In other words, these proposals are diametrically opposed to the foreign policy of the United States since 1945 and would require a fundamental shift in U.S. diplomacy that could have serious repercussions in terms of U.S. credibility and reputation abroad. However, this consideration is only one reason why isolationism remained a minority position in the 1990s. More importantly, isolationist policies would seriously risk the security of the United States at a time where a dangerous nexus between the proliferation of WMD-capable uranium and the emergence of terrorist non-state actors was already in the making. Finally, a retreat of the United States from the international stage would not only have implications for regional security arrangements, but would also affect trade between the United States and the outside world, which could seriously interfere with American economic and wealth growth.

---

[47] The isolationist school stems from the first President of the United States George Washington, who urged his fellow Americans in his farewell address to avoid 'permanent alliances'. See George Washington, "Farewell Address to the People of the United States," *The Independent Chronicle* (26 September 1796). This view was seconded by another great U.S. President Thomas Jefferson, when he warned against 'entangling alliances' in his inaugural address in 1801.
[48] Patrick Buchanan, "America First – and Second, and Third," *The National Interest* 19 (Spring 1990), 82.
[49] Ronald D. Asmus. *The New U.S. Strategic Debate* (Santa Monica: RAND, 1993), 24.

I.2.5 Which Way, Uncle Sam?

These four outlined approaches make up the foreign policy playing field for President Clinton at the outset of his first presidential term. While there are several options at hand, the realities of the early 1990s mandated that a sustainable U.S. foreign policy course could only be created on the basis of the collective security, multi- and unilateralist body of thought. This political fact has not only to do with the tradition of American foreign policy in the late 20th century, but is also based on the solid convictions of the political elite on Capitol Hill as well as the public at large, in the time period given. The conservative American political scientist Joshua Muravchik is a typical voice in this regard, as he makes "an argument for a foreign policy that is engaged, proactive, interventionist and expensive (…) In short, America must accept the role of world leader."[50]

In the American elite, there exists a consensus that U.S. leadership continues to be of utmost importance in a time where international affairs present themselves as much more complicated and diffuse than ever before. The new international environment requires a much higher degree of flexibility on the part of American strategic thinkers, as they need to respond to new challenges at the horizon in a much more creative and case-by-case approach than was necessary during the times of the bipolar world of the Cold War. On the basis of this assessment, Richard N. Gardner proposes the concept of what he calls 'practical internationalism' as the guiding star of the American foreign policy in a post-Cold War world:

> 'Practical internationalism' is a concept that seeks to avoid the extremes of 'come home America' isolationism, global unilateralism, and utopian multilateralism. It envisages a leadership role by the United States in working with other nations to build a peaceful world order through effective international organizations. It recognizes that the most effective instruments of foreign policy may not always be found in the United Nations and global organizations – that bilateral, regional and 'plurilateral' approaches not involving every member of the world community may often be better designed to serve our interests – and that unilateral action (such as the bombing of Tripoli in response to Libyan terrorism) may sometimes be necessary.[51]

This case for pragmatism within a framework given by the multi- and unilateral school of thinking is seconded by the former *Foreign Affairs* editor William G. Hyland:

> It is fruitless to search for a politically correct concept of the national interest to justify American foreign policy. Debating in these categories is itself an intellectual hangover from the Cold War. (…) No overriding principle articulated in advance will be sufficient to handle the burgeoning diversity of the new international agenda. If the choices are only among various concepts of realism, the operational question still remains: For what objectives ought the United States use its still awesome power?[52]

---

[50] Joshua Muravchik. *The Imperative of American leadership. A Challenge to Neo-Isolationism* (Washington, DC: AEI, 1996), 1.
[51] Richard N. Gardner, "Practical Internationalism," *Rethinking America's Security.* Allison/Treverton, 268.
[52] William G. Hyland, "The Case for Pragmatism," *FA* 71.1 (1991/1992), 42-43.

In response to Hyland's proposed question, the following chapter will outline the core national interests of the United States from a 'practical internationalist' point of view at the outset of Clinton's first term.

I.3. U.S. National Interests

This chapter will not be able to give an all-inclusive description of U.S. national interests, but will outline the most important U.S. foreign policy goals at the beginning of the 1990s. An intense debate among foreign policy pundits at the time about the creation of the new U.S. grand strategy of the post-Cold War world was growing. Though many proposals were tabled,[53] it soon became clear that an overarching doctrine, such as containment during the second half of the 20th century, could not be duplicated in response to the evolving international environment. The challenge was to assess the durability and usefulness of U.S. Cold War national interests for the present time, while simultaneously keeping an open eye for future foreign policy challenges and opportunities. In essence, U.S. elites needed to determine how much continuity or change of the foreign policy agenda was in the best interest of the American people.

Walter Russell Mead stresses the continuity of the predominant American national interest when he states: "The overriding American interest in the nineties remains what it has been for most of our modern history: the quest for a peaceful world order based on international law and peaceful commerce.[54] On the most basic level, the pursuit of U.S. national interests after the end of the Cold War does not change tremendously from the guidelines that served as compass for U.S. Presidents during the time period 1945-1990. The liberal American policy experts Charles W. Kegley Jr. and Gregory A. Raymond outline in this regard a representative list of core U.S. national interests. They claim that "U.S. policymakers are likely to set priorities and attempt to craft a coherent policy by pursuing a strategy that

- promotes American power, position, and primacy in order to enhance the capacity of the United States to exercise influence abroad;
- preserves global stability in order to foster a free market environment conductive to prosperity and the realization of American economic interests;
- advances the core liberal principles of democracy, human rights, and international law;
- provides a security arrangement that encourages arms reduction, inhibits rearmament, and reduces the risks of accidental war; and
- establishes a crisis-prevention regime to lower the chances that diplomatic crisis will inflame smoldering interstate rivalries and internal rebellions."[55]

---

[53] Compare for the centrality of the term 'grand strategy' in the American foreign policy debate in the 1990s for instance Robert J. Art, "Defense Policy," *U.S. Foreign Policy. The Search for a New Role.* Robert J. Art/Seymour Brown (eds.) (New York: Macmillan, 1993), 89-135; Walter Russell Mead, "An American Grand Strategy," *World Policy Journal* 10.1 (Spring 1993), 1-37; Barry Poser /Andrew L. Ross, "Competing Visions for U.S. Grand Strategy," *International Security* 21.3 (Winter 1996/97), 5-53 and Alexander Nacht, "U.S. Foreign Policy Strategies," *The Washington Quarterly* 18.3 (Summer 1995), 195-210.
[54] Mead, "An American Grand Strategy," 42.
[55] Kegley, Jr./ Raymond, "Must we Fear a Multipolar Future?" 181.

It is unquestionable that majorities of the Democratic and Republican party in the American debate could sign up to the above mentioned foreign policy goals in the early 1990s. However, heated debates emerged among the different political forces as soon as concrete proposals were tabled on how to implement these goals in different regional scenarios. The diverging assessments of the nature of power among realists and liberal internationalists, as well as a different esteem for the value of alliances were the underlying reasons for the controversies about the foreign policy course of the country.

As the American decision-making process on NATO enlargement – a prime case study for this phenomenon – will be discussed in greater length in chapter VII, an example of the German-American relationship shall suffice at this point to showcase the different interpretations of U.S. national interests in the American debate. In his 1991 article "America's changing strategic interests," Samuel Huntington holds the opinion that the U.S. should actively "limit German power in the new Europe, by encouraging German involvement in NATO and European international organizations, while at the same time working with the UK, France and other countries to constrain German control over these organizations"[56] in order to maintain a prime and unchallenged position in Eurasia. In other words, the prime objective for Huntington is the containment of German power in Europe, albeit through bilateral or multilateral frameworks. Compare this approach to Walter Russell Mead's deliberations on how to manage the German-American relationship in a new era:

> The great objective for American policy vis-à-vis Germany is to update and transform the relationship established during the Cold War and to shift the balance in the relationship from the defense and security orientation of the Cold War to the constructive economic needs of the nineties and beyond. The new grand bargain with Germany will replace the NATO-centric relationship of the past. For its part, the United States will not only continue to be committed to Germany's military security, but it will pledge its unstinting help as Germany confronts the unfolding upheaval in the east. (…) The new grand bargain need not include a German commitment to a global peacekeeping role. Germany's economic cooperation is much more valuable to the United States than any number of German troops in blue helmets or otherwise outside Europe.[57]

This hands-on example underlines a common theme in politics, i.e. details matter in the implementation of guidelines into concrete policies and action plans. This is also reflected in the field of military planning, which is tasked to prepare the United States in the new era for "a more complicated world characterized by a diffusion of economic, political and military power and relationships that resist easy or permanent categorization."[58]

---

[56] Samuel P. Huntington, "America's Changing Strategic Interests," *Survival* 33.1 (January/February 1991), 13. Not to misrepresent Samuel Huntington: He also puts emphasis on the economic dimension advocating to "promote evolution of the European Community in the direction of a looser, purely economic entity with broader membership rather than a tighter political entity with an integrated foreign policy" (Ibid, 13), but obviously has a very different outlook on managing the U.S.-European alliance than proponents that support a strong Europe as a strong partner in a transatlantic alliance.
[57] Mead, "An American Grand Strategy," 22.
[58] Haass. *Intervention*, 6.

I.4. U.S. Military Strategy

I.4.1 Change in Military Strategy

In order to be successful in the new era after the end of the Cold War, military planners and defense strategists need to take into consideration significant changes in the international defense environment. The key developments that mandate a shift in the strategy are identified by Paul D. Wolfowitz as "the transformation of the Soviet Union, and Eastern Europe; changes in the nature of regional conflicts; and the evolution of increasingly capable American friends and allies."[59] Interestingly enough, the success of U.S. Cold War policies has resulted in a different strategic landscape, which requires new awareness about long-known threats that now move to the forefront of the defense agenda. Most notable is the "spread of advanced conventional and unconventional military technologies – chemical, biological, and nuclear, as well as the ballistic missiles to deliver them – (which) is creating new instabilities."[60] Defense circles also put greater emphasis on the unfavorable consequences of asymmetric warfare and potential wild-card scenarios such as overturn of friendly governments in critical regions for U.S. interests.[61]

In response to these new threat scenarios, the natural departure point of an adjustment to the military strategy is still predominantly Cold War thinking, which molded two generations of American security experts. During George Herbert Walker Bush's presidency and President Clinton's first term, the debate among the defense community focuses on which strategic objectives of Cold War thinking continue to be in the U.S.' national interest after the demise of the Soviet Union. As the following deliberations will show, there is a significant amount of common ground between the U.S. military strategy prior and after 1990.

I.4.2 Continuity in Military Strategy

The ultimate goal of U.S. military strategy since its existence has been the protection of the U.S. homeland from destruction. In addition to this prime objective, military capabilities have always been used by the United States for the promotion of a diversified portfolio of economic and strategic interests that secure the unique U.S. position within the international community. The defense expert Robert J. Art outlines his priority list for U.S. military strategy, which includes the

> protection of the U.S. homeland from attack, continued prosperity based in part on preservation of an open world economy; assured access to Persian Gulf oil; prevention of war among the great powers of Europe and the Far East and preservation of the independence of Israel and South Korea; and where feasible, the overthrow of a government that is engaging in the mass murder of its citizenry.[62]

---

[59] Paul D. Wolfowitz, "The New Defense Strategy," *Rethinking America's Security*. Allison/ Treverton (eds.), 177.
[60] Haass. *Intervention,* 5.
[61] See for further information Klaus Dieter Schwarz. *Weltmacht USA. Zum Verhältnis von Macht und Strategie nach dem Kalten Krieg* (Baden-Baden: Nomos, 1999), 46-48.
[62] Robert J. Art, "Defense Policy," *U.S. Foreign Policy*. Art/Brown, 13.

This tall agenda showcases the continued ambition of the United States to be a world power. This notion of U.S. supremacy is especially wide-spread among defense circles, particularly outlined in the Pentagon's 1992 February draft of the Defense Planning Guidance for the Fiscal Years 1994-1999. In the report that was leaked to the New York Times, the prime defense strategy objective is described as follows: "Our first objective is to prevent the re-emergence of a new rival, either on the territory of the former Soviet Union or elsewhere, that poses a threat on the order of that posed formerly by the Soviet Union."[63] This statement serves as a representative example that the United States, out of self-interest and/or the promotion of its values, should uphold its hegemonic position in the world. This approach, albeit not new, mirrors the Cold War strategy of promoting American institutions and way of life as a superior role model for the world.

On the domestic front, there is continuity in the way the President is expected to shape the mandate for military action abroad. Just as during the Cold War, the U.S. military continues to call for only clearly-defined, precise orders from its Commander-in-Chief. The critical document for military strategy in this regard is the Weinberger Doctrine which is named after U.S. Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger's six points that he outlined in his speech entitled "The Uses of Military Power" on November 28, 1984.[64] In an attempt to learn from the failures of U.S. military strategy in the past, Weinberger presented the following terms as a pre-requisite for a successful completion of a military mission:

1. The United States should not commit forces to combat unless the vital interests of the United States or its allies are involved.
2. U.S. troops should only be committed wholeheartedly and with the clear intention of winning. Otherwise, troops should not be committed.
3. U.S. combat troops should be committed only with clearly defined political and military objectives and with the capacity to accomplish those objectives.
4. The relationship between the objectives and the size and composition of the forces committed should be continually reassessed and adjusted if necessary.
5. U.S. troops should not be committed to battle without a "reasonable assurance" of support of U.S. public opinion and Congress.
6. The commitment of U.S. troops should be considered only as a last resort.[65]

Even with intense debates over details of this strategy,[66] Weinberger's six points are generally accepted as a helpful framework to explore if U.S. military capabilities should be deployed into a crisis region. More importantly though, the common understanding in the defense community is that it is not strict adherence to Weinberger's manifest that is most significant, but success in achieving the respective mission's goal. The road to success continues to be shaped by the same

---

[63] See "Defense Planning Guidance – Excerpts from Pentagon's Plan: Prevent the Re-Emergence of a New Rival," *NYT* (8 March 1992), 1/14. Under the leadership of Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney, the defense planning guidance was significantly changed after the press had reported about it. Not only did the language become more diplomatic, but in later drafts the value of bilateral and multilateral arrangements was weighted higher than in the original draft. See Patrick E. Tyler, "Pentagon Drops Goal of Blocking New Superpowers," *NYT* (24 May 1992), 1/4.

[64] The speech was delivered at the height of a controversy within the American public over the terms of engagement of U.S. troops after the bombing of the U.S. military barracks at Beirut airport, which resulted in the death of 241 marines.

[65] See *Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger's speech to the National Press Club in Washington* (28 November 1984).

[66] Some critics pointed toward the fact that the definition of a vital interest is in the eye of the beholder and that it may be wise at times to commit troops in order to deter an enemy from aggression before truly vital interests of the United States are involved.

factors in the early 1990s, i.e. a superiority of U.S. military forces in the world combined with the highest level of preparedness for eventual conflicts.

I.4.3 Two-War Strategy

One decisive and hotly debated feature of military planning is the two-war strategy, which requires not only a substantial amount of troops, but also military hardware in different regional theaters in the world. Critics of a continuation of this strategic policy consider the U.S. threat assessment for the emergence of conflicts in potential crisis regions such as the Persian Gulf and on the Korean peninsula to be overemphasized. They hold that even during the Cold War U.S. forces would not have had the means and resources to fight two wars over a long period of time contrary to official statements by the Pentagon. Most importantly, they do not see the need to maintain a force and equipment structure at the same level of the Cold War after the fall of its archenemy. In a speech to the Foreign Service Institute, RAND analyst Richard L. Kugler outlines his views on the U.S. national military strategy and force posture for the post-communist era:

> How many forces will we need for the wars ahead? At the risk of oversimplification, I think that a 'One War Strategy' makes sense. That is, we should always have enough active forces to promptly deploy a field a field army of about 10 divisions, 10-15 air wings, and 4-6 carriers to the regions where our vital interests are engaged.[67]

While this is a plausible argument on the basis of a purely military assessment, in terms of threat projection and adequate countermeasures, the political dimensions mandated a continuation of the two-war strategy, including the allocation of adequate financial means in the defense budget. From a political point of view, this strategic decision was not only taken in order to keep the influential defense community at bay, but also to protect the credibility of the United States as the sole superpower. The 1997 Quadrennial Defense Review describes the importance of the two-war strategy for the United States as follows: "Such a capability is the sine qua non of a superpower and is essential to the credibility of our overall national security strategy. It also supports our continued engagement in shaping the international environment to reduce the chances that such a threat will develop in the first place."[68]

I.4.4 Preventive Defense Measures

In addition to the two-war strategy, the development and enforcement of preventive defense measures are a central issue in the defense debate in the 1990s. Obviously, the military is only one part of the toolbox, which includes a wide array of different economic and political means to prevent the emergence of threats. The role of the military is multi-facetted, including non-proliferation and peacekeeping efforts, the fight against terrorism and drug trafficking, as well as the creation of a friendly environment for democracy promotion efforts in the former Soviet

---

[67] Richard L. Kugler. *U.S. National Military Strategy and Force Posture for the Post-Communist Era* (Santa Monica: Rand, 1992), 17.
[68] William S. Cohen. *Report of the Quadrennial Defense Review* (Washington, DC: Department of Defense, May 1997) Section III, 6.

bloc. Such a complicated and diverse agenda is only manageable through the well-established military approach of forward presence, i.e. the stationing of U.S. troops in foreign countries. During the Cold War, forward presence was an important feature for the deterrence strategy of the United States, building the backbone of its military approach. After 1990, a debate starts on whether forward presence and deterrence are still adequate means of guaranteeing U.S. security and, if so, in what way they need to be upheld.

In the case of forward presence, there is unchallenged agreement in the defense community that it is of continued importance for the United States. This is due to the fact that stationed troops abroad fulfill multiple purposes:

> Forward presence will remain one of the enduring principles of U.S. security policy. Its importance to our strategy is fundamental and goes far beyond its military role for deterrence and war-fighting, as important as that is. In addition to their military role, forward deployed forces play a vital but less visible role in maintaining stability, preserving regional balances, and demonstrating U.S. commitment. Forward deployed forces and overseas basing are critical for both peacetime operations and crisis response.[69]

While the durability of the concept is acknowledged among security experts, there is also agreement in the defense community that the United States has the unique possibility to reduce forward deployed forces at the beginning of the 1990s. This is especially true for the European case, due to the altered power constellations on the continent. This strategic move has to be seen within the American rationale of taking greater advantage of its European allies in terms of military burden-sharing, while at the same time maintaining a sufficient presence to deter aggression and meeting American security commitments.

The deterrence principle continues to play an important role in the U.S. military strategy as well. It remains a decisive tool in forcing state actors to consider carefully how to interact with the United States, knowing that superior military hardware, including second nuclear strike capability, is at the U.S. President's disposal. However, the emergence of non-state actors on the international scene and the spread of WMD material and expertise after the fall of the Iron Curtain are new features in the security world that annul the concept of deterrence as an ultimate solution. It is this dangerous nexus of access to the deadliest weapons, combined with a lack of direct accountability after an attack, that challenges established security approaches in the post-Cold War world and ultimately increases the value of alliances for the United States.

---

[69] Wolfowitz, "The New Defense Strategy," *Rethinking America's Security*. Allison/ Treverton (eds.), 190.

II. Germany: After Reunification

II.1. Germany's Role after Reunification

In an effort to assess Germany's role after reunification, it is most useful to compare its status during the Cold War as member of the European and international community with that of the early/mid 1990s. The dichotomy 'change vs. continuity' proves most effective in this regard as it sheds some light on the debates and decisions that the Bonn Republic faced about its future foreign policy course after the fall of the Berlin Wall. Unsurprisingly, Germany turned out to be the most important benefactor of its unification mainly for two important reasons.

First and foremost, its security situation improved significantly with the end of the Cold War, as it lost its status as front-line and battleground state for the two superpowers. To put the gravity of this discontinuation into perspective: it is most likely that Germany would have been one of the main battlefields if the standoff between the United States and the Soviet Union had turned hot. The maneuvers of the East German military, the so called Nationale Volksarmee (NVA), in connection with the Red Army, as well as East German war-game documents found after 1989, indicate that the East German strategy in the event of an attack on West Germany was to employ a Blitzkrieg strategy, in order to achieve rapid territorial gains. The deployment of nuclear warheads on West German/NATO forces was part of the accepted strategic rationale in the East.[70] The depreciation of this threat, which held the German nation in a closed fist for many decades also meant a dramatic change in West German military strategy on the basis of the improved security situation. The 1994 White paper of the Ministry of Defense states: "The threat of a large-scale and existential threat has vanquished. Germany's territorial integrity and that of its allies isn't militarily challenged for the foreseeable future."[71]

On the basis of this analysis the concept of forward defense ceased to be at the center of the German defense doctrine. It was replaced by a much more complicated and diversified military strategy, which adhered to Germany's natural interest of national defense with its continued desire for stability on the European continent. For German Foreign Minister Genscher, both objectives were two sides of the same coin: "The defense of allied territory has the same importance for reunited Germany as the defense of the German homeland."[72] The debate in the early/mid 1990s was to what length and pains the Germans were able and willing to go in order to live up to this principle.

Second, Germany regained its full sovereignty with the ratification of the Two plus Four Treaty and validated the mandate of the Basic Law to unite East and West Germany, which had been

---

[70] Compare for further information Klaus Naumann (ed.). *NVA. Anspruch und Wirklichkeit nach ausgewählten Dokumenten* (Berlin/Bonn/Herford: Mittler, 1993), 179-219 and Jörg Schönbohm. *Zwei Armeen und ein Vaterland* (Berlin: Siedler, 1992), 11f/156.

[71] Compare *Weißbuch 1994. Weißbuch zur Sicherheit der Bundesrepublik Deutschland und zur Lage der Zukunft der Bundeswehr* (Bonn: Bundesministerium der Verteidigung, 1994), 202. Original quote: „Die Gefahr einer großangelegten und existenzbedrohenden Aggression ist überwunden. Deutschlands territoriale Integrität und die seiner Verbündeten ist militärisch auf absehbare Zeit nicht existentiell bedroht."

[72] See Klaus Naumann. *Die Bundeswehr in einer Welt im Umbruch* (Berlin: Siedler, 1994), 126. Original quote: "Die Verteidigung des Bündnisgebietes hat für das vereinte Deutschland gleiche Qualität wie die Verteidigung der deutschen Heimat."

apart for over forty years.[73] This regained ultimate control of the country's actions was strikingly visible in the departure of the last Russian soldier from German soil on August 31, 1994. The established freedom to maneuver had also an impact on the U.S.-German relationship. In Karsten Voigt's words: "The presence of American troops in Germany as well as its security guarantee continue to be vital but are no longer necessary to survive."[74] Through unification, Germany had become a more independent and powerful actor in international relations: a position which Bonn's partners and even the Germans themselves welcomed with mixed feelings.

On the one hand, Germany had gained not only more power, but also more responsibility as the largest country in the heart of Europe. Its allies, especially the United States, looked toward the Germans to morph themselves from an importer of security during the Cold War to an exporter of security, by stabilizing the countries in Central and Eastern Europe. In general, the U.S. saw Germany as a natural partner to share the burden of leading the international community on the basis of shared interests and values. President Clinton accurately described this view in an interview with the Süddeutsche Zeitung in which he argued that Germany had no choice but to assume the leadership role, especially on the European continent given its very own national interests.[75]

On the other hand, the European nations, as well as the Germans themselves, were to some extent afraid to take on exactly this more ambitious role, which would confront Germany once more with its old dilemma, i.e. being "too weak and at the same time too strong, too weak to shape the continent and too strong to be easily accepted by its neighbors."[76] The main reason for the German refusal to accept a role as primus inter pares in the post-Cold War era was of course the mishandling of the same geopolitical position in the first half of the 20th century, which resulted in two world wars and the Holocaust. Therefore, the re-emergence of a de facto strong Germany in the heart of Europe with its unique history made for a peculiar situation shortly after reunification: While the Germans were still adjusting to their new/old place in the world, some European publics wondered if it was time again to be afraid of their powerful ally.[77]

The German response to these fears was a mantra-like promise to continue on the same foreign policy path that the Federal Republic of Germany had walked so successfully in the past decades. Even though the above mentioned changes gave the Kohl government an immense increase of

---

[73] Compare *Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany: promulgated by the Parliamentary Council on 23 May 1949, as amended up to and including 20 December 1993* (Bonn: Press and Information Office of the Federal Government, 1994), Article 23.

[74] Karsten Voigt, "Das deutsche Interesse am Multilateralismus," *Außenpolitik* 47.2 (1996), 108. Original quote: "Die Anwesenheit amerikanischer Truppen in Deutschland sowie die amerikanische Schutzgarantie sind wieterhin für Deutschland lebensnotwendig, jedoch nicht länger überlebensnotwendig."

[75] William J. Clinton, "President Clinton: SZ Interview mit Bill Clinton: Deutschland muss eine Führungsrolle übernehmen. Der U.S.-Präsident vor seiner Europareise: Die Bundesrepublik kann sich nicht vor ihrer Verantwortung zurückziehen," *SZ* (4 July 1994). Original quote: "Ich glaube Deutschland bleibt gar nichts anderes übrig, als seine Führungsrolle zu übernehmen. Es hat keine andere Wahl. Die Deutschen waren bei weitem freigiebiger mit Investitionen im Osten als jedes andere Land. Ich meine, es gibt gar nicht die Möglichkeit, über eine Welt zu reden, in der Deutschland keine Führungsrolle spielt. Die Bundesrepublik kann sich nicht vor ihrer Verantwortung zurückziehen. Selbst wenn sie dies anstrebe, würde das dadurch geschaffene Vakuum Deutschland dazu zwingen, aktiv zu werden." See also George Herbert Walker Bush's "partners in leadership" speech at the Rheingold-Halle Mainz, May 31, 1989.

[76] Arnulf Baring, "Germany, What Now?" *Germany's New Position in Europe. Problems and Perspectives.* Arnulf Baring (ed.) (Oxford: Berg, 1994), 2. See by the same author "Wie neu ist unsere Lage? Deutschland als Regionalmacht," *IP* 4 (1995), 12-21 and *Scheitert Deutschland? Abschied von unseren Wunschwelten* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlagsgesellschaft, 1997)

[77] Among the many newspaper articles that focus on this point only two examples: "Germany is a Challenge for Post-Soviet Europe," *NYT* (27 December 1991), A10 and "The German Question. Ask it openly, answer it frankly," *The Economist* (12 October 1991), 18.

political weight in the international arena, there was consensus among all political forces that Germany would not waiver from its established course.[78] Not only out of gratitude for American and NATO protection during the Cold War, but also out of a strategic pursuit of future security interests, Germany's compass continued to show West. As a member of NATO and the WEU, the Bonn Republic had a strong interest in security within the Western hemisphere and its immediate neighbors, in order to guarantee the safety of its citizens. This stability was also the prerequisite for Germany's economic aspirations.

During the decades of the Cold War, Germany had established a closely-knit web of economic relations with partners on both sides of the Atlantic, which was the motor for prosperity and wealth creation in the country.[79] As a trading state with an export-driven economy, Germany did not cease to be in need of these secure and stable markets when the wall in Berlin fell. The final argument for Germany's secure position in the West is the adherence to the same values such as the pursuit of human rights, the rule of law, democracy and free-market economy which are based on a shared heritage. A convergence of interests on such a large scale provides an excellent framework for cooperation and makes the Western community one of natural allies.

Germany has especially championed this cooperative spirit, as multilateralism has become an axiom of German foreign policy in the second half of the 20th century. Since its existence, the Federal Republic of Germany has pledged to work through multilateral institutions and the Basic Law even authorizes the government to transfer certain sovereignty rights to inter-governmental institutions.[80] For the Germans, this approach served the purpose of reassuring their allies (and themselves) that the country had learned its historic lesson in nullifying any unilateralist ambitions. In this line of thinking, the international institutions continue to be of special importance for the development of German foreign policy after the end of the Cold War. The historian Gregor Schöllgen describes the agenda that lies ahead after 1990:

> Due to Germany's situational position on the junction between the zones of stability and disintegration, this means predominantly a continuation and intensification of cooperation in the European Community, NATO, the CSCE and naturally within the UN. This multifaceted cooperation has a double advantage: For once, it offers Germany opportunities for economic and political development as well as security. Then all these institutions also integrate German policies, which is not to be of underestimated importance for Germany's neighbors and allies.[81]

---

[78] Out of the many testimonies of continuity by Germany's politicians and elite only two examples: Theo Sommer, "Why we can be trusted," *Newsweek* (9 July1990), 38 and Rudolf Scharping, "Deutsche Außenpolitik muß berechenbar sein," *IP* 8 (1995), 38-44.

[79] Some statistics illuminate Germany's success, but also dependency on exports for a flourishing economy: From 1960 to 1988, Germany's ratio of world exports increased from 9 to 11.4%. At the end of the 1980s, the overwhelming majority of German export goods went to the highly westernized and industrialized OECD countries (82%), roughly 10% to 'third world' countries and finally 8% to its eastern neighbors (the Soviet Union as well as Eastern Europe). These numbers are drawn from two publications: Stephan Hessler/Ulrich Menzel. *Regionalisierung der Weltwirtschaft und Veränderungen von Weltmarktanteilen 1968-1988* (Bonn: Stiftung Entwicklung und Frieden, 1992), 22 and Mario von Baratta. *Fischer Weltalmanach 1993* (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 1992), 971.

[80] See *Basic Law*, Article 24.1

[81] Original quote: "Für die Bundesrepublik Deutschland gelegen an der Nahtstelle zwischen den Zonen der Stabilität und des Zerfalls, bedeutet das zunächst vor allem eine Fortsetzung und Intensivierung der Mitarbeit in der Europäischen Gemeinschaft, der NATO, der KSZE und natürlich auch der UNO. Diese vielfältige Kooperation hat einen doppelten Vorzug. Einmal bietet sie der Bundesrepublik Entfaltungsmöglichkeiten wirtschaftlicher und politischer Art sowie nicht zuletzt Sicherheit. Dann aber binden alle diese Institutionen die deutsche Politik gleichsam ein, und das wiederum ist für die Nachbarn und Verbündeten Deutschlands von nicht zu

The need for allies is undiminished in a world that has lost its structuring principle after the collapse of the Soviet Union. The continuation of a policy that presents Germany as reliable, durable, and trustworthy has not lost any of its appeal and continues to be of the essence in the situation given.[82]

A further decisive feature of Germany's foreign policy that has stood the test of time is what the American political scientist Phil Gordon calls the "policy of responsibility."[83] On the backdrop of a strong sense of guilt for its recent history, Germany focused on pursuing a moral foreign policy. This approach entailed first and foremost shunning away from power politics or the appearance thereof in the international arena. On top of its agenda was the promotion of peace and peaceful solutions to international conflicts, entailing measures such as banning weapons exports to areas of tension. The Germans felt and feel an obligation to make themselves the advocates of the underprivileged in an effort to promote universal values such as freedom and democracy.

However, Bonn did not only show continuity in its foreign policy guidelines, but also in the conduct of its politics. A regular feature of Germany's foreign policy was that its leadership decided not to decide on an issue, thereby avoiding to be clearly labelled in a certain camp. If they were forced to choose or came to the conclusion that they were one-sided on an issue, they employed commensurate steps for the counter-position in order to become or at least appear even-handed.[84] While this rationale caused a lot of frustration and criticism among Germany's allies, it proved to be an excellent approach for the country's geopolitical situation as keystone state in the heart of Europe. Germany had to carefully consider how to manage its special relationships with the United States and France (in itself a Hercules task at times) with its ties to the Soviet Union, and, after reunification, with Russia as well as the Central and Eastern European countries. In maneuvering the country through a rocky territory of contradicting offers, demands and even threats from its partners on the international stage, all German governments have engaged in a strategy of "constructive ambiguity" since Adenauer,[85] i.e. raising their diplomatic counterparts' awareness of the various options that the country could theoretically pursue, thereby achieving most of the time a beneficial outcome for Germany. As the political scientist Gunther Hellmann has shown, the Kohl government did not change this conduct of foreign policymaking after reunification. Hellmann outlines the following four contradictory policy initiatives in the timeframe 1992-1996 as examples of this well-established pattern:

> They (German politicians) continue to advocate – mentioning only the most important examples – first, the deepening as well as widening of the European Union (…); second, they argue in favor of a widening of the EU as well as a

---

unterschätzender Bedeutung." Gregor Schöllgen. *Angst vor der Macht. Die Deutschen und ihre Außenpolitik* (Berlin/Frankfurt am Main: Ullstein, 1993), 131.

[82] Compare also Karl Kaiser/Hanns W. Maull. *Deutschlands neue Außenpolitik. Band 1: Grundlagen* (München: Oldenbourg, 1997).

[83] Philip H. Gordon, "Berlin's Difficulties. The Normalization of German Foreign Policy," *Orbis* 38.2 (Spring 1994), 226.

[84] The example of historic significance certainly is Willy Brandt's Ostpolitik that complemented the previous policy of strength toward the Soviet Union. The effort here was to build a rapprochement between East and West Germany by restoring economic and personal ties in a non-aggressive way.

[85] For more information on the term "constructive ambiguity" see Uwe Nerlich, "Sicherheitsinteressen des vereinigten Deutschlands," *Sicherheitspolitik Deutschlands: Neue Konstellationen, Risiken, Instrumente*. Wolfgang Heydrich/Joachim Krause/Uwe Nerlich/Jürgen Nötzold/Reinhard Rummel (eds.) (Baden-Baden: Nomos, 1992), 787-796.

substantial decrease in the German contribution to the EU budget (…); third, they promote the full integration of selected Central and Eastern European countries into NATO as well as the continuation of cooperative relations with Russia (…); fourth, they are in favor of not only the continuation of NATO's special role in security affairs (and insofar as the perpetuation of a clearly visible U.S. military presence in Europe), but also the development of an own European security identity with the help of the WEU and the EU.[86]

On the backdrop of this specific foreign policy approach, it is not surprising that Germany has again and again been tasked to serve as a mediator between different parties. From decade-long experience, the exercise of consensus-building comes naturally to the German establishment, as it has been 'business as usual' for over fifty years. Well-respected foreign minister Dietrich Genscher was the embodiment of this approach – crowning his long-year career with his masterpiece of tireless back-channel negotiations that contributed significantly to the peaceful reunification in 1990.

II.2. A Normalization of German Foreign Policy?

Even though there was a strong impulse in the political class and the public at large to uphold the established habits of policymaking as described above, the question about the future course of German foreign policy arose in the early 1990s. The departure point for advocates of a more self-confident and ambitious German role in the international arena was not only Germany's gain in power, but equally the sheer necessity to address pressing crisis in the post-Cold War world. The European dream of spending its peace dividends after the collapse of communism was short-lived and quickly shattered by a series of events that called for immediate attention on both sides of the Atlantic. The American military intervention in Iraq under President Bush, the humanitarian catastrophe in Somalia, as well as the war in the Balkans did not give Germany a chance to take a break from history.

These events were not simply an accumulation of random crisis, but pointed toward a new trend in international relations after the end of the Cold War. The fact of the matter is that the breakdown of the bipolar system resulted not only in a Europe whole and free, but also in the intensification of ethnic rivalries, a tendency to claim one's right of self-determination by hostile/military means, as well as an increase in the proliferation of WMD-capable material and carrier systems. It is in this dangerous nexus of heightened anarchic behavior and loss of political authority in connection with a more and more interdependent world that the challenge for Germany's foreign policy becomes transparent. It is neither possible nor desirable for a country in the heart of Europe to cut itself off from these external developments, as they will find ways to

---

[86]Original quote: "Sie (deutsche Politiker) sprechen sich weiterhin – um nur einige der wichtigsten Beispiele zu nennen – erstens sowohl für die Vertiefung als auch für die Erweiterung der Europäischen Union aus (…); sie sprechen sich zweitens sowohl für die Erweiterung der EU als auch für eine deutliche Senkung des deutschen Beitrages zum EU-Haushalt aus (...); sie sind drittens sowohl für die volle Integration ausgewählter mittelosteuropäischer Nachbarstaaten in die NATO als auch für die Fortentwicklung partnerschaftlicher Beziehungen mit Rußland (...); sie sind viertens sowohl für die Beibehaltung der herausgehobenen sicherheitspolitischen Rolle der NATO (und insofern für die Aufrechterhaltung einer deutlich sichtbaren militärischen Präsenz der Amerikaner in Europa) als auch für den Ausbau einer eigenen sicherheitspolitischen Identität der Europäer mit Hilfe der WEU und der EU. Gunther Hellmann, "Jenseits von 'Normalisierung' und 'Militarisierung'. Zur Standortdebatte über die neue deutsche Außenpolitik," *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte* 1-2 (1997), 30.

hit home: be it in the shape of migrants on the country's doorstep or in the form of economic consequences for an export driven economy. The answer to these dangerous effects of the globalized world can only be a globalized German foreign policy, as Federal President Roman Herzog has pointed out.[87]

A prerequisite for the globalization of Germany's foreign policy is a rational analysis of the leverage and limitations of its power, thereby laying the groundwork for the definition of its foreign policy priorities. It is in this exercise where different attitudes toward a normalization of Germany's foreign policy crystallize. While other countries consider the definition of one's priorities not only normal but mandatory, some "Germans feel that 'power' and 'national interests' are distasteful concepts that are relevant to Germany's future only as part of broader multilateral endeavors."[88] Therefore, it cannot surprise that power projection in the military arena and to some extent even in the economic field had been a taboo for Germany's public diplomacy approach after 1949. In light of the mounting international problems in the post-Cold War world, however, the German angst to address the issue of its own power has not only been criticized by foreign countries, but by Germans historians, policy analysts and policymakers as well.[89]

While Germany could certainly not live up to the self-confidence of other nations, the German government and policy elites mostly from the conservative spectrum, as well as from the defense community, endorsed the thought of taking on more responsibility in the international arena. The camp of proponents of normalization was headed by senior government officials such as Chancellor Helmut Kohl, Defense Minister Volker Rühe and Foreign Minister Klaus Kinkel as well as high-level representatives of the defense establishment, most notably General Klaus Naumann, Inspector General of the German Armed Forces and Vice-Admiral Ulrich Weisser, Head of the German Defense Ministry's Policy Planning Staff.[90] Against the majority of their party, the SPD politicians Hans-Ulrich Klose and Karsten Voigt also agreed with the assessment that it was necessary to remove many of the constraints that had been placed on Germany after the Second World War.[91]

Two debates that occupied the headlines of the German foreign policy magazines in the early to mid 1990s exemplify Germany's domestic struggle to normalize its relations with the outside world: first, the role of German troops in multilateral efforts of UN or NATO approved peace monitoring, peacekeeping and crisis-control operations; second, the German bid for a permanent seat on the Security Council of the United Nations. On the former account, the ruling of the Federal Constitutional Court on July 12, 1994 opened a new chapter in Germany's foreign policy, as it allows German participation in humanitarian as well as military NATO out of area operations.[92] While some overly critical voices warned against the start of a re-militarization of the country, the ruling quieted de facto a controversial debate in the country about the deployment of German troops in multilateral, international missions. The decision was welcomed

---

[87] Roman Herzog, "Die Grundkoordinaten deutscher Außenpolitik," *IP* 4 (1995), 3-11.

[88] Gary L. Geipel, "The Nature and Limits of German Power," *Germany in a new era.* Gary L. Geipel (ed.) (Indianapolis: Hudson Institute, 1993), 20.

[89] See for instance Timothy Garton Ash, "Germany's Choice," *FA* 73.4 (July/August 1994), 65-81; Franz-Josef Meiers, "Germany: The Reluctant Power," *Survival* 37.3 (Fall 1995), 82-103; Christian Hacke. *Die Außenpolitik der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Weltmacht wider Willen* (Frankfurt am Main: Ullstein, 1997) and Hans-Peter Schwarz. *Die gezähmten Deutschen: von der Machtbesessenheit zur Machtvergessenheit* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlagsgesellschaft, 1985).

[90]See Naumann. *Die Bundeswehr im Umbruch* and Ulrich Weisser. *NATO ohne Feindbild: Konturen einer europäischen Sicherheitspolitik* (Bonn/Berlin: Bouvier, 1992), 152-66.

[91] Compare for Hans-Ulrich Klose, "Klose fordert von der SPD neue Beschlüsse zu Kampfeinsätzen," *FAZ* (1 July 1993). For Karsten Voigt see "Rechter SPD-Flügel: Bisherige Position nicht zu halten – für Kampfeinsätze der Bundeswehr. Voigt für Abschied von provinzieller außenpolitischer Kultur," *SZ (*4 February 1993).

[92] The court ruled that the federal government had to obtain the constitutive agreement of the Bundestag prior to (in exceptional cases after) every mission in which Germany participates.

by the German government and its partners as it not only provided clarity at home, but also made Germany a more trustworthy and responsible partner for its allies.

The German government employed the same philosophy of reliability and willingness to help solve international crisis in its bid for a permanent seat on the UN Security Council. This goal was made official by Foreign Minister Klaus Kinkel during his speech in the General Assembly on September 23, 1992. Making the German case, Karl Kaiser sees a permanent seat in the Security Council as an ideal tool to oblige Germany to its historic responsibility of strengthening diplomatic efforts and the international law as such:

> A country of Germany's stature cannot be content with the role of a 'free rider' or consumer of a United Nation's produced stability or at least its governance of world politics. (…) A rejection of German cooperation in the enforcement of international law is seen by other democracies either as a covered sequel of another path with disastrous German anti-Western political traditions or a cowardly denial of responsibility from a country that owes its current standing to its partners' willingness to take on this responsibility during the whole post-war period.[93]

Even though the campaign was not successful in the end, the Kinkel proposal gives testimony of a more confident Germany willing to share the burden of guaranteeing stability and peace in the world. For the German Foreign Minister, this is only the most prominent example of a new overarching mindset, as the return to normality is a sine qua non of his active foreign policy in the post-Cold War world. In Klaus Kinkel's words: "We have to prove internally and externally our ability for normality if we do not want to suffer severe political damage."[94]

II.3. Germany's Agenda and Security Interests

In an effort to present Germany's agenda and security interests after 1990 comprehensively, it is most useful to employ a model of three separate but overlapping clusters of countries that are decisive for the determination of Bonn's foreign and security orientation. First, there is the family of Western democracies with its established security architecture of NATO and WEU. Second, the Soviet Union and the former members of the Warsaw Pact in the East are looking toward Germany to help them manage change in an era of uncertainty. These two areas certainly preoccupy Germany's agenda in the post-Cold War period, as they are intimately linked to the country's most vital interests of security for its own citizens. Finally, the third aspect on Germany's security agenda is Bonn's ties with other non-European countries, most notably with

---

[93] Original quote: "Ein Land vom Gewicht der Bundesrepublik kann sich nicht mit der Rolle eines 'free rider' oder Konsumenten der von den Vereinigten Nationen produzierten Stabilität beziehungsweise Steuerung der Weltpolitik begnügen. (...) Eine Ablehnung deutscher Mitwirkung an der Durchsetzung des Völkerrechts wird deshalb seitens der übrigen Demokratien entweder als eine kaschierte Fortsetzung unseliger deutscher Traditionen eines antiwestlichen Sonderwegs Deutschlands oder als feige Verweigerung von Verantwortung seitens eines Landes gesehen, das seinen heutigen Status der Bereitschaft seiner Partner verdankt, gerade eine derartige Verantwortung während der gesamten Nachkriegszeit wahrzunehmen." Karl Kaiser, "Die ständige Mitgliedschaft im Sicherheitsrat. Ein berechtigtes Ziel der neuen deutschen Außenpolitik," *EA* 19 (1993), 545/551.

[94] Original quote: "Wir müssen jetzt unsere Fähigkeit zur Normalität nach innen und außen unter Beweis stellen, wenn wir politisch nicht schwer Schaden nehmen wollen." Klaus Kinkel, "Verantwortung, Realismus, Zukunftssicherung. Deutsche Außenpolitik in einer sich neu ordnenden Welt," *FAZ* (19 March 1993), 8.

those that pose a security risk to the international community. In this category also fall nations that do not uphold human rights and humanitarian standards of their citizens, thereby corroding and challenging the moral authority of the United Nations as the legitimate representation of the world community.

Having established the geographical playing field for Germany, the next step is to look at the pertinent security issues after reunification. At the top of the agenda is the structural organization of security on the European continent after the watershed moment of 1990. The German position is clear: the Kohl government strives for the continuation of the cooperative security architecture that provided the framework of stability during the Cold War. Joachim Krause elucidates the mission:

> Germany's paramount strategic interest has to be to maintain the cooperative framework of its international environment. With regard to the security and defense policies, the implications are twofold: Germany has to play an active part in all efforts that organize cooperative security and defense in a politically meaningful way; it also has to learn to deal with those challenges that call the cooperative environment into question and might evolve into causes for instability.[95]

The underlying rationale of this memorandum is the primacy of interlinked interests and the idea that the security of a state is enhanced by its membership in an alliance of like-minded nations with a joint mission statement. Germany plays a key role in both strategic processes that try to enhance its security situation on the European continent through a multilateral approach: first, through the establishment of a common foreign and security policy (CFSP);[96] second, there is Germany's interest to further and intensify the European integration efforts. The challenge on the latter aspect of the agenda is described in the dichotomy of "deepening and widening," i.e. not only creating institutions on a supranational level that are representative of the European citizens and have the power to act, but also managing the addition of further member states into the European Union (EU).

The most pressing case in question at the time is the admittance of former members of the Warsaw Pact into the EU. This effort does not only entail the support for democratic structures on a national level of a candidate country, but also embraces a consolidation of their market-oriented economies. This strategy serves the German interests of eliminating a security vacuum on its Eastern border as well as shaping a potential market for its goods. The urgency of this agenda in the early to mid 1990s is highlighted by Federal President Roman Herzog's statement: "If we do not stabilize the East, the East will destabilize us."[97] Therefore, it is not surprising that the German government was genuinely open and sympathetic toward Eastern European candidate countries in their efforts to obtain EU and NATO memberships if they qualified for admittance under the respective institution's criteria.

---

[95] Original quote: "Strategisches Interesse Deutschlands muß in erster Linie sein, die kooperative Gesamtstruktur seiner internationalen Umgebung beizubehalten. Bezogen auf die Sicherheits- und Verteidigungspolitik bedeutet dies zweierlei: Deutschland muß einen aktiven Part bei allen Bemühungen übernehmen, kooperative Sicherheit und Verteidigung politisch sinnvoll zu organisieren; es muß zudem lernen, mit Herausforderungen fertig zu werden, die das kooperative Umfeld in Frage stellen und zu Instabilitätsfaktoren werden können." Joachim Krause, "Kooperative Sicherheitspolitik: Strategische Ziele und Interessen," *Deutschlands neue Außenpolitik. Band 3: Interessen und Strategien.* Karl Kaiser/Joachim Krause (eds.) (München: Oldenbourg, 1996), 79.

[96] Please compare the following chapter for an in-depth discussion of this process.

[97] Original quote: "Wenn wir den Osten nicht stabilisieren, destabilisiert der Osten uns." Roman Herzog, "Grundkoordinaten," 7.

In addition to Germany's investment into the security arrangements for its immediate neighborhood, it also has a stake in promoting stability outside the European borders. As a major power of the industrialized Western world, it has an interest in strengthening international organizations such as the UN and the CSCE that work on a peaceful and just world order. Based on its historic responsibility, its agenda is focused especially on the civilization of politics, i.e. preventing military conflict situations wherever possible. In the words of the 1994 White paper of the German Defense Ministry: "German security policy is a policy of anticipatory, comprehensive and multilateral security precaution."[98] The German focus on preventive measures does not exhaust itself in non-proliferation efforts and conflict deterrence, but includes issues such as the international fight against organized crime, the protection of the environment, as well as countermeasures against poverty and the security of the international trading system.[99] In order to be successful with this tall and diversified security agenda, Germany needs to join forces with the United States and its immediate neighbors in Europe.

II.4. Germany's Role within Europe

In the post-Cold War world, Europe and Germany find themselves in a status of mutual dependency. On the one hand, the European community continues to provide Germany with legitimacy in its foreign policy actions and serves as a supranational framework in which the challenges of the early to mid 1990s can be addressed. On top of Bonn's priority list is the intensification of integration efforts on the European continent as well as the prevention of the (re-)emergence of aggressive nationalism that could severely endanger peace and stability in Germany's immediate neighborhood. In all these efforts, Europe is the key to making progress for Germany.[100] At the same time, Germany plays a paramount role in the European project simply on the basis of its size and geography. It is able to project its power, for instance, in blocking policy initiatives that do not comply with its national interests. A positive German vote on a proposal, however, increases its chances to find a majority within Europe. The lesson learned here is that Europe needs an engaged Germany in order to promote European institutions as decisive actors on the continent as well as on the international stage.

The end of the Cold War significantly changed Europe's geopolitical position in the world. While it had been the main theater of the ideological struggle of the second half of the 20th century, it had now been relieved of this immense burden and its policy options as a more independent international actor had been enhanced. Europe had received a third chance after a century of two world wars. Its task was twofold: on the domestic front it worked toward building a stable, prosperous and peaceful continent, while internationally it bought into the objectives and

---

[98] Original quote: "Deutsche Sicherheitspolitik ist eine Politik vorausschauender, ganzheitlich angelegter und multilateral vernetzter Sicherheitsvorsorge." *Weißbuch*, 43.
[99] See Bundesakademie für Sicherheitspolitik. *Ziele und Interessen. Deutschlands Sicherheit in der veränderten Welt – Arbeitsergebnisse des Seminars für Sicherheitspolitik 1992* (Bonn: Bundesministerium der Verteidigung, 1992), 57-72.
[100] See Reinhardt Rummel, "Regional Integration in the Global Test," *Planning a Common Foreign and Security Policy in the European Community*. Reinhardt Rummel (ed.) (Baden-Baden: Nomos, 1992), 29. A representative sample of the debate about the mutual dependency of Germany and Europe includes Gottfried Niedhart (ed.). *Nationale Interessen und internationale Ordnung im 20. Jahrhundert* (Mannheim: Palatium, 1997); Daniel Vernet, "Europäisches Deutschland oder deutsches Europa?: Deutsche Interessenpolitik in Europa," *IP* 52 (February 1997), 15-22; Gregory F. Treverton. *America, Germany, and the future of Europe* (Princeton: Princeton University, 1992); Bruce Goldberger, "Why Europe should not fear the Germans," *German Politics* 2.2 (August 1993), 288-310; Martin van Heuven. *The integration of Germany and its role in Europe* (Santa Monica: RAND, 1995); William Wallace, "Deutschland als europäische Führungsmacht," *IP* 50 (May 1995), 23-28; Rainer Winkler, "Deutschlands geopolitische Lage im sich wandelnden Europa," *Welt Trends* 6 (März 1995), 98-111.

missions of the United Nations and was active in crisis prevention, peacekeeping and peacemaking efforts. While these two general objectives were shared by all members of the European community, there was by no means convergence on the specifics of policy in both arenas.

The divergence of interests and foreign policy cultures among European countries became painstakingly obvious in the varying opinions toward the definition of Europe, its internal structure and future role in the world. One controversial debate centered around the question on how to organize European decision-making processes in light of the scheduled Northern and later Eastern enlargement of the EU. This argument did not only have to do with the traditional display of power politics, but ultimately centered on the question of what kind of Europe was envisioned by its member countries. Closely linked to the institutional debate was Europe's vision for its future role in the international arena. As Hans-Georg Ehrhardt has shown, the EU theoretically had three options:

> First, it could become a superpower with comparable means and room for manouever as the United States. (...) Second, the European Union could emerge as a main contributor to collective security systems (i.e., the United Nations and the CSCE), renouncing the option of unilateral action, but concentrating its efforts on collective conflict settlement mainly with political and economic means. It will be a civilian power within a reformed and evolved UN and CSCE system. Third, the European Union could evolve as a special entity that is neither a traditional superpower nor a civilian great power in the sense of a homogeneous political actor. It will rather be a co-optive or "soft" power, strong enough to organize international cooperation and to insert its own contribution into a regional and global network of political collaboration.[101]

The decision as to which option becomes the frontrunner within the EU is closely linked to domestic decisions, in particular, initiatives that empower central decision-making processes and enable the European countries to speak with one voice are of special relevance here. Arnulf Baring has noted three different philosophies in this regard, which he associates with the positions of the governments of Germany, France and Great Britain.[102] On the one end of the spectrum is Great Britain, which is deeply suspicious of a closely integrated Europe. Its criticism is of geopolitical nature, as it is deeply troubled by a Germany in the heart of Europe that once again would be in a position to project its power on the continent.

Not surprisingly, Germany is on the other end of the scale arguing for more integration and not less. In the first phase after the collapse of the Soviet Union, Germany even strongly advocated the creation of a federal Europe. Until the 1992 CDU party meeting in Düsseldorf, the Kohl government officially envisioned a 'United States of Europe' model as the desirable government system for Europe.[103] The background for this position was the intrinsic knowledge about the merits of this system, with Germany being a federal state itself, and the strong conviction that the German model on a European level would make integration on the continent irreversible. The reason why Germany's European partners ultimately did not buy into this model has not only to

---

[101] Hans-Georg Ehrhardt, "European Policy After Reunification," *The New Germany in a Changing Environment*. Hans-Georg Ehrhardt (ed.) (Kingston: Queen's University, 1994), 44/45.
[102] Baring, "Scheitert Deutschland?" 125-129. The debate within Europe has been much more diverse though, as proponents of every philosophy can be found in every member state of the EU.
[103] Karl Feldmeyer, "Wenn Wahlkämpfer an Europa denken. Das Hin und Her der Unionsparteien soll den wechselnden Stimmungen Rechnung tragen," *FAZ* (5 November 1993), 14.

do with power politics, but also with the unbroken attractiveness of the nation state even in the beginning era of globalization. While other European governments saw the necessity for further integration as well, they were hesitant to give away sovereignty rights to Brussels in areas that pertained their core national interests.

France serves as a prime example for the embodiment of this strategy. While Paris favored an integrated Europe in most areas, its enthusiasm was not all-inclusive: "They (in France) favor integration, but only until the moment – which is decisive – in which the national decision of power over security and foreign affairs is lost. This loss is not acceptable to Paris under any circumstances."[104] France's desire to remain in ultimate control of its foreign and defense policies has consequences for its envisioned system of government and decision-making processes within the European community. This is apparent, for example, in the German-French memorandum that was tabled at the meeting of the European Council on December 6, 1990 in Rome. This document serves as an excellent example for the different German-French philosophies as to the deepening of the institutional structures of Europe:

> As a traditional advocate of a federal Europe, the German federal government promoted the widening of responsibilities for the European parliament, whereas France following its intergovernmental point of view lobbied primarily for the widening of the European Council's role and responsibility in shaping the CFSP.[105]

In light of the French position on the decision-making process of Europe, which exemplifies the thinking in other European capitals on this issue, it is evident that Germany's vision of a federal Europe is unrealistic, as Hans-Peter Schwarz summarizes: "Looking at the feasibility for a federal Europe, it is clear that Germany's position would stand alone if it wanted to continue on its current path."[106] Even though this ultimate goal was out of reach for Bonn, the German government looked for other ways to create a stronger political union in Europe. Despite their above mentioned differences, Germany found in France a willing and capable partner to work together on the European integration agenda. Both nations considered cooperation in this field advantageous, as it securely anchored Germany in the European house and continued to manifest the German-French relationship as the motor of Europe. The memories of the thorny road to rapprochement after the first half of the 20th century was still vivid, therefore, policymakers on both sides understood the end of the Cold War as an opportunity to intensify bilateral cooperation for the benefit of a stronger Europe overall.

The Maastricht Treaty is considered a milestone of European integration efforts, as it lays out a detailed vision for a more streamlined European Union. Article B of the common provisions section of the treaty, which was signed by all twelve European members on February 7, 1992, identifies the following three key objectives for the newly created Union:

---

[104] Original quote: "Dort (in Frankreich) ist man für die Integration, aber nur bis zu dem Punkt – und das ist entscheidend – an dem die nationale Entscheidungsgewalt in der Sicherheits- und Außenpolitik verloren ginge. Diesen Verlust würde Paris keinesfalls hinnehmen." Baring, Scheitert Deutschland?" 128.

[105] Original quote: "So trat die Bundesregierung als traditionelle Verfechterin eines föderalen Europas für die Ausweitung der Kompetenzen des Europäischen Parlaments ein, während Frankreich sich nach seiner intergouvernementalen Sichtweise vor allem für die Erweiterung der Rolle und Aufgaben des Europäischen Rates bei der Gestaltung der GASP einsetzte." Valerie Guerin-Sendelbach. *Frankreich und das vereinigte Deutschland. Interessen und Perzeptionen im Spannungsfeld* (Opladen: Leske und Buderich, 1999), 113.

[106] Original quote: "Festzuhalten bleibt somit beim Blick auf die Machbarkeit eines Bundesstaats: Deutschland wäre ziemlich allein, wenn es auf diesem Weg weiter wie bisher voranschreiten wollte." Schwarz. *Die gezähmten Deutschen*, 37.

- To promote economic and social progress that is balanced and sustainable, in particular through the creation of an area without internal frontiers, through the strengthening of economic and social cohesion and through the establishment of economic and monetary union, ultimately including a single currency in accordance with the provisions of this Treaty;
- To assert its identity on the international scene, in particular through the implementation of a common foreign and security policy, including the eventual framing of a common defence policy which might in time lead to a common defence;
- To develop close cooperation on justice and home affairs.[107]

Only through strong German-French cooperation was it possible to agree with the other European countries on a treaty that gave the EU a roadmap and timeline for a more cohesive decision-making process and identity. The Treaty also reveals the difficulty of finding common ground on issues that were formerly organized fully by individual nation states. Among many other compromises that had to be made between the member states, the dichotomy of supranational and intergovernmental elements as rivalling structural principles of the European Union is evident.[108] Even though the Treaty of Maastricht serves as an anchor for the European Union, to which provisions its member states would revert back to in the following years on numerous occasions, there is no doubt that the final version of the document had to incorporate different philosophies and interests of its member states. Maastricht was a consensus and can be seen as the departure point for more discussions among the EU members on pertinent issues, such as the degree of national sovereignty rights that should be transferred from national capitals to Brussels or the individual competencies of the European bodies in the larger institutional framework.

During the first term of President Clinton, the EU as an institution had to address several challenges that hampered progress in its set objectives of economic and monetary union, a common foreign and security policy, as well as closer cooperation in justice and home affairs. These issues were manifold:[109] The ratification process of the Maastricht Treaty in some member countries proved to be more difficult than the enthusiasm of the European Council meeting in the Netherlands might have portrayed. Most notably, the negative vote in the initial Danish referendum, but also the only small majority of French that voted in favor of the ratification of the treaty cast shadows on the citizens' enthusiasm for the European project.[110]

Even though the Danes voted in favor of membership in the EU in a second referendum and the treaty came into force on November 2, 1993,[111] Brussels was facing a lingering legitimacy problem coming from the streets of Europe. As Stephen A. Kocs observes: "The contentious ratification debates in several European states, including France and Germany, suggested that as integration deepened, it might encounter growing resistance from electorates for whom the

---

[107] See *Consolidated version of the treaty establishing the European Community* (Brussels: Office Journal of the European Communities, 24 December 2002). Especially the first two objectives would remain at the forefront of European policymaking in the 1990s and require the subsequent detailed analysis.

[108] Compare Werner Link, "Perspektiven der Europäischen Integration," *Die Zukunft der europäischen Integration. Folgerungen für die deutsche Politik. Symposium des Forschungsinstituts der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Auswärtige Politik am 2. Juli 1993. Arbeitspapiere zur Internationalen Politik 78.* Karl Kaiser/Hanns W. Maull (eds.) (Bonn: Union, 1993), 11/12.

[109] This list is not comprehensive but merely outlines some of the major issues that challenged the EU in its legitimacy.

[110] Only 51.05% approved the ratification of the Maastricht Treaty, whereas 48.95% cast their vote against it.

[111] The EU had to make significant concessions allowing Copenhagen to unilaterally opt out of the economic and monetary union as well as defense matters if it chose to do so.

European Union decision-making continued to seem remote and technocratic."[112] Indeed, citizens of all member states attested the European decision-making process a democratic deficit,[113] as they did not see their interests represented by the complicated Brussels bureaucracy. In the mid 1990s, the word of an EU fatigue was being passed around through Europe.[114]

A second challenge for EU officials was inherent in the laudable desire to enlarge the European zone of peace and stability, thereby eliminating potential security vacuums in the EU's immediate neighborhood. The early to mid 1990s were dominated by two parallel processes in this area: first, the ongoing negotiations with the candidate countries of the fourth European enlargement round which resulted in the accession of Austria, Finland and Sweden to the EU on January 1, 1995. Second, the controversial debates within the EU on potential membership for former Warsaw Pact countries showcased once more the dichotomy over what Europe should spend its political capital foremost: the deepening or the widening of the EU? The specifics of this established debate revolved in the present cases around the feasibility of membership as such, the question of which Central and Eastern European country would qualify, as well as the decision on potential timetables for the negotiations. Both enlargement processes put the EU's institutional framework under strains, as the system had originally been set up for six nations and now had to accomodate fifteen members with more countries knocking on its door. As the ability to act was a sine qua none for the success of the European project, policymakers entertained the thought of reforming EU institutions or finding creative ways to cooperate among smaller groups of European countries.

Two proposals were especially noteworthy in the later effort to circumvent stagnation in the European decision-making process. The first one originated in Germany where two CDU politicians, Karl Lamers and Wolfgang Schäuble, tabled their ideas on the future of European politics in September 1994. In this widely noticed document, the two authors strongly advocate the creation and promotion of a core Europe that should serve as the linchpin for future integration efforts. The Benelux countries, France and Germany would serve as an anchor in the heart of Europe, in an attempt to hold an ever growing union together:

> In order to achieve this purpose, the countries of the inner core do not only have to naturally contribute to all policy fields but furthermore need to act more visibly in concert than others to propose joint initiatives in order to advance the Union.[115]

Through coordinated and joint policy initiatives, the countries of core Europe could counteract the still existing impulse of governments to look for national solutions, thereby sending a clear signal for further European integration. A key demand of the document is that European capitals which choose to go down the path of more cohesive policy planning should under no

[112] Stephen A, Kocs. *Autonomy or Power? The Franco-German Relationship and Europe's Strategic Choices, 1955-1995* (Westport: Praeger, 1995), 237.

[113] For a good overview on European public opinion in this regard, please consult David Marsh, "Partners dance to different tunes: As political uncertainty becomes more widespread across Europe, Maastricht looks less relevant," *FT* (18 June 1994), 8. For a German analysis on this issue Peter Graf Kielmansegg, "Legitimität bleibt für die Europäische Union auf absehbare Zeit ein knappes Gut," *FAZ* (17 February 1995), 13.

[114] As German examples of this phenomenon serve Klaus-Dieter Frankenberger, "Bürgernähe gegen Europa-Verdruss," *FAZ* (23 December1993), 10 and "Schrempp beklagt Europamüdigkeit," *FAZ* (3 November 1995), 20.

[115] Original quote: "Zu diesem Zweck müssen die Länder des festen Kerns sich nicht nur selbstverständlich an allen Politikbereichen beteiligen, sondern darüber hinaus gemeinsam erkennbar gemeinschaftsorientierter handeln als andere und gemeinsame Initiativen einbringen, um die Union weiterzuentwickeln." Karl Lamers/ Wolfgang Schäuble. *Überlegungen zur europäischen Politik* (Bonn: CDU/CSU Fraktion, 1 September 1994), 5.

circumstances be thwarted by other members in this desire: "It is crucial that these countries that are willing and able to proceed further in their cooperation and integration are not allowed to be blocked by the veto rights of other members."[116] Schäuble/Lamers saw the creation of a core Europe as a necessary tool to infuse new energy into the European integration process, predominantly in the area of economic and monetary policies. The reactions to this advance ranged from applause to stark criticism, which mainly focused on the German leadership role in such a construct and the selection of the countries of core Europe which was perceived as arbitrary.

Assessing the institutional limitations of the EU after the last round of enlargement in a similar way, but drawing an slightly different conclusion led France to present its own strategy in response to the Schäuble/Lamers proposal:

> The French government counteracted the described proposal of a deepening core with France and the Benelux countries being based on the monetary union with its differentiation concept that envisioned concentric circles of lesser integration to the outside and a variable geometry of several spheres of intensified solidarity to the inside.[117]

In other words, France shunned away from creating a core group of countries that would synchronize their policies in domestic and foreign affairs. On the contrary, it favored flexible coalitions of the willing that could be made up of different EU members depending on countries' interests and the issue at hand. However, Paris knew that it would be very difficult to orchestrate European policies without Germany at the table. This simple truth sparked a a close German-French cooperation on several domestic and foreign policy initiatives in the 1990s among them the implementation of the monetary union, as well as further steps toward a common European foreign and security policy.

II.4.1. The Path to Monetary Union

Germany pursued the goal of economic and monetary union not only out of political calculation, but also had substantial financial and economic interests tied to this initiative. With exports being a strong factor in Germany's wealth creation, Bonn had a major stake in a stable trading system with reliable markets for its products and services. The creation of one economic market on the European continent that allowed for free flows of goods and people was a major consideration in this regard. It was evident that Germany, as a transit country in the heart of Europe, would be one of the main beneficiaries of a common European market.

---

[116] Original quote: "Entscheidend ist, daß die Länder, die in ihrer Kooperation und in der Integration weiter zu gehen willens und in der Lage sind als andere, nicht durch Veto-Rechte anderer Mitglieder blockiert werden dürfen." Ibid.

[117] Original quote: "Dem dort skizzierten Angebot einen Vertiefungskern mit Frankreich und den Benelux-Nachbarn zu bilden, ausgehend von der Währungsunion, setzte die französische Regierung ihr Differenzierungskonzept entgegen, das konzentrische Kreise minderer Integration nach außen und eine variable Geometrie mehrerer Bereiche 'verstärkter Solidarität' nach innen vorsah." Josef Janning, "Das Ringen um Rolle und Strukturen der Europäischen Union," *Jahrbuch Internationale Politik 1993-1994*. Deutsche Gesellschaft für Auswärtige Politik (München: Oldenbourg, 1996), 152. Compare also Janning's helpful bibliographical references on the French vision of a variable geometry in Europe in the same article. See also Alain Juppé, "Respenser l'Europe," *Le Monde* (18. November 1994).

From the idea of a common economic area to the vision of one European currency it was only a small step. The Ecu, this envisioned name for the currency was changed later to Euro following a German proposal, would be advantageous to German entrepreneurs and business people, as it eliminates the risk of currency fluctuations within the European system, thereby having a stabilizing effect for the mid- to long term planning of companies. In Norbert Walter's words:

> From a German perspective, a monetary union that included as many partners as possible, would be advantageous because such discrete changes of competitive positions with all its corporate strategy insecurities would not occur anymore or at least be reduced.[118]

An additional benefit lies in the enhanced transparency of costs and prices in the European common market, which creates more intra-European competition. This development is not only advantageous for the European citizens, but also gives European business an important impulse to optimize its goods and services in order to remain competitive in the global economy. With a common currency, Europe, and especially Germany, does not only strengthen the efficiency of its products, but also promotes the continent as an interesting market for foreign investment.

Most importantly, the monetary union serves as an important tool in the deepening and widening of the European Union. Not only does it offer the Central and Eastern European countries an incentive to consolidate their households in order to be part of an economic area of prosperity, but it also creates financial discipline on the European continent. Klaus-Peter Schmid describes the impact of the monetary union on the scope of action for national governments:

> The single most importance of a standardized currency in Europe is its disciplinary action. The participating countries abstain from economic policy instruments with whose help until now they were seeking short-term advantages against competing countries, along the lines of the compensation of a generous wage policy through currency devaluation. No country could continue a policy of cheap money; no government would be able to print money on its own in order to cover budget deficits or to balance debt. If its rules were not severely violated, the currency union would be the stability union.[119]

---

[118] Original quote: "Aus deutscher Sicht brächte eine Währungsunion, die möglichst viele Partner einschließt, deshalb den Vorteil mit sich, daß derartige diskontinuierliche Veränderungen der Wettbewerbsposition mit all ihren Unsicherheiten für die Planung der Unternehmen nicht mehr aufträten bzw. reduziert würden." Norbert Walter, "Interessen und politische Optionen der Bundesrepublik," *Die Zukunft der europäischen Integration.* Kaiser/Maull, 40.
[119] Original quote: "Die entscheidende Bedeutung einer einheitlichen Währung in Europa liegt jedoch in ihrer disziplinierenden Wirkung. Die beteiligten Länder verzichten auf wirtschaftspolitische Instrumente, mit deren Hilfe sie bis dahin kurzfristige Vorteile gegenüber konkurrierenden Ländern suchten, etwa in der Kompensation einer großzügigen Lohnpolitik durch Abwertung. Kein Land könnte mehr eine Politik des billigen Geldes machen, keine Regierung im Alleingang Geld drucken und damit Haushaltsdefizite decken oder Schulden begleichen. Die Währungsunion würde – sofern ihre Spielregeln nicht gröblich missachtet werden – zu einer Stabilitätsunion." Klaus-Peter Schmid, "Vorteile und Hindernisse für die Währungsunion," *Die Zukunft der europäischen Integration.* Kaiser/Maull, 50-51. See also Hans Tietmeyer. *Die Europäische Wirtschafts- und Währungsunion. Eine deutsche Sicht* (Stuttgart: Gustav Fischer, 1992).

In order to achieve this union of stability, Germany was willing to sacrifice the Deutsche Mark (DM), which had not only been the leading currency within Europe since 1978, but also the second most used for transactions and investments after the U.S. dollar.[120]

If the Germans were trading in their symbol of the Wirtschaftswunder, which had the reputation of a strong currency in the international finance arena, they wanted to ensure that the new European currency would continue to be a guarantor of prosperity just as the DM had been in the last 40 years.[121] Making this objective a top priority in the deliberations of the Maastricht Treaty and in subsequent negotiations, it is not surprising that the pillars of the monetary union resemble traditional German economic policies and structures to a large extent.[122] Germany successfully introduced economic convergence criteria with which EU members needed to comply before they could become part of the monetary union. The criteria were:

- the ratio of government deficit to gross domestic product must not exceed 3% and the ratio of government debt to gross domestic product must not exceed 60%;
- there must be a sustainable degree of price stability and an average inflation rate, observed over a period of one year before the examination, which does not exceed by more than one and a half percentage points that of the three best performing Member States in terms of price stability;
- there must be a long-term nominal interest rate which does not exceed by more than two percentage points that of the three best performing Member States in terms of price stability;
- the normal fluctuation margins provided for by the exchange-rate mechanism must be respected without severe tensions for at least the last two years before the examination.[123]

In addition, the Kohl government was also able to implement its ideas on the creation of a European Central Bank (ECB) in Frankfurt. Against some initial resistance, the Germans managed to equip the ECB with a mandate to enact monetary policies independent from other actors, thereby effectively copying the role of the Bundesbank in the German system on a European level. As completion date for the economic and monetary union, the Maastricht Treaty determined January 1, 1999.[124]

The political decisions of Maastricht were accompanied by an intense public debate in Germany about the merits of the economic and monetary union. Critics argued that the potential gains, as outlined above, did not justify the trade in of Germany's stable anchor currency in Europe and its credible national central bank for an uncertain future in this vital field for the country's economic prosperity. Some economic experts deemed the convergence criteria as too soft to guarantee

---

[120] See Andrej Heinke. *Wechselnde Konstellationen. Die deutsch-amerikanischen Außen- und Sicherheitsbeziehungen in der ersten Amtszeit von US-Präsident Bill Clinton* (Baden-Baden: Nomos, 2003), 35.
[121] Originally, the Germans tried to achieve this aim by connecting progress on the economic and monetary union to making headway on the political union. When France and other European partners did not match Germany's enthusiasm for this envisioned symbiosis between the two processes, Bonn decided to push hard for a monetary union of their liking. In their assessment, progress on the political union would evolve naturally in the coming years based on daily cooperation between the EU member states.
[122] The crucial European Council meetings were the Madrid (December 1995) and Dublin (December 1996) Summits that worked on the agenda and timeline of the economic and monetary union as well as on the stability pact regulations.
[123] The convergence criteria are derived from Article 121(1) of the treaty establishing the European Community.
[124] For Germany's partner France, the economic and monetary union was not only a tool for closer integration on the European continent but also a means to break the predominance of the strong DM, whose status as a reserve currency had been a thorn in Paris' flesh in the past decades.

stability in the European market and criticized that the timeline of the new union did not allow enough time to harmonize the economies of participating countries. A further cause of concern was that, whereas monetary policies would be decided on the supranational level now, fiscal and tariff policies would remain within the responsibility of national governments, thus adding a potential source of instability to the system. The loss of national decision-making power in this crucial policy field was considered by many public elites a too high price for the goal of European integration.[125]

As one of the main pillars of the European integration process and in light of substantive concerns in the population, the creation of the monetary union remained on top of the agenda for policymakers and the general public alike. Not only were further negotiations to agree upon additional details of the process necessary, but the EU also needed to continuously address the pressing crisis that threatened the validity of the approved path toward monetary union. The envisioned plan came under pressure for the first time in the run up to the critical referendum of the Maastricht Treaty in France, when investors sold off their contingents of British, Italian, Spanish and Scandinavian currencies out of fear for a collapse of the whole system. Though Germany intervened heavily against the devaluation of the other European currencies, this episode delivered a first blow to the idea of an integrated European economic realm. Additional strains on the process toward monetary union were periodic calls from European politicians and audiences that advocated a weakening of the convergence criteria, thereby endangering the stability and competitiveness of the European currency. This issue was especially pertinent for the policymakers in Bonn in light of the domestic acceptance of the common currency. By no means exceptional to a general trend in Europe, German public opinion was highly critical of the installation of the Euro:

> Between April 1994 and August 1998, the Euro was rejected in twelve unofficial inquires in Germany. In favor of the adoption of the Euro was 20 percent of the population at best. The discrepancy between political decision making and the polled population was substantial. A democratic legitimating was out of the question.[126]

The lack of acceptance of the new currency among the European populations presented a serious problem to the national capitals that needed to justify their actions in Brussels to a weary audience at home. The struggle to win over at least the minds, if not the hearts, of their own Euro-sceptic populations as well as the ongoing negotiations about the specifics of the monetary union tied up a great amount of political resources and capital of European governments. While some political leaders certainly would have liked to focus all their energy on these European

---

[125] See Rainer Follmann, "Nach Maastricht: Mehr Fragen als Antworten?" *Orientierungen zur Wirtschafts- und Gesellschaftspolitik* 51 (März 1992), 10-13; Hans-Eckart Scharrer, "Probleme einer Europäischen Wirtschafts- und Währungsunion nach Maastricht," *Hamburger Jahrbuch für Wirtschafts- und Gesellschaftspolitik.* Erhard Kantzenbach / Bruno Molitor / Otto G. Mayer (eds.) (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1992); Renate Ohr, "Koreferat," *Der Vertrag von Maastricht in der wissenschaftlichen Kontroverse.* Rudolf Hrbek (ed.) (Baden-Baden: Nomos, 1993), 89-102; "Manifest von 60 Ökonomen gegen Maastricht," *FAZ* (11 June 1992); "Kritik deutscher Rechts- und Wirtschaftswissenschaftler an Maastricht," *Handelsblatt* (26 June 1992); Helmut Hesse, "Maastricht und die Europäische Währungsunion – eine nüchterne Diskussionsübersicht," *Staatswissenschaften und Staatspraxis* 3 (1992), 307-318; Reimut Jochimsen, "Die Europäische Wirtschafts- und Währungsunion. Chancen und Risiken," *EA* 13/14 (1993), 377-388.
[126] Original quote: "So wurde der Euro in Deutschland zwischen April 1994 und August 1998 bei zwölf inoffiziellen Befragungen eindeutig abgelehnt. Für die Einführung des Euro sprachen sich allenfalls 20 Prozent der Bevölkerung aus. Die Diskrepanz zwischen politischer Entscheidungsebene und der befragten Bevölkerung war beträchtlich. Von einer demokratischen Legitimation konnte keine Rede sein." Heinke. *Wechselnde Konstellationen*, 34.

economic affairs, the pressing crisis in Yugoslavia urged the EU also to move on the issue of a common foreign and security policy.

II.4.2. A Common Foreign and Security Policy

The need for a rethink on the European security architecture after the end of the Cold War was evident and preoccupied the top of the agenda for policymakers on both sides of the Atlantic. The reorganization of Europe's security after the implosion of its long standing enemy had to be managed in strategists' minds by two defense organizations: NATO and the WEU.[127] In the early 1990s, policymakers tried to solve the delicate question of competencies between both institutional frameworks. This process was of utmost importance as it had serious implications for the future role of the United States on the European continent as NATO's founder and contributor extraordinaire. While the solution to this conundrum was eventually reached in a multilateral framework, the management of the complicated, and at times intense process was spearheaded by three key players: The United States, Germany and France.

Once more, Germany played in this process the role of a mediator between its long-standing allies, as it had vested interests with both countries in light of its own security needs. While it was still dependent on the U.S. nuclear deterrence umbrella in a post-Cold War world, it shared with France the strategic goal to build up European defense capabilities in its own right. This approach served not only its integration agenda on the continent, but also envisioned Europe as a more powerful player on the international scene. As testimonies of Germany's interest to make Europe a more robust actor in global affairs serve especially three initiatives (in addition to the already discussed Maastricht Treaty) that the Kohl government undertook with France in 1991/92. The so called Genscher-Dumas Initiative of February 4, 1991 was crucial in establishing an organic link between the WEU and the European political union.[128] Originated by a French proposal in the late 1980s, the WEU was deemed to become the EU's defense pillar with far-reaching authorities. Article J4 of the Maastricht Treaty outlines the scope of the common foreign and security policy, as well as the WEU's role in it as follows:

1. The common foreign and security policy shall include all questions related to the security of the Union, including the eventual framing of a common defence policy, which might in time lead to a common defense.
2. The union requests the Western European Union (WEU) which is an integral part of the development of the Union, to elaborate and implement decisions and actions of the Union which have defense implications. The Council shall, in agreement with the institutions of the WEU, adopt the necessary practical arrangements.[129]

Another milestone for the credibility of European defense policy was the Petersberg Declaration, a statement of WEU leaders after their meeting in Bonn in June 1992. This document is of

---

[127] While Europeans and Americans continued to value the OSCE and UN as important international institutions that should be supported, there was agreement that both could not guarantee Europe's vital security needs.
[128] Compare "Gemeinsames deutsch-französisches Papier zur sicherheitspolitischen Zusammenarbeit im Rahmen der GASP der Politischen Union vom 4.2.1991," *Maastricht in der Analyse. Materialien zur Europäischen Union (Strategien und Optionen).* Werner Weidenfeld (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann Stiftung, 1994), 119-122. See also Steven Philip Kramer, "The French Question," *The Washington Quarterly* 14.4 (1991 Autumn), 83-96.
[129] *Treaty establishing the European Community*, Article J4.

relevance as WEU members announced their willingness, in principle, to detail forces to UN or CSCE run operations. This decision added an important component to their traditional mission of defending Europe from an outside aggressor and committed the WEU to involvement in humanitarian, rescue, peacekeeping and combat missions. In addition, the declaration strengthened the operational role of the WEU by founding a planning cell and giving the organization the authority over military units.

The third, and most prominent, German-French initiative was the creation of the Eurocorps which surfaced in the Kohl-Mitterrand proposal of October 14, 1991. Both government leaders agreed to build on the joint French-German brigade as the basis for a European corps, to which the armed forces of other WEU member-states could be added.[130] While some European nations were sympathetic toward the idea (most notably Spain and Luxembourg as well as Belgium, which even decided to contribute one military division to the corps in 1993), other European capitals were highly critical of such a bilaterally orchestrated initiative, out of fear of an overpowering Franco-German axis in Europe. The Franco-German Summit Meeting in La Rochelle (May 1992) defined the mission of the Corps as:

1. the defense of the Western Europe in the context of article 5 of the NATO and WEU treaties;
2. peacekeeping and peacemaking;
3. humanitarian tasks.[131]

Even though France and Germany had jointly sponsored the initiative, they were at odds with each other when it came to the relationship of the Eurocorps to the WEU and NATO. While Germany saw the Corps as a tool to strengthen the WEU as the European pillar within NATO, the French viewed the initiative as a first step toward a more independent European defense structure outside of the transatlantic military alliance. The discussion about the Eurocorps is also a prime example that the United States as a European power was involved in the crafting of a new security architecture, in this particular case through its position on the set up of the command structures of the Eurocorps as they related to NATO. After long negotiations between Washington, Paris and Bonn, the parties agreed that "the Eurocorps would be able to undertake military actions under WEU command if NATO was not involved, but would be placed under NATO command for military operations involving the Atlantic Alliance as a whole."[132]

The debate on the Eurocorps and the ultimate decision on it had noteworthy consequences for all three parties involved: "On the German side, the acceptance of a military unit with international peacekeeping and peacemaking as a declared mission represents a new commitment to play an international security role and, importantly, to do so in a multilateral European context."[133] For the French, their agreement to place Eurocorps troops as a single unit under NATO command in certain conditions was an important buy-in to the concept of multinational military integration and a first step toward accepting NATO's continued status as the paramount defense alliance on the continent. The implications of the Eurocorps compromise for the United States were twofold and mirrored the domestic debate on future U.S. engagement in Europe: On the one hand, the U.S. was able to manifest its position and influence on the continent through

---

[130] See "Paris und Bonn wollen den Kern einer europäischen Armee schaffen," *FAZ* (17 October 1991), 1.
[131] *Press Release, Summit of the French-German Defense and Security Council on 22 May 1992 in La Rochelle* (Washington, DC: The Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany, 26 May 1992).
[132] Kocs. *Autonomy or Power,* 222.
[133] Philip H. Gordon, "The Franco-German Partnership and the Western Alliance 1989-1994," *France, Germany and the Western Alliance.* Philip H. Gordon (ed.) (Boulder: Westview, 1995), 45.

NATO, on the other hand, Washington saw the need to allow its European partners to build up their capacities in the hope that they would be able to manage their own security needs and become strong(er) allies in joint international missions. For the Americans, it was essential that they could continue to exercise leadership in Europe through NATO if they decided that this was in their genuine national interest – a European bloc of nations that could potentially gang-up on the U.S. had to be prevented by all means.[134]

A further clarification on the relationship between the institutional defense frameworks came with the ground-breaking ministerial meeting of the North Atlantic Council on January 10/11, 1994 in Brussels. Besides the introduction of the Partnership of Peace initiative, which was a major step toward the Eastern expansion of NATO, the Heads of State and Government tasked the WEU as a bridge builder between the EU and NATO.[135] Equally important, the NATO countries continued on the path of flexible management of troop contingencies by proposing the creation of combined joint task forces as a response to security challenges inside and outside of alliance territory. The declaration states:

> We support the development of separable but not separate capabilities which could respond to European requirements and contribute to Alliance security. Better European coordination and planning will also strengthen the European pillar and the Alliance itself. (…) As part of this process, we endorse the concept of Combined Joint Task Forces as a means to facilitate contingency operations, including operations with participating nations outside the Alliance.[136]

With this new concept of flexible coalitions of the willing that were able to act outside of a consensus oriented and driven institutional framework, NATO and the WEU tried to position themselves as interlocking institutions that had recognized the security needs of the transatlantic relationship in the post-Cold War world.[137] A decisive feature of this approach was the double-hatting concept that allowed forces of member states to be assigned simultaneously to the WEU and NATO from now on, thereby strengthening the effectiveness and efficiency of the Western alliances significantly.

Even though the implementation of the concept took until summer 1996, NATO showed its capacity to address the new security situation on the European continent. Contrary to some critics that had proclaimed NATO dead after the end of the Cold War, the alliance was able to promote itself as a stable and important player in a rapidly changing environment.[138] This process had begun as early as July 1990 when NATO presented its new strategic concept and found its culmination point during the Brussels Summit in 1994.[139] After the meeting in Belgium, it was obvious that the continuation of the Atlantic link was essential for European security in the post-Cold War world: NATO was here to stay.[140]

---

[134] Jim Hoagland, "Europe – A Great Idea, Up to a Point," *WP* (25 April 1991), A15.
[135] Compare chapter VII.
[136] *Declaration of the Heads of State and Government. Ministerial Meeting of the North Atlantic Council / North Atlantic Cooperation Council* (Brussels: NATO, 10-11 January 1994).
[137] In order to enhance the coordination between WEU and EU as well as NATO respectively the Council and the secretariat of the WEU moved from London to Brussels at the end of 1992.
[138] Ian Davidson, "Alive but ailing: NATO is not the solution to the future security needs of Europe," *FT (*12 January 1994), 24.
[139] *The Alliance's New Strategic Concept* (Brussels: NATO, July 1990).
[140] Roy Rempel, "German Security Policy in the New European Order," *Disconcerted Europe. The Search for a New Security Architecture.* Alexander Moens/ Christopher Anstis (eds.) (Boulder: Westview, 1994), 159-196.

While Europe had taken some important political steps toward a common foreign and security policy, the presence of the transatlantic defense alliance was still needed. It served not only as a forum of consultation among its members, but also securely tied the United States to Europe and committed Washington to continue is role as security guarantor on the continent. At the least, the Balkan crisis exemplified that Europe could not act decisively and jointly through the CFSP, even if a grave security risk emerged in their immediate sphere of influence. The European handling of the war in former Yugoslavia in the early stages of the conflict made the continued preponderance of national over European interests painstakingly obvious.[141] While the European governments also had to address inter-operability problems between their national forces and reluctance in their publics to invest in defense, the lack of political will to act as one player was the greatest obstacle of a functioning common foreign and security policy in the early to mid 1990s.

III. President Clinton's First Term

III.1. Bill Clinton: The Man from Hope

While the EU decision-making process is always a painful process of negotiation and compromise between sovereign nation states, the presidential system in the United States endows its commander-in-chief with far reaching authority. Oftentimes characterized as the most powerful person in the world, the President of the United States is able not only to steer the country's domestic course, but also plays a paramount role in shaping the international order, given Washington's superpower status. An innate desire for power, a strong record within one's own party, the talent to run a sophisticated campaign and the ability to identify and drive issues that are a priority for a majority of the American people are only some of the successful ingredients to make the White House one's temporary home. Bill Clinton showed these crucial building blocks for success in the presidential race of 1992 – looking at his biography it seems that he had been preparing for the highest office of the country for the majority of his life.[142]

The president-in-waiting, William Jefferson Blythe III, was born in Hope, Arkansas on August 19, 1946 and grew up in Hot Springs. His mother Virginia played a key role in the upbringing of her son "Billy", as he was called during his youth, as Clinton's natural father was killed in a car accident before his birth. Virginia decided to remarry Roger Clinton – a decision that did not sit well with most of her immediate family. In their opinion,

---

[141] Compare chapter VI.

[142] President Clinton's rise to power and its policies during his two terms in the White House are subject of several in-depth analyses. A couple of representative examples on Clinton's upbringing, political skills, leadership abilities and presidential actions include William J. Clinton. *My Life* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2004); Hillary Rodham Clinton. *Living History* (New York: Scribner, 2003); David Maraniss. *First in his Class. A Biography of Bill Clinton* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1995); Nigel Hamilton. *Bill Clinton. An American Journey. Great Expectations* (New York: Random House, 2003); John F. Harris. *The Survivor. Bill Clinton in the White House (*New York: Random House, 2005); George Stephanopoulos. *All too human. A Political Education* (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1999); George Carpozi, Jr.. *Clinton Confidential. The Climb to Power. The Unauthorized Biography of Bill and Hillary Clinton* (Del Mar: Emery Dalton Books, 1995); Joe Klein. *The Natural. The Misunderstood Presidency of Bill Clinton* (New York: Random House, 2002); Ambrose Evans-Pritchard. *The Secret Life of Bill Clinton: The Unreported Stories* (Washington, DC: Regnery, 1997); John Hohenberg. *The Bill Clinton Story: Winning the Presidency* (Syracuse: Syracuse University, 1994).

Roger Clinton was a poor choice of partner: unreliable, weak willed, ineffective in his job, prone to rob his own till, a heavy drinker and inveterately unfaithful. (…) Roger Clinton, car dealer and gambler, was a big, unintelligent, spoiled 'good ole boy', a southern chauvinist, the 'baby' of his family – indeed, still called 'Baby' by his mother, even as he approached his forties.[143]

While Roger took a genuine interest in Billy and his later born son Roger Cassidy, some of his unfavorable attributes would show in their marriage in subsequent years, which finally resulted in a temporary divorce in 1962. Even though his stepfather was far from being a perfect role model and at times his reckless behavior sent the family in turmoil, Bill Clinton decided to adopt Roger's surname as his own.

The former president's adolescence resembles that of a somewhat typical life of a kid in the South during the 1950s/60s. Being part of small town America, the family struggled financially and Clinton learned the value of money early on. As he reports in his autobiography: "It's hard to convey to young people today the impact the Depression had on my parents' and grandparents' generation, but I grew up feeling it."[144] Another omnipresent aspect of life in the South was race, as segregation was still the political consensus and the attempt to promote civil rights legislation was only at its very beginning. In practice, there was a lot of racial interaction in the small towns of the South, including Bill Clinton's grandfather's grocery store where he spent a great amount of time as a child. As one of his first role models –the president's autobiography is dedicated to 'Papaw' – his grandfather taught him to judge a human being not by the color of his skin, but by his actions. Not being a majority position at the time, this act of tolerance and non-prejudicial thinking left a lasting impression on Clinton.

The highly politicized era of the 1950 and 60s was an ideal playing field for a policy-interested teenager who was an excellent student and was eager to leave his mark. As a ten year old, Clinton already preferred watching the Republican and Democratic conventions over indulging in cartoons like other children. Mapping out his future career path early on, he acknowledges that he saw himself as a natural fit in this business: "It sounds crazy, but I felt right at home in the world of politics and politicians."[145] It was only logical that he would pursue this goal by all means that were at his disposal in Hot Springs. In addition to excelling at his local high school, Bill Clinton entered the American Legion Boys State program, a well-regarded dry-run exercise for politicians in the making that enabled students to vote on current issues mirroring national decision-making processes. Serving as a Senator for Arkansas, Clinton not only got the chance to meet William J. Fulbright, the long-serving Senator of his home state in Washington, DC, but was also able to shake President John F. Kennedy's hand during a White House reception. Both events were a true inspiration for the young student and served as reinforcement of his plan to go into politics.

Consequently, his only college application was received by the Georgetown University School of Foreign Service in the nation's capital. Being one of the best schools for international affairs, Clinton's tenure in Washington guaranteed him not only a superb education, but also allowed him to be in the city in which contrasting views on civil rights and the Vietnam War clashed almost on a daily basis in the mid 1960s. Aspiring to be more than a student and bystander in the political turmoil unfolding, the Arkansan got involved in campus politics and joined the first

---

[143] Hamilton. *American Journey*, 49.
[144] Clinton. *My Life,* 11.
[145] Ibid, 35.

campaign in 1966, during his sophomore year, when Judge Frank Holt unsuccessfully tried to become governor back home.

Deeply saddened by the outcome, the candidate's staffer nevertheless had learned important basics in campaigning that would serve him well in the future. The election "not only gave him the chance to master the geography of his home state, but to learn speechwriting, campaign organization, debating – even television political program making and appearance on the TV screen."[146] It also taught him the value of establishing networks, as Judge Holt recommended him for a position on Senator Fulbright's staff, a job that gave Clinton some ease on the financial side and also fulfilled his desire to move closer to the decision-making circles in the capital.

Through his work on Capitol Hill, he gained a clearer sense of the growing catastrophe in Vietnam and honed his political skills. He tried to put them to good practice in a bid to become council student president on East campus of Georgetown in 1967, even though his classes and work in the Senate already demanded a lot of time and energy. In the end, he lost significantly and had to concede that his opponent had outspent, outorganized and outmaneuvered him. Having learned an important lesson in time management and dedication to one's own campaign, Clinton started to contemplate his path after the end of his college days and decided to go with the recommendation of his mentor Fulbright to apply for one of the prestigious Rhodes scholarships.

Through strong support of his academic and political networks and a convincing presentation at the selection committee, he was awarded one of the fellowships that would bring him to Oxford for two years. The successful road to England had been paved through the experience that he had gained in his college years. Not only had he been reassured of his dedication to become a politician, but he had also used his time wisely to learn and advance the instruments necessary to succeed. As David Maraniss concludes for this period of Clinton's life: "The Georgetown years established that Clinton was first in his class in terms of political will and skill, and yet people could sometimes tire of him. Still, even losing would not derail him from his political course. Nothing could."[147]

Oxford proved to be an experience of a lifetime, as it brought together an excellent group of intelligent, policy-interested and opinionated young leaders. With a somewhat reduced class schedule compared to American standards, the university gave its students the opportunity to discuss the political situation at home in a variety of circles and to bond with each other. The friendships that Clinton was able to form in England would later serve him well in his presidential campaign and as occupant of the White House.[148] As he was spared from going to South East Asia to serve his country, Clinton started his law studies at Yale University after his study abroad. During his years in graduate school, he did not only succeed in achieving a higher academic degree, but also continued to work on political campaigns for the Democrats. He supported the unsuccessful Senate race of Arkansan Joe Duffey, as well as the presidential campaign of George McGovern, which ended in a devastating defeat against Republican incumbent Richard Nixon. More importantly, he met his wife-to-be Hillary Rodham at Yale, who became a constant source of encouragement and support of his political career before and after their marriage in 1975.

---

[146] Hamilton. *American Journey*, 137.
[147] Maraniss. *First in his Class,* 112.
[148] Among the many Rhodes scholars that helped and served Clinton on his rise to power, Robert Reich as Secretary of Labor and Strobe Talbott as Deputy Secretary of State are probably the best known due to their prominent roles in the first Clinton administration.

Graduating from the Ivy League university in New Haven in 1973, he signed up for a position as a professor at the University of Arkansas Law School at Fayetteville. While being an attractive position in which Clinton especially enjoyed the interaction with the students, this job also enabled him to move back to his home state and prepare his own political future. Clinton decided that his first run at serving in a public office would be the congressional elections in 1974. He was able to clinch the Democratic nomination easily, but in the end had to concede victory to Republican John Paul Hammerschmidt. Conventional wisdom had expected a swift victory for the popular incumbent; however, Bill Clinton was able to narrow the margin to a mere 6,000 votes. The strong showing of the newcomer on the Arkansan political scene strengthened Clinton's reputation in the state, making him a natural frontrunner for other political offices.

In 1976, he was determined to take advantage of this prevailing mood and launched a successful bid to become Attorney General, which brought his family to Little Rock. Only one year later, he had decided to run for governor of the state and won 63% of the vote on Election Day, making him at age 32 the youngest governor in the United States in four decades. Only two years later, at the end of the term, it looked as if the career of a rising star of the Democratic Party had come to an abrupt end when the people of Arkansas ousted him from the governor's mansion in 1980. What went wrong?

In an effort to change too many things at once, Bill Clinton had failed to identify a few core issues in his tenure that mattered most to his citizens. His leadership style seemed to be diffuse and ad hoc at times, lacking a clear priority setting and a well-functioning communications strategy. In addition, the governor also suffered from two specific issues that had emerged during his two years in office. The first problem was self-inflicted, as Clinton had raised individual car tag fees in support of an investment program for roads, which was highly unpopular and damaged him significantly especially among his core constituents such as middle class workers.

The second decisive issue in the 1980 governor's election was the handling of the Cuban refugee issue that emerged after Fidel Castro deported 120,000 political prisoners to the United States in the spring of the same year. Most of them washed ashore the coasts of Florida, causing a tremendous problem for the Carter administration. Washington decided that some of the refugees had to relocate to Fort Chaffee in Arkansas, while the administration was looking for a solution of this pressing crisis. When a couple of hundred Cubans rioted one night, Clinton was forced to call on the National Guard to keep the refugees inside the parameters of the fort. To make matters worse, President Carter broke a public promise as the winter of 1980 approached, when he announced that additional Cubans would be relocated to Arkansas, due to insufficient heating at other camps. This decision which Carter had explicitly ruled out only months earlier hurt the President and the governor politically in their looming election campaigns. Both would pay a heavy price for it – in retrospect, Bill Clinton evaluated the lost election as follows:

> It was a near-death experience, but an invaluable one, forcing me to be more sensitive to the political problems inherent in progressive politics: the system can absorb only so much change at once; no one can beat all the entrenched interests at the same time; and if people think you've stopped listening, you're sunk.[149]

Out of a variety of job offers, Bill Clinton decided to accept a position with a well-respected Arkansas law firm and planned a comeback to power. In a successful race against Governor Frank White, he relied on a clear issue-based campaign, his still existing high popularity among

---

[149] Clinton. *My Life*, 287.

voters and the skills of his political consultant Dick Morris, who was essential in shaping the candidate's message through speeches, TV spots and radio ads. Learning from past mistakes, Clinton put the issues of employment and education at the heart of his bid for re-election and convinced his fellow citizens that he was the right man to improve living conditions in the state. When Clinton took the oath as governor for the second time in January of 1983, he had earned a reputation as a 'comeback kid' that would stay with him for the rest of his political life.

In his subsequent tenure of 10 years in office in Arkansas, he won the confidence of voters again and again by establishing an impressive track record of achievements, which did not go unnoticed outside the state boundaries. The governor also actively looked for opportunities to take on national issues and expand his networks on a wider scale – a strategy that led him to the Chairmanship of the National Governors Association, the Education Commission of the States, as well as the Democratic Co-Chairmanship of the governor's task force on welfare reform (all in 1986). Within the Democratic Party he had positioned himself early through his work in the Democratic Leadership Council, where he became Chairman in 1990 as a non-traditionalist not afraid to look at new ideas out of the mainstream in order to find solutions for the citizens' problems.

As pundits observed in the late 1980s, Bill Clinton was preparing himself thoroughly for a campaign for the highest office in the nation. The only remaining issue was when he would take the leap of faith to fulfill his youth's dream of becoming President of the United States. He contemplated entering the race in 1988, but eventually decided that he preferred to finish his term in Arkansas and, moreover, he valued his family time too much at this point to give it up for the gruesome pace of a presidential campaign. He was also concerned that it could be too early given he was only 42 at the time. When the next chance came along in 1992, the variables of the equation had changed and Clinton was ready to throw himself into the ring.

III.2. Don't Stop Thinking About Tomorrow: Nomination, Campaign, and Election[150]

The Democratic Party faced a tough challenge at the onset of the presidential election cycle in 1992. The task at hand was to find a candidate that could convince the American people to reverse a decade-long trend of sending Republicans to the White House. What made matters more complicated was that the Democrats were up against an incumbent, who enjoyed high approval ratings at the beginning of the year after a swift victory in the first Gulf War. Many senior Democrats including House Majority Leader Dick Gephardt and New York Governor Mario Cuomo shunned away from the assignment of facing George Herbert Walker Bush in a national election. This in turn opened the playing field for several less-well known candidates that entered the Democratic primaries. Bill Clinton's fiercest opponents in his attempt to clinch the nomination of his party were: Paul Tsongas, former Senator from Massachusetts; Bob Kerrey, Senator from Nebraska; Tom Harkin, Senator from Iowa, as well as; Jerry Brown, former Governor of California.

The primaries in the American political system play an essential role in giving the candidates a chance to test-drive and streamline their policies, as well as to heighten their popularity on a national level – in essence, they are designed to prepare for the highest office in the country. During this process, the Governor from Arkansas' campaign faced an almost near-death

---

[150] The title "Don't stop thinking about tomorrow" by the band Fleetwood Mac was Clinton's campaign song in 1992.

experience, after defeats in the early primary states such as New Hampshire, Maine and South Dakota. However, his strong showing in the Southern Super Tuesday primaries shortly thereafter, broke this momentum and let him emerge as the frontrunner for the Democratic ticket. He held on to this status by additional wins in Illinois and Michigan and was able to clinch the presidential nomination after the New York primary on April 7, 1992. What made his campaign appealing to a majority of Democrats was his pledge to take a fresh look at the most pressing issues of voters, independent of traditional party lines.

In positioning himself as a New Democrat running on a progressive, but centrist campaign, Clinton was willing to break with Democratic traditions when it came to the relationship between the people and their government. As a rule, he purposefully refrained from advocating big government solutions and avoided at all costs the impression that he would be a tax and spend President if elected. Clinton argued for a "New Covenant" that would strengthen America in its efforts to promote opportunity, responsibility and community for all citizens. In his speech at the Democratic National Convention, he explained this idea at greater length:

> (W)e need a new approach to government – a government that offers more empowerment and less entitlement, more choices for young people in the schools they attend, in the public schools they attend, and more choices for the elderly and for the people with disabilities and the long-term care they receive – a government that is leaner, and not meaner. A government that expands opportunity, not bureaucracy – a government that understands that jobs must come from growth in a vibrant and vital system of free enterprise. I call this approach a New Covenant – a solemn agreement between the people and their government, based not simply on what each of us can take but on what all of us must give to our nation.[151]

In evoking rhetoric reminiscent of John F. Kennedy's call to serve the country, Bill Clinton tried to unify the nation around the patriotic idea of fostering prosperity and equal opportunity within the United States. Despite President Bush's foreign policy successes and Washington's paramount role in the post-Cold War world, there was a growing feeling at home that the country was moving into the wrong direction and might, in fact, be ill-equipped for the challenges ahead. With the demise of the Soviet Union, domestic issues moved up the priority list even more than in previous elections: most notably, the state of the economy and the distribution of wealth within the society were of paramount concern for a majority of citizens.

Compared with the extremely successful economic performance of the United States in the 1980s, voters were questioning the economic plan of the President and his team. In light of severe signs of a recession, as well as an unemployment rate of 8%, the Bush administration had severe difficulties to defend its record and convince the public of their measures to reverse the trend. Washington Post journalist John F. Harris summarizes the mood at the time as follows:

> The sluggish growth combined with and contributed to other trends that cumulatively created a picture of a country badly offtrack – "in a ditch," as Clinton would say often that year. The trade balance with other countries was

---

[151] Bill Clinton, "A New Covenant. Governor Bill Clinton – Democratic National Convention (New York City, 16 July 1992)," *Putting People First. How we can all change America.* William J. Clinton / Al Gore (New York: Random House, 1992), 217-232.

growing. The gap in wealth between the highest rung of society and those beneath was growing. The journalists Donald L. Barlett and James B. Steele produced an unlikely best-seller with their book *America: What Went Wrong?*, an angry indictment of the failures of the American economy. It was more than the economy that seemed to be fraying.[152]

Candidate Clinton singled out the economy as the single most important issue and pledged to jumpstart it, especially to the benefit of the middle class. His elections manifest "Putting People First. How we can all change America" outlined in great detail various initiatives that would be promoted under his leadership. The proposals by the candidate and his running mate Senator Al Gore concentrated especially on four areas looking at promoting jobs, income equality, and poverty reduction. A Clinton/Gore administration promised an economic plan that would

- Reduce the deficit by 50%;
- Invest more funds in training, education and new technologies;
- Promote trade;
- Cut taxes for the middle class and the working poor.[153]

Using economic proposals as the main pillar of his campaign, Clinton also announced to reform the health care, as well as the welfare system. Mixing Democratic positions such as promoting better opportunities for the underprivileged, with calls for fiscal responsibility and robust national defense was the Arkansas candidate's strategy to win the White House for the Democrats. The Clinton campaign was trying to find a third way between the well-established positions of the parties, combined with the claim that change in Washington was badly needed. In this regard, the call for change was much more than the usual power struggle between an incumbent and his opponent, as Charles O. Jones outlines:

> (T)he election was advertised as being about change – in people, in style, and mostly, in policy. For many it was time to let the 'baby boomers' take over, to modernize leadership, to represent the tortured Vietnam generation. (…) It was time to be much more aggressive in reforming major policy programs, as well as the organization and operation of the government.[154]

Clinton effectively tried to position himself as the leader of a new movement that was blind to labels such as "right" and "left" or "conservative vs. liberal." For him those categories were mere distractions in the challenge to tackle the most pressing (domestic) issues for the average American.

Politics at home was also the departure point for the presidential candidate when asked about his foreign policy ideas, as well as his vision for the United States abroad in the 1990s. Responding to a question asking why the American people should put "the management of foreign affairs in the

---

[152] Harris. *Survivor,* xiii.
[153] Clinton /Gore. *Putting People First,* 3-32.
[154] Charles O. Jones, "Campaigning to Govern: The Clinton Style," *The Clinton Presidency. First Appraisals*. Colin Campbell / Bert A. Rockman (eds.) (Chatham: Chatham House, 1996), 18.

hands of a man who's been nothing more than the Governor of Arkansas," Clinton gave the following answer:

> Because I'm, of the three choices, I am the best, most likely to rebuild America's strength at home and therefore give us the emotional and political freedom to engage in the world. Because as a Governor I have been involved heavily in international economics over the last 10 years, and that is the core of our, our new foreign policy, at least part of it.[155]

In other words, domestic reform was a precondition for the United States to continue an activist foreign policy role.

While Clinton lacked a comprehensive foreign affairs strategy during the campaign, he spoke out in favor of the continuation of an assertive international and multilateral U.S. foreign policy. Part of this approach was his strong belief in promoting democratic values around the world, for the benefit of the United States. Advocating democratic realism as a main foreign policy pillar, Clinton followed the theory that democracies do not go to war with each other, respect the rule of law and human rights, and therefore, are the best foundation for the international order.[156] In his view, the Bush administration had moved away from this American tradition and had sided wrongfully with the status quo in places such as Russia and China, making power politics the new axiom in U.S. foreign policy.

In a major speech in Milwaukee, Wisconsin Clinton elaborated on his criticism: "President Bush seems too often to prefer a foreign policy that embraces stability at the expense of freedom: a foreign policy built more on personal relationships with foreign leaders than on consideration of how these leaders acquired and maintained their power."[157] The Democratic candidate promised that, under his leadership, this trend would be reversed by ensuring that the call for democratic reform became part of Washington's priorities in bilateral and multilateral consultations. The international arena offered, therefore, yet another opportunity for Clinton to showcase his agenda of change.

More important than foreign policy convictions, however, were character questions in the 1992 election. Clinton's integrity and character were questioned repeatedly by his political opponents and the media, in light of the fact that the Governor of Arkansas had avoided the draft for Vietnam and was plagued by constant rumors about extramarital affairs. The candidate was able to defend these attacks by running an issue-based campaign and the strong support of his wife Hillary, who helped Clinton showcase himself as a family man against the ongoing scrutiny of the media. One of the decisive moments in this regard was the interview that the Clintons gave on the CBS's show *60 minutes* immediately after the Super Bowl, in which Clinton acknowledged that he 'had caused pain in his marriage,' but that also saw Hillary Clinton fully supporting her husband and defending their marriage against any intrusion from outside.

Bill Clinton drew fire about his policies and code of conduct outside the political arena, not only by the acting President but also by the independent candidate Ross Perot. Running on an anti-Washington platform, the Texas millionaire promised to change the way that business was done

---

[155] "The 1992 Campaign. Excerpts from Interview with Clinton on Goals for Presidency," *NYT* (28 June 1992).
[156] See A.M. Rosenthal, "On my mind: The Clinton Doctrine," *NYT* (6 October 1992).
[157] William J. Clinton, "Address by Governor Clinton at the Institute of World Affairs, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, October 1, 1991: 'American Foreign Policy and the Democratic Ideal'," *Clinton's foreign policy: a documentary record.* Philip Auerswald/Christian Duttweiler/John Garofano (eds.) (The Hague: Kluwer Law International, 2003), 6.

in the nation's capital, only if enough supporters would put him on the ballot in all states. With an extremely successful grassroots campaign, he managed to achieve this goal and became a substantial force to reckon with in the national campaign for the White House. The Democratic and Republican candidates alike were forced to invest political capital and resources to keep the independent Perot at bay. While a victory for the Texan was not feasible at any time of the race, Clinton and Bush were concerned about swing voters, who would side with Perot against the candidates of the established parties. Consequently, his presence also was felt on Election Day, on November 3, 1992, when Perot received almost 19% of the popular vote, the strongest showing of an independent candidate since the 1912 election. Bill Clinton, however, carried the day with 43% and 370 votes in the Electoral College, against Bush's 37.4% and 168 votes.

In the end, three points were decisive for Bill Clinton's victory. First, the candidate had identified correctly the economy as the most pressing issue for voters and had built his whole campaign around this topic. He had purposefully defined what the election was about, thereby forcing the other two candidates to react to his initiative. Second, despite the questions about his character and judgement, Clinton was the candidate closest to the average American. A majority of voters saw him as the one who carried the hopes of the nation at this juncture in U.S. history. In other words, his agenda of change resonated deeply within the population. Third, the Clinton team ran a flawless and innovative campaign, playing toward their candidate's strengths. Not only did they use traditional elements of American elections, such as the convention and the debates to their advantage, but they also introduced new features to political campaigning, such as the Clinton/Gore bus tour that brought them into much neglected parts of the United States. The establishment of rapid response teams that would immediately counteract statements by other campaigns was another important feature, in order to gain control of the public message in this presidential election.

III.3. Inside the White House (1993-1994)

When Clinton arrived in Washington, he was faced with a range of expectation levels for his presidency. His voters and the public-at-large looked to him to use the rare opportunity of a unified government, i.e. a Democratic White House and Democratic controlled Congress, to end gridlock and fulfill his campaign promises swiftly. On the contrary, the Republican minority refused Clinton's claim that the people had given him a mandate for change, in light of the election results. Having been denied an absolute majority of votes due to Perot's strong showing, the Republicans saw in Clinton a weak President to begin with and were convinced that strong opposition to the White House would not hurt them politically.

Aware of this partisan dichotomy, Clinton started a variety of initiatives, in order to fulfill his commitment to be a President for the average American. After his first 100 days in office, his record of legislative achievements was impressive. Not only had he signed the Family and Medical Leave bill into law, which obligated businesses to give unpaid leave to their employees, in order to take care of family members, but he also concluded negotiations with Congress on the "motor voter" law that made voter registration easier. Furthermore, he had laid the groundwork for the reinventing government initiative by Vice-President Al Gore, which was disclosed in September of 1993 and called for a more effective and cost-saving government. Under the administration's plan, this would be achieved by eliminating wasteful government procedures, including subsidies, as well as cutting federal work force employees by 250,000 people. The high quantity of initiatives to change existing legislation would become a familiar pattern of the Democratic Congress and the Clinton White House in the first two years of its tenure. The

Congressional Quarterly documented these mostly successful efforts at the end of the 103rd Congress with a presidential legislative success rating of 86.4%.

In political terms, however, the two decisive issues of Clinton's early years in office were his economic plan and the promise to reform health care, both on which he had campaigned heavily. Within the first month, Clinton had created a National Economic Council within the White House, which spearheaded the effort to decide on the individual components of the plan.[158] He used the 1993 State of the Union Address to oppose a continuation of supply-side economics and presented his own vision for enhancing the prosperity produced by the U.S. economy for the benefit of its citizens. His plan had two key components: first, it called for $704 billion in deficit reduction over five years to be achieved by $328 billion in new taxes and $376 billion in spending cuts.[159] Due to higher deficit numbers than originally estimated by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), Clinton had decided, in preparation of the speech, to abandon his campaign pledge of a middle class tax cut, in favor of reducing the debt of the federal government substantially. The proposed increase in tax revenue would be accomplished by a raise of the income tax from 31% to 36% for couples that earned more than $140,000, as well as a "millionaires' surtax," a 10% surtax on income of over one million dollars.

The second part of the plan was, in Clinton's words, an attempt to "reverse our economic decline, by jump-starting the economy in the short term and investing in our people, their jobs and their incomes in the long run."[160] With the help of a $30 billion stimulus package, Clinton was hoping to create more than 500,000 jobs in the short term, thereby triggering a spirit of optimism in the country. The initial public response to the President's overall plan, deemed "Clintonomics" by some pundits, was highly supportive. While the Republicans tried to paint the stimulus package as "pork barrel" and the tax increases as harmful for the economy, a majority of Americans agreed with Washington journalist Elizabeth Drew's assessment of the plan: "The economic program was bold by conventional standards and did seek to reverse Reaganomics and redirect the country's economic resources from consumption to long-term investment, and at the same time to take a major bite out of the federal deficit."[161]

While public support was an important component in Clinton's strategy to put his plan into practice, the real struggle about the specifics of his proposal was taking place in Congress. The administration, and its allies on Capitol Hill, decided to focus first on receiving congressional passage of the deficit reduction piece of the plan. In order to achieve the envisioned measures, the President needed to find majorities in the House of Representatives and the Senate for the budget resolution and a subsequent reconciliation bill – a measure that would bring actual spending and taxing in line with the provisions of the resolution. Facing a non-cooperative Republican opposition, Clinton's challenge was to hold on to his Democratic majority in both houses, a task in which the president needed to invest a substantial amount of political capital.[162]

---

[158] For a detailed overview of the internal deliberations and decision-making process of Clinton's economic plan in the White House, please consult Bob Woodward. *The Agenda. Inside the Clinton White House* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1994).

[159] "Clinton Outlines his Plan to Spur Economy," *1993 Congressional Quarterly Almanac*. Neil Skene / Robert W. Merry (eds.) (Washington, DC: CQ, 1994), 7D-12D.

[160] William J. Clinton. *1993 State of the Union Address* (Washington, DC, 17 February 1993).

[161] Elizabeth Drew. *On the Edge. The Clinton Presidency* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1995), 73.

[162] Referring to Clinton's complicated relationship with Congress in his first term, Michael Foley observes: "The prospect of a Democratic president working in parallel with a Democratic Congress to promote a Democratic agenda seemed wholly feasible. In practice, the opportunities for the president to engage in effective party and legislative leadership were very limited. Notwithstanding the party linkages between the separate branches, Clinton's presidency was beset by Congressional constraints that were immune to the simple configuration of party seats." Michael Foley, "Clinton and Congress," *The Clinton Presidency*. Campbell / Rockman (eds.), 22.

The final voting results of both bills exemplify the partisan nature of the 103rd Congress and outline Clinton's dependency on almost every single representative: the House adopted the budget resolution on a 243-183 vote, the Senate followed suit on a 54-45 vote (all Republicans voted against the resolution) after several hours of debates. The passage of the reconciliation bill was even closer, with a 219-213 vote in the House and a 50-49 majority in the Senate that required the Vice-President to cast the decisive vote. The conference bill that resolved the existing differences between the House and Senate version of legislation was put on the floor for a final vote after extensive negotiations and passed the House with a slim majority of 218-216, as well as the Senate with another 51-50 vote. Paul J. Quirk and Joseph Hinchliffe depict the outcome of Clinton's deficit reduction efforts as follows:

> As finally enacted, Clinton's economic program fell short of his aspiration to reduce the deficit by more than $700 billion over five years. But it imposed tax increases of $241 billion, and consistent with the New Democrat platform, even greater spending cuts of $225 billion – for a total deficit reduction of almost $500 billion. For the most part, the program extracted the new taxes from corporations and the wealthy, Republican constituencies that had fared well under Reagan-Bush tax policies.[163]

While the budget resolution was considered a success by the White House, it was tainted by the fate of the stimulus package, which was successfully filibustered by the Republicans in the Senate. Through a sophisticated and long-lasting media campaign, the GOP had succeeded in painting the stimulus package as an example of unnecessary and wasteful government spending that was predominantly directed at districts and states governed by Democrats. Not only did Clinton thus lose one of the two pillars of his economic plan, but he and his party also had to defend themselves against the public perception that they were not bringing change to Washington's way of doing business and the country itself. In the end, Clinton's short term effort to jumpstart the economy had been stalled, leaving him only with the deficit reduction initiative – a policy that would take time to produce tangible results for the average American.

Next to the economic plan, health care was the second priority for the President in 1993 and 1994. In the campaign, Clinton had attached his political future to the task of bringing reform to a social system that touched on the lives of every American citizen. His departure point had been a sober analysis of the existing modus operandi, in which "40 million Americans had no health care coverage at all for some time each year, 22 million lacked adequate coverage and 63 million, for one reason or another, were to lose it over the next two years."[164] Another important point that was criticized by the White House and the average citizens alike was the relationship between the fairly expensive costs for health care compared to the level of coverage that the individual insurance policy guaranteed.

Clinton's vision was to overhaul the whole system by passing one of the most ambitious social legislations in U.S. history, comparable only to Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal Policy in the 1930s. In a national televised, and arguably the most important domestic speech of his first term, Clinton named the following six principles as guidelines for his forthcoming plan: "security, simplicity, savings, choice, quality and responsibility."[165] In addition to these remarks before a

---

[163] Paul J. Quirk / Joseph Hinchliffe, "Domestic Policy: The Trials of a Centrist Democrat," *The Clinton Presidency.* Campbell /Rockman (eds.), 273.
[164] *The White House Domestic Policy Council, The President's Health Security Plan* (Washington, DC: Times Books, 1993), 3.
[165] William J. Clinton. *Address of President William Jefferson Clinton before a Joint Session of Congress: 'Health Care Security for all Americans'* (Washington, DC, 22 September 1993).

joint Congress, he also dedicated a substantial part of his 1994 State of the Union Address to this issue, outlining his plan in greater detail:

> Our goal is health insurance you can depend on: comprehensive benefits that cover preventive care and prescription drugs; health premiums that don't jump when you get sick or get older; the power, no matter how small your business is, to choose dependable insurance at the same rates governments and big companies get; one simple form for people who are sick; and, most of all, the freedom to choose a health plan and the right to choose your own doctor.[166]

Equally important to these individual provisions was his promise to veto any legislation emerging from Congress that did not include universal coverage for all Americans.

The Clinton administration had been preparing its proposal under the leadership of the First Lady in an internal White House inter-agency task force that invited several experts to give recommendations behind closed doors. At the end of their deliberations stood the aim to overhaul the existing system completely by forcing employers, under the employer mandate, to cover 80% of their workers' health care premiums. The government would pick up these costs for the jobless and poor, thereby guaranteeing health care coverage also to the underprivileged. An additional feature of the Clinton plan was the proposed creation of regional "health alliances" that would administer the health insurances for individuals and companies. These alliances would serve as a clearing house for the various plans of health maintenance organizations (HMOs), in an attempt to manage cost-efficiency and quality control of the health care providers in a decentralized manner.

The Clinton proposal also addressed numerous additional aspects of the health care system, such as the number and regional distribution of doctors, changes in the administration of the Public Health Service, and subsidies for special groups, such as early retirees. Immediately after the 1,342 page comprehensive bill finally had been sent to the Hill on October 27, 1993, the political game witnessed in the deliberations over the economic plan started anew.

Even though there was a bipartisan consensus in Congress to address the health care crisis at the beginning of the process, the shared sentiment was soon lost in the specifics of the plan. From the outset of the congressional hearings, the Republicans found in the existing health care providers a powerful ally in criticizing the envisioned stronger role of the government in the market under the Clinton proposal's health alliance umbrella. The industry lobbied long and forcefully in a national media campaign against the new health care system, portraying it as run by bureaucrats without any compassion for the individual needs of the patients. Given the scope and complexity of the pending bill, it was hard for the Democrats to counter these simple, but effective, accusations of promoting big government solutions.

The legislative process, which mandated discussion on the health care reform in eight different congressional committees, resulted in numerous additional (counter-) proposals and contributed further to public insecurity about the plan. Without a unified Democratic Party or political buy-in from the opposition, it was impossible for the President to find a path through these congressional complexities or to convince the public of his proposals. [167] Hence, several attempts

---

[166] President William J. Clinton. *Address before a Joint Session of Congress on the State of the Union* (Washington, DC, 25 January 1994).

[167] By June 1994, Republican congressional leaders New Gingrich and Bob Dole had decided to block any health care legislation and made this issue a major topic in the November midterm elections.

to modify the plan and find common ground with the Republicans on individual aspects proved futile, so that health care was stalled in Congress and considered dead prior to the 1994 August recess. In retrospect, Clinton and his team had made two strategic errors in trying to pass health care: First, they had overestimated their own mandate, as well as the political opposition, to a plan that was drafted without any (congressional) Republican input in its planning phase. Second, by making universal coverage a condition sine qua non for the reform, Clinton had minimized, without immediate political pressure, his room to compromise, which he needed to save his plan.

The loss of the health care reform was a substantial blow to Clinton's legislative ambitions and contributed to a downward trend of public approval ratings for the President. The reason for this development was more far-reaching than simple public dissent with the White House's inability to change a social system that almost every American considered flawed. More importantly, the American public was disappointed by Clinton and his administration for not living up to the high hopes and the agenda of change that his campaign had promised to fulfill. To some extent, Clinton personally had become a liability for his own presidency, partly due to his political agenda, as Sidney Blumenthal outlines:

> In the way that he (Clinton) opened up so many questions about government, social equality, race, gender, the common good, and the American identity, he seemed to be associated with the movements and causes of the 1960s. Yet at the same time, he was advocating a political agenda that was intended to overcome the debilities of the 1960s that still afflicted the Democratic Party. Both for being of the 1960s and for trying to transcend the 1960s, he was hated and feared.[168]

Equally troublesome for the public perception of the President were the repeated incidents that raised questions about Clinton's character and judgement. For one, resurfacing stories about alleged indecent behavior toward women in his time as governor of Arkansas haunted Clinton throughout his first term in the White House. No less damaging for the president's public image was the Whitewater controversy that referred to alleged wrong-doings of the Clinton family in a real estate deal in the 1970s and 1980s. Under mounting public pressure, the president agreed finally to an independent counsel that investigated the matter. Though eventually cleared from all accusations, the ongoing inquiry undermined the public's confidence in their Commander-in Chief. Paul J. Quirk and Joseph Hinchliffe's analysis of Clinton as a political leader alluded to the flaccidities in the president's unique personality:

> At bottom, Clinton's troubles seemed to derive from key personal shortcomings: in particular, an apparent tendency to cut corners on matters of personal and professional ethics and a lack of awareness or concern about the requirements of effective decision making and management in the White House.[169]

The weaknesses in the organization of his staff was in fact another major aspect that hampered Clinton's ability to project leadership inside the Beltway. Part of the issue was the White House's young and dedicated, but also inexperienced staffers, who lacked strong ties to power centers within Washington, such as Capitol Hill, the media or business. The coordination and accurateness within the president's inner circle called for improvement as well, due to

---

[168] Sidney Blumenthal. *The Clinton Wars* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2003), 51.
[169] Paul J. Quirk /Joseph Hinchliffe, "Domestic Policy," 285.

contradictory remarks of different members of his cabinet on policy initiatives, several nomination debacles (for instance to fill the position of Attorney General), and a substantial amount of leaks to the press. The White House appeared too often divided and in disarray missing an overarching, simple message that the domestic audience could rally around.

The Republicans under the leadership of their Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich benefited greatly from the White House's blunders and were moreover able to label Clinton as a liberal, who was out of touch with the needs of his constituents.[170] The disappointed expectations of the public toward the Democratic unified government played further into the hands of the GOP strategists. In the lead-up to the midterm elections, the Republicans reinforced this sentiment by taking advantage of their minority status to excuse themselves of the responsibility to govern, most prominently executed in the health care debate.

In addition to playing the spoiler for Democratic bills in Congress, the Republican leadership was able to nationalize the 1994 midterm elections in a shrewd move that broke with traditional American electoral politics. The decisive instrument in this strategy was the "Contract with America," a detailed policy agenda that the Republicans promised to follow if they were elected into power. With all but two Republican members of the House signing the contract, this document helped also to close the ranks within the party and present the GOP as viable alternative for the Democrats. The main goal of the initiative was to "restore the bonds of trust between the people and their elected representatives"[171] by making government reform a top priority of the 104th Congress.

The 1994 midterm elections turned ultimately into a referendum on the first two years of the Clinton presidency, as Gary C. Jacobson observes: "All politics was not local in 1994. Republicans succeeded in framing the local choice in national terms, making taxes, social discipline, big government and the Clinton presidency the dominant issues."[172] The GOP struck a chord with this strategy and created a political earthquake on Election Day, when they achieved a net gain of 54 seats in the House of Representatives and picked up eight seats in the Senate. This 'Republican Revolution' was not restricted to the congressional elections, but also showed in gubernatorial races all around the country, as Walter Dean Burnham's statistics show: "If 38.4 percent of Americans had been living under Republican governors before the election, fully 71.8 percent were doing so following the 1994 upheaval."[173] This landslide victory for the GOP changed the political equation in Washington completely, as President Clinton was not only facing Republican majorities on Capitol Hill, but also a much more conservative public at the beginning of the 104th Congress.

III.4. The Comeback Kid: Clinton's Road to Reelection (1995-1996)

The Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich was determined to capitalize on the new majorities in Congress and started immediately to pass several bills in the House, which had been outlined in the Contract with America. These legislative successes created further momentum, on top of the election results in favor of the GOP and made Congress the power center of the political process

---

[170] The president contributed to this perception in his early days in office when he addressed the issue of homosexuals serving in the military as one of his first policy initiatives.

[171] *Republican Contract with America* (Washington, DC, 27 September 1994).

[172] Gary C. Jacobson, "The 1994 House Elections in Perspective," *Midterm: Elections of 1994 in Context*. Philip Klinkner (ed.) (Boulder: Westview, 1996), 3.

[173] Walter Dean Burnham, "Realignment Lives: The 1994 Earthquake and Its Implications," *The Clinton Presidency*. Campbell/Rockman (eds.), 367.

within Washington in 1995. Gingrich was convinced that the voters had given him a mandate to enact congressional reform and reverse the decade-long political reality of an activist federal government in the United States. In trying to substantiate this tall order into initiatives, he could build especially on his inner-party allies located in the very conservative wing of the Republican Party as well as the group of 73 freshmen to Congress.[174] After the first three months in the majority, Gingrich's assault on the executive branch had made him the focal point of national attention, as Elizabeth Drew describes in a chapter called 'Newt Unchained':

> Going into the celebrations of the Hundred Days, Gingrich could rightly claim success. He had done a remarkable thing, and demonstrated that he was a leader. He set a goal, motivated his troops, even galvanized them, and met the goal. Whatever one thought of the substance of his achievements, he had set the agenda for the House, the Senate, and the nation.[175]

Being faced with this sea change on the national stage, President Clinton had to find ways in which the White House could make its voice heard in the political debate and react to an agenda that was pursued actively elsewhere. The starting point of this ongoing struggle for the next two years was a change in the organization and policymaking of the White House predominantly orchestrated by political consultant Dick Morris. Clinton's former advisor in the Arkansas State House was brought in after the midterm elections to make sure that that the President would be able to balance Congress as a political center of gravity in the second half of his first term and to set the stage for a victory in the 1996 national elections.

At the beginning of his tenure, Morris performed a sober analysis of mistakes made in 1993/1994 and came to the conclusion that the single-most important cure was to make Clinton look more "presidential" in order to gain back public trust in his abilities as a national leader. In his judgement, Clinton needed to establish control over the large symbols of American policymaking and refrain from daily involvement in congressional disputes and quarrels. An important component of this strategy included a disavowal from unquestioned loyalty to his party at all costs, thereby countering the public impression that Clinton was moving too often in lockstep with the liberal wing of the Democratic Party. The challenge ahead was, in essence, the redefinition of the Clinton presidency, which Morris forcefully pursued through his "triangulation strategy". Morris defined this approach, which aimed to present the President as an independent force beyond the two parties as follows:

> Triangulation is much misunderstood. It is not merely splitting the difference between left and right. Clinton's objective was to combine the best theme from each side: "opportunity" from the left and "responsibility" from the right. And he rejected the worst of each: the tendency of conservatives to ignore the problems of the less privileged, and the liberals' tendency to be naïve. This "third way" rises above the other two and forms a triangle.[176]

---

[174] In an unprecedented move, Gingrich abolished the seniority system in the committees of Congress and gave the Chairmanship of three subcommittees to freshmen. With this action he fostered not only loyalty to him as a person but also effectively strengthened the position of the Speaker in the House.

[175] Elizabeth Drew. *Showdown. The Struggle between the Gingrich Congress and the Clinton White House* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996), 184.

[176] Dick Morris. *Behind the Oval Office. Getting Reelected against all odds* (Los Angeles: St. Martin's, 1999), 339.

Clinton was convinced that this proposed move to the political center was the only way to hold on to the White House in the upcoming elections. In order to reverse the national trend against him, he was willing to meet some of the Republican demands on their core issues such as taxes, welfare, crime and the federal budget, in order to neutralize these topics for 1996. In taking these issues off the table, he intended to put his own agenda on the forefront of the debate, including policy fields such as education, the environment and other social/values issues.

To put this redefinition of the Clinton presidency into practice required a new management and decision-making style in the White House, as well as a rebranding of the President on a national scale. As a first step, Clinton introduced a more hierarchical chain of command within the White House, thereby enhancing the discipline and effectiveness of his staff. Another significant change took place in the communication strategy, as the President and his cabinet identified a priority list of policy fields for the administration and coordinated their positions on these more effectively than in the past. In addition to these structural changes, Clinton reached out to the American people through a variety of instruments, in order to label the Republican proposals coming out of Congress as extremist and to work on regaining trust in his leadership. With Morris's help Clinton used a series of carefully crafted speeches on individual issues, personal travel throughout the United States, as well as a sophisticated and virtually unnoticed nationally advertising campaign in key battle states starting in early July 1995 until Election Day to find a majority of votes for his candidacy in 1996.

This game plan for Clinton's reelection, in its entirety, remained largely concealed from the public and the political opposition for most of 1995 and the beginning of 1996– daily politics and its commentators were focusing rather on the Republican initiatives on Capitol Hill. National attention shifted from Washington for the first time after the midterms only when two terrorists bombed a government building in downtown Oklahoma on April 19, 1995, killing 168 people and injuring over 800 civilians. President Clinton acted quickly and decisively in the face of this national crisis and was able to present himself as an able Commander-in-Chief. In purely political terms, this incident gave the President a chance to break the Republican momentum in Washington and was an opportunity in which Clinton could look presidential and in charge.

The defining struggle for political supremacy inside the Beltway was fought out in the budget negotiations of 1995/1996. Being aware of the magnitude of the impact of their decision for every American citizen, the President and the Republicans sought to manifest their policy priorities in the various budget line items. The overarching struggle between the White House and Congress was ultimately a fundamental disagreement over the role of the federal government in U.S. society. On the one hand, Republicans were looking for a much leaner government that would practice fiscal responsibility and believed in a minimum of state interference into individuals' lives. The fiscal 1996 Budget Resolution presented by Congress filled these convictions with numbers, in calling for a balanced budget within seven years to be achieved through cutting projected federal spending by $894 billion and reducing taxation by $245 billion. Under the Republican proposal, federal programs such as Medicaid ($182 billion), Medicare ($270 billion) as well as other non-defence entitlement programs ($190 billion) would carry the main burden of the spending cuts.

While the White House saw after some initial hesitation, common ground in the idea of a balanced budget, the reduction of funding for social programs at the above suggested level were not acceptable for the President. Clinton was in a very delicate situation in the budget negotiations: on the one hand, his veto power under the U.S. constitution gave him relevance in the debate and an ability to stop the ideas of the Republican revolution to gain full maturity; on the other hand, he needed to find a way to move to the political center in light of the more

conservative mood in the country, even if it came to the expense of more liberal positions of the Democratic Party.

In mid June of 1995, Clinton reacted to the Republican proposal and put forth his plan, which foresaw a balanced budget within ten years. Even though he acknowledged the need to restrain domestic spending by proposing cuts in Medicare ($125 billion), his budget was dominated by a different set of priorities. As outlined in his address to the nation on June 13, 1995, he was determined to prevent cuts in education, control health care costs, "cut taxes for the middle class and not the wealthy" and "cut welfare, but save enough to protect children."[177] In several interviews in the following months, the President made clear that he would not let any budget pass his desk that did not adhere to these general principles.

On the other side of the aisle, the Republicans also were standing the ground on their budget proposal, unwilling to compromise. In light of their majority in the House and the Senate as well as the public pressure to find an agreement, Newt Gingrich and Senate Majority Leader Bob Dole had come to the conclusion that Clinton would be blamed for a potential government shutdown and would therefore concede his position eventually. However, their calculation of Clinton's actions as well as the political mood in the country was wrong, as a large majority of Americans placed the responsibility for the eventual shutdown in November 1995 on them.[178] Under pressure to act, both sides agreed on a continuing resolution that opened the government temporarily for a month, after Clinton accepted a seven-year balanced budget as a provision in the compromise.

Unable to find common ground on the specifics of the 1996 federal budget in the subsequent negotiations, the government was closed again partially on December 15, 1995 for three weeks. During these days, the approval ratings of Newt Gingrich continued to plummet, while the President was seen as the protector of an activist federal government by a majority of his countrymen. When the budget crisis finally unravelled through stop-gap measures and a compromise on April 25, 1996, the record showed a President, who had accepted several Republican principles in the final budget, namely tax cuts, deficit reduction and a balanced budget, much to the dismay of a majority of congressional Democrats. The White House had consciously accepted these provisions in return for standing firm on the level of cuts in social programs and the need for modest investments in education, thereby stalling the much proclaimed Republican Revolution in its tracks.

The outcome of the budget negotiations helped Bill Clinton to undercut a core Republican issue and transformed the national debate in a way that put traditional Democratic issues on the public radar. The 1996 State of the Union Address is an excellent example of Clinton's attempt to unify the country around a new values agenda that combined conservative and liberal elements under one roof. Arguing for a new synthesis, Bill Clinton spent most of the speech on issues such as family, the environment, education, and the fight against crime, but also proclaimed twice that the "era of big government is over"[179] – traditionally, a rather unusual statement for a Democratic

---

[177] William J. Clinton. *Address of the President to the Nation* (Washington, DC: The White House, Office of the Press Secretary, 13 June 1995). See also *Press Briefing by Chief of Staff Leon Panetta, Chairman of National Economic Council Dr. Laura Tyson, OMB Director Alice Rivlin, Secretary of Treasury Bob Rubin* (Washington, DC: The White House, Office of the Press Secretary, 13 June 1995).

[178] Kevin R. Kosar. *Shutdown of the Federal Government: Causes, Effects, and Process* (Washington, DC: The Library of Congress, 20 September 2004).

[179] William J. Clinton. *1996 State of the Union Address* (Washington, DC, 23 January 1996). In the course of the year, Clinton demonstrated that the reduction of government involvement was more than a catchy phrase when he signed the welfare bill on August 22, 1996 that eliminated federal guarantees of support for the underprivileged. For details on the individual provisions of the legislation see: U.S. Department of Health & Human Services. *The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996* (Washington, DC, 22 August 1996); Dan Froomkin,

President. By claiming predominance on these policy fields and having put Republican ideas into practice as part of his own initiatives, Clinton had regained his control over the political process.

This new approach to presidential politics derived from the triangulation strategy and became a decisive factor in the election year of 1996. While Republican presidential candidate Bob Dole ran a campaign criticizing the government for demanding more and more authority over citizen's lives and being an enemy of religion, in addition to calling for a simplified tax system as well as a tougher drug law enforcement,[180] the President's issues of saving and investing in Medicare, Medicaid, education and the environment resonated more deeply with the population.[181] In addition to the right choice of topics for the campaign, Clinton benefited furthermore from his economic policies of the first half of the term, as William C. Berman observed:

> Clinton was also helped by the steady improvement of the economy, for which he finally received credit from many voters. Ten million new jobs had been created since 1993, unemployment had dropped well below 6 percent, the stock market soared, and corporate profits climbed at a rapid rate.[182]

Through the economic upswing of the country, which was felt all throughout the United States, and a more popular agenda, the voters saw the current President as the more able candidate to lead the nation into the 21st century. In a remarkable comeback from his midterm defeat, Clinton's record was able to hold the attacks of Senator Dole at bay and serve as a basis for outlining a positive and convincing strategy for the next four years. The voters bought into this agenda on Election Day and enabled Clinton to carry the White House for the Democrats a second time.

III.5. Foreign Policy Priorities and Developments

When President Clinton came into office, his outlined domestic agenda played a paramount role in his priority setting, much to the expense of his personal involvement in the details of his foreign policy. Even though he determined the overarching guidelines of Washington's engagement with and in the world, Clinton delegated far-reaching responsibilities in this field to his experienced foreign policy staff.[183] The core team that the President entrusted with handling the foreign affairs portfolio was his National Security Advisor Anthony Lake, the Secretary of

---

"Welfare's Changing Face," *WP* (23 July 1998); William J. Clinton, "How we ended welfare, together," *NYT* (22 August 2006).

[180] Compare Bob Woodward. *The Choice. How Clinton won* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996), 158/159. Compare also Bob Dole. *1996 Republican Convention Speech* (San Diego, 15 August 1996).

[181] The choice of topics on which Clinton ran in the 1996 election had been carefully selected by Dick Morris on the basis of extensive polling. The success of the strategy can be seen for instance in the frequency of questions on core issues of the Clinton campaign in the two presidential debates. See Commission on Presidential Debates. *The First Clinton-Dole Presidential Debate* (October 6, 1996) and Commission on Presidential Debates. *The Second Clinton-Dole Presidential Debate* (October 16, 1996).

[182] William C. Berman. *From the Center to the Edge: The Politics and Policies of the Clinton Presidency* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2001), 65.

[183] The media picked up on Clinton's personal involvement in foreign policy deliberations that was significantly less than the time that his predecessors had spent on this topic. See for instance Thomas L. Friedman, "Clinton Keeping Foreign Policy on a Back Burner," *NYT* (8 February 1993).

State Warren M. Christopher, as well as the U.S. Ambassador to the UN Madeleine Albright.[184] These three individuals were tasked to provide the overall framework for a post-Cold War U.S. foreign policy, recommend strategies and solutions to pressing international crises, as well as shield the President from any outside distractions that could interfere with his domestic initiatives.

Addressing the question of U.S. policy priorities in a post-bipolar world, the White House embarked on a somewhat different course than previous administrations at the outset of President Clinton's first term. In crafting a strategy for U.S. engagement in the world, the core players in the President's inner circle were sympathetic to strengthening the collective security architecture, without giving up Washington's premium leadership role in the world. Their strategy was also informed by the "new interventionist" school of thought that "reunited divided strains of American foreign policy liberalism: traditional Wilsonian liberalism, defined by support for international organizations and self-determination of peoples; and its Cold War cousin, defined by anticommunism."[185] Paying tribute to Clinton's campaign promise of encouraging democracy promotion as a key American interest in the world, the early foreign policy approach of the administration was dominated by Madeleine Albright's theory of "assertive multilateralism" and Anthony Lake's call for a strengthening of good governance around the globe.[186]

Both principles were understood as a shift of emphasis in U.S. policy; promoting more multilateral solutions to international problems, without giving up completely the ability to act unilaterally. President Clinton's address to the UN General Assembly exemplified this new balance that was characteristic for the early months of his tenure:

> On efforts from export control to trade agreements to peace-keeping, we will often work in partnership with others and through multilateral institutions such as the United Nations. It is in our national interest to do so. But we must not hesitate to act unilaterally when there is a threat to our core interests or to those of our allies.[187]

Compared with previous Republican administrations, the Clinton team saw the UN as a potential vehicle to guarantee and promote American interests around the world. This was not only based on the positive role that the UN played in the aftermath of the Gulf war in 1991/1992, but was also coming from an innate American interest to divide the burden and costs of world leadership more equally among its allies.[188] In fact, Clinton used foreign policy not only as a way to foster

---

[184] For biographical information on Clinton's foreign policy team, please consult Peter B. Levy. *Encyclopaedia of the Clinton Presidency* (Westport: Greenwood, 2002) as well as Madeleine Albright. *Madam Secretary* (New York: Miramax Books, 2003). For details on Anthony Lake see Jason DeParle, "The Man Inside Bill Clinton's Foreign Policy," *NYT* (20 August 1995).

[185] Stephen John Stedman, "The New Interventionists," *FA* 72.1 (1992/1993), 4.

[186] Strobe Talbott offered a passionate defense of a pro-democracy oriented U.S. foreign policy even when this approach had lost its appeal. Strobe Talbott, "Democracy and the National Interest," *FA* 75.6 (November/December 1996), 47-63.

[187] William J. Clinton, "Confronting the Challenges of a Broader World. Address to the UN General Assembly," *U.S. State Department Dispatch* 4 (New York, 27 September 1993).

[188] UN Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali summarized his ideas of the UN's role in the 1990s and beyond in the "Agenda for peace" that stipulated a "rapid deployment of troops during international emergencies, a beefed up conception of peace enforcement, and new sources of revenue (including a UN Endowment Fund) in order to pay for the UN's increased responsibilities." See Gary B. Ostrower. *The United Nations and the United States* (New York: Twayne, 1998), 209.

security and freedom in the post-Cold War world, but also as an effective tool to promote American economic interests. In what some commentators called a change from geopolitics to geoeconomics, the President used the State Department as one resource to boost prosperity of U.S. companies abroad and to create more jobs within own borders. Secretary of State Warren Christopher emphasized the importance of this goal at his Senate confirmation hearing when he ranked the elevation of "America's economic security as a primary goal of (the administration's) foreign policy" and pledged to personally sit at the 'America desk' in his department that would ensure the observance to U.S. economic interests in all decisions.[189]

This revaluation of economic issues in U.S. foreign relations was complemented by the White House's credo to foster democracy and market economies around the globe.[190] The crucial document in this respect was Anthony Lake's "From Containment to Enlargement" speech at the Johns Hopkins University in which he outlined the details of the strategy. Calling for continued engagement in the world, the National Security Advisor pledged that the explosion of ethnic conflicts in the world constituted a grave problem for America's interest, which demanded immediate action from Washington. In his own words: "A major challenge to our thinking, our policies and our international institutions in this era is the fact that most conflicts are taking place within rather than among nations."[191] For Lake, this increasingly visible phenomenon in the 1990s required a shift from containment to a strategy of enlargement, in which the United States and its allies needed to consolidate democracies and market economies, pursue a global humanitarian agenda, as well as counter the aggression of backlash states against the liberalization of their own societies. This approach was more an idealistic leitmotif than a handbook for concrete policy action. The level of engagement and the means employed should be determined on a case-by-case basis, according to America's national interests at hand.

This pragmatic neo-Wilsonian and geoeconomic blueprint of U.S. foreign policy was tested for the first time in the 1993 international crises of Haiti and Somalia – both conflict regions that the Clinton administration had inherited from its predecessor. Both cases were typical examples of UN conflict resolution attempts in the 1990s, which faced a different challenge than the majority of missions during the Cold War, as Gary B. Ostrower outlines:

> The most traditional UN peacekeeping missions have involved separating two warring parties who agreed to be separated. The three largest UN operations – Cambodia, Somalia, and Bosnia – had not fallen into that category, which is what defined them more as peace enforcement operations than peacekeeping missions. Haiti, the most successful of the UN missions with which the Clinton administration associated itself, also fell in the peace enforcement category.[192]

---

[189] Warren Christopher, "Statement before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Washington, DC, 13 January 1993," *In the Stream of History. Shaping Foreign Policy for a New Era*. Warren Christopher (Stanford: Stanford University, 1998), 24/25. Another telling initiative was the training of Foreign Service personnel that Christopher announced at a conference for senior business executives: "We are trying very hard to prepare a new generation of entrepreneurial foreign affairs professionals who understand that assisting American business is essential in this new era of international relations." See Warren Christopher, "A Foreign Policy that Strengthens America's Economic Future. Washington, DC, 20 October 1993," *U.S. Department of State Dispatch* 4 (1 November 1993).

[190] Clinton circumscribed his approach in this area with the slogan "we must compete, not retreat". See William J. Clinton. *Remarks by the President at American University Centennial Celebration* (Washington, DC: The White House, Office of the Press Secretary, 26 February 1993).

[191] Anthony Lake. *From Containment to Enlargement* (Washington, DC: Johns Hopkins University, 21 September 1993). See also Daniel Williams, "Clinton's National Security Adviser Outlines U.S. 'Strategy of Enlargement'," *WP* (22 September 1993).

[192] Ostrower. *The United Nations and the United States,* 215.

Located in its immediate neighborhood, the United States had a long history of intervention in Haiti. The most recent reason for U.S. concern was the overthrow of the country's first freely elected, President Jean Bertrand Aristide, by the military in 1991, which had resulted in a massive flow of immigrants reaching American shores. The Bush administration had reacted by freezing its economic assistance to the island state and had even supported sanctions by the Organization of American States (OAS), mandating that Aristide's power had to be restored. Clinton continued on this path and pressured Lt. General Raoul Cedras, who had orchestrated the coup, to step down as the White House considered his rule not only as a danger for Haiti, but also a blow to democratization efforts in the whole Caribbean. In line with his foreign policy philosophy of the early months, Clinton sought to work through the United Nations in order to have the Haitian rulers comply with international law.

At the beginning of the process, the strategy was successful, as UN Representative Dante Caputo was able to broker the "Governor's Island agreement" in which Cedras agreed to leave Haiti and allow Aristide's return by October 30, 1993. However, when the regime did not show any intention to comply with this agreement in the early months of 1993, the Clinton administration was able to find majorities in the United Nations General Assembly for two UN resolutions. Security Council Resolution 841 imposed a global oil and arms embargo on July 16, 1993 and was followed by Security Council Resolution 867 on September 23, which permitted 1200 policy and military advisors to enter Port-au-Prince in order to restore democracy. While these international negotiations were under way, the constant flow of "boat people" from the South raised serious questions about the status and future of these refugees within the United States, and put the President under pressure to find a lasting solution to the problem. With his abilities as an effective Commander-in-Chief already being in doubt, Clinton's national standing deteriorated further when the USS Harlan County, a part of the UN peacekeeping force, was prevented from landing in the capital's harbor by the junta. In the face of angry protestors at the docks, the U.S. navy ship retreated, and eventually returned, to the United States without fulfilling its mission, thereby causing serious embarrassment for Washington. This singular event delivered not only a serious blow to U.S. reputation and leadership, but Haiti also continued to be a constant issue and annoyance for the Clinton administration in the following years.

The White House engaged in a full year of negotiations after the incident, which did not result in Cedras' surrender and progressively made the international community look weak. Only after Washington prepared an invasion of the island for September 19, 1994, last-minute negotiations were successful in securing the return of Haiti's legitimate leader Aristide. To facilitate this process, the United States stationed 20,000 troops on the island in the transition phase and invested heavily in the economic recovery of the country in the subsequent years. Without question, the handling, duration and level of commitment of American resources for the Haiti crisis raised doubts about Clinton's foreign policy priorities as well as the White House's strategy on how American power should be used in the post-Cold War world.

Even more damaging for the President's foreign policy merits was the handling of the humanitarian crisis in Somalia. The country at the Horn of Africa had moved to the forefront of international attention in the 1990s due to a grave famine that resulted in massive casualties and bloody fights between the various ethnic clans, causing civil warlike conditions for the population. Under President Bush, the White House had supported the United Nations Operation in Somalia (UNSOM), which was tasked to bring humanitarian relief to civilians by providing food and other basic necessities to the Somalis. When the initial force of 8,000 peacekeepers faced mounting difficulties in distributing the relief aid properly, the Bush administration initiated and led "Operation Restore Hope" (also known as the United Nations Task Force) on December 3, 1992, in order to guarantee the uninterrupted delivering of supplies

if need be with military force. President-elect Clinton supported this approach and agreed, furthermore, on the overall intent of this mission, namely to first and foremost stabilize the humanitarian crisis and, in a second step, to come up with a limited and specific plan for disarmament of the Somali clans.

In the face of mounting criticism at home, President Clinton was able to limit the scope of the follow-on mission "Operation Continue Hope," which reduced the total amount of U.S. troops out of fear of major American casualties. On top of the humanitarian relief goals, this mandate included regionally limited peacekeeping/-enforcing and even nation building measures. Having identified General Mohamed Farah Aideed, one of the most powerful warlords based in Mogadishu with aspirations to become Somali's national leader at whatever costs, as the mission's prime target, the United Nations focused significant efforts on capturing him. With an officially declared warrant against Aideed, the UN forces became a target for Aideed's supporters in a rapidly deteriorating overall security situation.

In the summer of 1993, the General's militia killed 24 Pakistani UN peacekeepers and was involved in the death of 10 Moroccan soldiers on June 17. The U.S. retaliated with a strike against Aideed's headquarters on July 12. It seemed that the UN itself and the international community had become a war party in the domestic conflict. In the Fall, this impression was confirmed when U.S. troops repeatedly came under fire and suffered the loss of 18 soldiers, following a failed attempt to capture Aideed in Mogadishu on October 3. The video of a dead, naked American soldier being dragged by an angry mob through the streets of Somalia's capital was broadcast throughout the world and can be seen as final tipping point for a policy change in Washington.[193] Being under pressure from Congress to enact the War Powers Resolution and limit the amount of U.S. troops even further, Clinton decided to retreat from the conflict altogether and announced that U.S. troops would depart the country by March 31, 1994.[194] For foreign policy specialists and the public at large, the capitulation of the international community in Somalia made the limitations of the UN in a volatile security situation painstakingly obvious and opened the door for more criticism on Clinton's trust in this international body, as well as his overall foreign policy objectives.

The domestic opposition to Clinton's foreign policy strategy centered predominantly on three areas in which critics saw the President's vision and actions as misguided. First, foreign policy experts lamented the lack of an overarching doctrine, similar to containment during the Cold War, which could be used as a compass for American involvement in the complex world of the 1990s. Being unconvinced of the practicability of the White House's strategy of enlargement, pundits feared that the United States would conduct foreign policy arbitrarily without a comprehensive plan or a clear sense of purpose. Former U.S. Secretary of Defense James Schlesinger was one representative of this concern when he depicted Clinton's foreign policy in the early stages of his term as follows:

> A plethora of foreign policy objectives has been put forward, as if all could be successfully and simultaneously pursued. We are urged to advance democracy and all its procedures, human rights, civil liberties, equality before the law, protection of minorities, self-determination, an orderly world, international law, economic growth, free markets, privatization, free trade, limits on environmental

---

[193] On the details of the mission, see Dirk Metz' excellent description: Dirk Metz. *Die Schlacht um das Olympic Hotel am 3/4. Oktober 1993 in Mogadischu/Somalia. Die Niederlage von US und UN-Streitkräften in einem asymmetrischen Konflikt* (Berlin: Dr. Köster, 2004).

[194] For a detailed account of the discussions about Somalia on Capitol Hill, please consult Ryan C. Hendrickson. *The Constitution, Congress, and War Powers* (Vanderbilt: Vanderbilt University, 2002), 21-42.

degradation, curtailment of the arms trade, prevention of the spread of advanced weapons etc. etc. (…) With so many conflicting objectives and with an inability to focus those means appropriate for achieving a limited set of objectives, now foreign policy is likely to be shaped by a capricious flow of events – rather than defined guideposts and a careful plan.[195]

Second, in addition to lacking a straightforward and all-inclusive paradigm for foreign policy, several commentators criticized the White House's existing philosophies of the President's inner foreign policy circle, which dictated U.S. engagement in the world. In the critics' view, the U.S. missions in Haiti and Somalia were doomed to fail not because of the individual operational mistakes, but because they all were motivated by a wrong set of priorities and a flawed approach to international politics. According to William G. Hyland, editor of Foreign Affairs, the Clinton team followed unrealistic assumptions that put core American interests at risk. He summarized the administration's shortcomings in four major points:

- Their aversion to the "cynical calculus" of pure power politics.
- Their belief that American policy had to pursue more noble humanitarian goals.
- Their belief that the use of force should not be limited to the defense of vital interests but extended to disinterested intervention in the name of moral principles.
- Their belief that the test of a policy's validity would be whether it could garner both domestic and international support: going it alone was wrong; the era of multilateral foreign policy and collective security, centered on the United Nations, had finally dawned.[196]

Michael Mandelbaum, professor at the Johns Hopkins University at the time, offered a similar point of critique when he called Clinton's foreign policy "social work" that "intended to promote American values" instead of advancing American interests.[197]

The third and final area of criticism was directed at Bill Clinton personally for his lack of involvement and leadership in the field of foreign policy. A piece of advice for the White House team at the end of their first year in office came in this regard from Paul D. Wolfowitz, who called for more presidential involvement in this important portfolio as well as a new communication strategy:

> He (Clinton) must overcome his own apparent annoyance at having to address issues of foreign policy at all, and accept that this is a major part of his responsibilities. And he must recognize that, although the issues are often complex, with powerful arguments on both sides and agonizing risks involved, a certain simplicity and clarity of articulation are ultimately required when vital U.S. interests are at stake.[198]

---

[195] James Schlesinger, "Quest for a Post-Cold War Foreign Policy," *FA* 72.1 (1992/1993), 17/18. Similar criticism is voiced here Jonathan Clarke, "The Conceptual Poverty of U.S. Foreign Policy," *The Atlantic Monthly* 272.3 (September 1993), 54-66, Linda B. Miller, "The Clinton Years: Reinventing U.S. Foreign Policy?" *International Affairs* 70 (October 1994), 621-634.
[196] William G. Hyland. *Clinton's World. Remaking American Foreign Policy* (Westport: Praeger, 1999), 21.
[197] Michael Mandelbaum, "Foreign Policy as Social Work," *FA* 75.1 (January/February 1996), 16-32.
[198] Paul D. Wolfowitz, "Clinton's First Year," *FA* 73.1 (January/February 1994), 43.

While some of the domestic criticism on Clinton's foreign policy course was based on the loss of a clear doctrine that structured a whole generation's thinking after the Second World War and would have been impossible to replace adequately for any administration, the White House's focus on democratization through (UN) multilateralism was questioned as a viable strategy by a majority of Americans. After the two debacles in Haiti and Somalia, the administration became sensitive to the criticism, and as a result, more restrictive in their engagement in the world as well as more sceptical of the UN's ability to secure American interests. Revoking the earlier enthusiasm about the dawn of a world domestic policy, the Presidential Decision Directive (PDD) 25 readjusted Washington's policy on multilateral peace operations. In essence, the directive declared that U.S. troops only would participate in future UN missions that were likely to succeed, served core American interests and were under American command.[199] Clinton also announced that Washington would decrease expenditures for peace operations and would give Congress a stronger voice in the decision-making process of U.S. involvement in multilateral peacekeeping and conflict resolution efforts.[200]

The trend toward a more self-constrained, pick and choose foreign policy that put more emphasis on continued world leadership of the United States, while at the same time asking for more burden-sharing from Washington's partners, moved even more to the forefront after the 1994 midterms.[201] Coming under pressure from the Republican majority in Congress to reduce U.S. foreign aid, involvement in UN operations and military presence abroad, Clinton had to counter the specific conservative proposals outlined in the Contract with America in the second half of his first term.[202] Designed to shape predominantly the domestic agenda until the presidential elections in 1996, Gingrich's foreign policy proposals in this document "incorporated the credo of inviolable U.S. freedom of action; the isolationist emphasis of conservative unilateralism was also unmistakably present in the form of a National Missile Defense system."[203]

While the President was able to fend off the most conservative proposal of a new and costly defense system, he had to work with the new majorities in Congress on foreign affairs issues. Hence, a more realist outlook on foreign policy became a feature of Clinton's engagement in the world in the following two years. Part of this evolution was not only visible in the definition of success and the choice of instruments in the Balkan and NATO East expansion cases but also in the way that Clinton used foreign policy to look presidential and to promote trust as part of his leadership strengths in 1995/1996. Through the adjustment of priorities in the foreign policy realm after the midterms, Clinton reverted back to a more traditional American power politics approach that showed manifold similarities with strategies of previous Republican administrations.

---

[199] The new key phrase in this regard was "selective engagement" that bridged Clinton's earlier foreign policy strategy with a more traditional realist approach. The 1994 national security strategy described the new line of approach as follows: "Our engagement must be selective, focusing on the challenges that are most relevant to our own interests and focussing our resources where we can make the most difference." *A National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement* (Washington, DC: The White House, Office of the Press Secretary, July 1994,) 5.

[200] *William J. Clinton signs PDD establishing "U.S. Policy on Reforming Multilateral Peace Operations"* (Washington, DC: The White House, Office of the Press Secretary, 5 May 1994). See also Manfred Knapp, "Die Macht der USA und die Moral der Staatengemeinschaft: Zur UN-Politik der Clinton Administration," *Macht und Moral: Beiträge zur Ideologie und Praxis amerikanischer Außenpolitik im 20. Jahrhundert.* Manfred Berg (ed.) (Münster: LIT, 1999), 295-318.

[201] Clinton acknowledged this strategy in a Freedom House speech by demanding: "We have to drop the abstractions and dogma, and pursue, based on trial and error and persistent experimentation, a policy that advances our values of freedom and democracy, peace and security." William J. Clinton. *Remarks by the President in Freedom House Speech* (Washington, DC: The White House, Office of the Press Secretary, 6 October 1995).

[202] See for instance Carroll J. Doherty, "GOP sharpens budgetary knife over international programs," *Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report* 52.49 (17 December 1994), 3566.

[203] Bernd W. Kubbig/Matthias Dembinski/Alexander Kelle. *Unilateralism as Sole Foreign-Policy Strategy? American Policy toward the UN, NATO, and the OPCW in the Clinton Era* (Frankfurt: Peace Research Institute, November 2000), 8.

IV. The U.S.-German Relationship

IV.1. Challenges and Realities

The peaceful revolutions in Eastern Europe in 1989/90 not only had ramifications for the United States and Germany in their immediate neighborhoods and for their status in the international arena, but also altered their long-standing bilateral relationship. With the Soviet Union as their common enemy gone, many foreign policy experts on both sides of the Atlantic saw a relationship in turmoil and predicted a serious weakening of the transatlantic bond.[204] The prime reason for this envisioned development was a trend toward addressing domestic issues as priority number one in the early and mid 1990s. For the wider public, just as for elites in both countries, the time had come to look inward and focus on challenges at home after fighting the communist enemy for several decades.

Public opinion polls in Germany and the United States during the first term of President Clinton reveal this paradigm shift tellingly. A survey conducted by the Friedrich-Naumann Stiftung and RAND in November 1994 is exemplary of the German public view during this time: "Asked to identify the most important problems facing the country today, the German public points to unemployment (73 percent), the economy (18 percent), asylum-seekers (16 percent) and crime (16 percent)."[205] This focus on domestic issues as most pressing concerns can also be found in a 1995 Chicago Council of Foreign Relations survey that analyzes American public opinion and U.S. foreign policy. The representative sample of Americans revealed crime (42 percent), unemployment (20 percent), health care/insurance (19 percent) and drug abuse (18 percent) as frontrunners in public concern. Even when asked about their foreign policy priorities, the American public chose issues that have a direct link to the well-being of their own nation: stopping the flow of illegal drugs into the U.S. (85 percent), protecting the jobs of American workers (83 percent), preventing the spread of nuclear weapons (82 percent), and controlling and reducing illegal immigration (72 percent).[206]

Both governments picked up on this public sentiment and made domestic matters their top priority. While the Kohl government found the handling of the German reunification within its own borders and the EU a tall order, the Clinton administration fulfilled its campaign pledge to concentrate its efforts on the economy and social programs.[207] The focus on domestic policy initiatives ultimately had consequences for the U.S. relationship with its allies, as Undersecretary of State Peter Tarnoff outlined in May 1993: "It is necessary to make the point that our economic interests are paramount. (…) With limited resources, the United States must define the extent of its commitments and make a commitment commensurate with those realities. This may on

---

[204] Out of the multitude of articles with this argument only a few examples Gebhard Schweigler, "Driftet die atlantische Gemeinschaft auseinander?" *IP* 6 (1995), 53-60; Werner Weidenfeld. *America and Europe: Is the break inevitable?* (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann Stiftung, 1996); Henry Kissinger, "Die atlantische Gemeinschaft neu begründen," *IP* 1 (1995), 20-26; W. R. Smyser. *Germany and America. New Identities, Fateful Rift?* (Boulder: Westview, 1993).

[205] Ronald D. Asmus. *Germany's Geopolitical Maturation. Public Opinion and Security Policy in 1994* (Santa Monica: RAND, 1994), 5.

[206] John E. Rielly (ed.). *American Public Opinion and U.S. Foreign Policy 1995* (Chicago: Chicago Press Corporation, 1995), 10/15. For additional information, compare also John E. Rielly, "Pragmatischer Internationalismus. Öffentliche Meinung und Außenpolitik in den USA," *IP* 3 (1995), 47-54 as well as John E. Rielly (ed.). *American Public Opinion and U.S. Foreign Policy 1991* (Chicago: Chicago Press Corporation, 1991).

[207] "According to the Federal Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs, the largest portion of the $700 billion transferred has been used to pay unemployment benefits in the east, where 14 percent of the workforce is jobless (versus 8 percent in the west). Some economists estimate that the jobless rate would be close to 40 percent in the east were it not for subsidized government work programs." See James Kitfield, "Kohl's answer," *The National Journal* 28.49 (7 December 1996), 4.

occasion fall short of what some Americans would like and others would hope for."[208] One of the first casualties of this strategic decision and the corresponding budget implications were the government sponsored person-to-person exchanges of German and American citizens, as Werner Weidenfeld, Coordinator of German-American Relations had to report in 1996:

> The declining American engagement presented itself first in the closing of the American Centers in Stuttgart and Hannover by the United States Information Agency, the U.S. agency for cultural and educational policy abroad, the dramatic decrease of U.S. support for the exchange programs of the German-American Fulbright Commission, and the announcement to cut funds for the popular parliamentary program for students and young professionals.[209]

This reduction of funding was an indication that Washington considered the mission to promote American values and its way of life in Germany as accomplished. For some long-time observers of German-American relations, the lack of investment in the next generation of transatlantic thinkers was part of a more far-reaching erosion of Western networks and structures in the post-Cold War era. Given demographic developments in the medium to long term in the United States it, moreover, seemed evident that the transatlantic bond was doomed to weaken eventually. Due to legal and illegal immigration into the United States, as well as higher birth rates of families with an Asian and Latin American background, the U.S. Bureau of Census projected in 1994 that the number of Americans with European origin would drop from 80 percent in 1980 to 64 percent in 2020 and 56 percent in 2050.[210] While the political implications of this demographic change were not quantifiable, it added to a German/European fear that the United States would slowly but surely loose interest in their continent.

The change in political leadership in the United States in the early 1990s reinforced this sentiment: Washington saw the arrival of more than 200 new congressional members in the 1992 and 1994 elections, thereby retiring a generation of American policymakers who had shared a common purpose with their German colleagues during the Cold War. Cord Jakobeit, political scientist at the University of Hamburg, painted a bleak picture of the future of German-American relations in light of this development: "On both sides of the Atlantic, the older generation of 'Atlanticists' is stepping aside, making way for a new generation that might not share the same pro-American or pro-European view."[211]

---

[208]Even though the State Department withdrew Tarnoff's comment later, it is exemplary for a common rationale and analysis of U.S. priorities in the post-Cold War world John M. Goshko, "Reduced U.S. role outlined but soon altered," *WP* (26 May 1993).

[209] Original quote: "Das rückläufige amerikanische Engagement äußerte sich zunächst in der Schließung der Amerikahäuser in Stuttgart und Hannover durch USIA, die amerikanische Behörde für auswärtige Kulturpolitik, der drastischen Senkung des amerikanischen Beitrages zu den Austauschprogrammen der Deutsch-Amerikanischen Fulbright-Kommission und der Ankündigung, die Mittel für das beliebte Parlamentarische Patenschaftsprogramm für Schüler und junge Berufstätige zu kürzen." Werner Weidenfeld. *Neue Wege transatlantischer Partnerschaft. Tätigkeitsbericht des Koordinators für die deutsch-amerikanische zwischengesellschaftliche, kultur- und informationspolitische Zusammenarbeit 1994/1995* (Bonn: Auswärtiges Amt, January 1996), 16.

[210] U.S. Bureau of the Census. *Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1994* (Washington, DC: Bureau of the Census, 1994), 18. See also Charles William Maynes, "Ethnische Veränderungen im 'Schmelztiegel' Amerika. Auswirkungen auf die amerikanische Außenpolitik," *IP* 5 (1996), 45-48.

[211] Cord Jakobeit, "German-American Relations: The Challenge Ahead," *The United States and German-American Relations through German Eyes.* Cord Jakobeit, Ute Sacksofsky and Peter Wenzel (eds.) (New York: Nova Science, 1996).

The debate about NATO's purpose in the early 1990s was influenced by the same issue,[212] i.e. the level of future American engagement in Europe. Not everyone in the United States, or in Europe for that matter, subscribed to Richard Holbrooke's assessment of America being a European power with continued interest and stake in the continent's security and prosperity.[213] Critical voices on both sides of the Atlantic pointed rather toward a diminished role of NATO in the international arena, as well as a growing trend of re-nationalization within Europe. The alliance's lack of political will at first to act decisively in the Bosnia crisis, as well as the decision to build up an independent European defense capability cast further doubts on America's role in Europe. Stanley R. Sloan, senior researcher at the Congressional Research Service in Washington saw the state of transatlantic military alliance at the end of the first two years of President Clinton in office as follows:

> The tendency of recent years has been to divide: until recently, the United States has largely told the Europeans that Bosnia is their problem; meanwhile, many Europeans have been looking for ways to accomplish military missions without U.S. assistance. This approach was enshrined in the January 1994 NATO summit that made much of separate European and American responsibilities and raised questions about the U.S. engagement to continued commitments to defense cooperation with its European allies.[214]

Christoph Bertram, correspondent for the German weekly 'Die Zeit', even saw a return to geopolitics, with serious consequences for Germany's foreign policy approach and its relations to the United States:

> The loosening of the collective structures which provided the framework for Germany's foreign policy is both cause and consequence of the return of geopolitics that has occurred since 1989. While before that crucial year the behaviour of Western countries was shaped not by their geographic location but by their Western affiliation, today where nations lie explains how they behave.[215]

Germany had a strong interest to counteract this trend, as it preferred to approach foreign policy issues multilaterally. Continued close relations with the United States were not only essential for Germany in its role as European linchpin of NATO, but also desirable due to Bonn's dependency on Washington's security guarantee. Therefore, it is not a surprise that especially the German side contemplated several initiatives in the early to mid 1990s in order to maintain and even deepen the bilateral relationship with the United States.[216] There was indeed no shortage of suggestions on how to build on the Cold War bilateral relationship in a new era: the areas of

---

[212] See Chapter VII.

[213] Richard Holbrooke, "America, a European Power," *FA* 74.2 (March/April 1995), 38-51.

[214] Stanley R. Sloan. *A Strategic Partnership between Germany and the United States: American Expectations* (Sankt Augustin: Konrad Adenauer Stiftung, Dezember 1995), 14.

[215] Christoph Bertram, "The Power and the Past: Germany's New International Loneliness," *Germany's New Position in Europe. Problems and Perspectives.* Arnulf Baring (ed.) (Oxford: Berg, 1994), 98.

[216] German Defense Minister Volker Rühe summarized the mission ahead as follows: "Europa und Amerika brauchen eine neue transatlantische Agenda, die die ganze Vielfalt politischer, wirtschaftlicher und militärstrategischer Fragen umfaßt. Es geht um die Verständigung auf gemeinsame politische Ziele und Strategien zu den Grundfragen einer komplexen Welt in einer neuen Zeit." Volker Rühe. *Rede von Bundesverteidigungsminister Volker Rühe über Europa und Amerika, gehalten auf der Münchner Konferenz für Sicherheitspolitik am 4. Februar 1995* (Bonn: Bundesministerium der Verteidigung, 4 February 1995).

envisioned cooperation centered around three themes. First, there was a continued need for cooperation in the security field, especially in light of the at times volatile and fragile domestic situation within Russia, as well as the West's intent to anchor the Central and Eastern European countries safely to the alliance. Germany and the United States remained part of an existing pluralistic security community after the end of the Cold War and shared the same outlook in the 1990s on strategic questions, such as the need for intensified non-proliferation efforts and an expansion of NATO eastward.

Second, the intertwined economies of Germany and the United States mandated a continued investment and interest in the other side of the Atlantic. In 1992, German exports to the United States totalled 42.6 billion DM and almost were matched by U.S. exports to Germany in the amount of 42.4 billion DM. In addition, American investments made up 30% of the total investments in West Germany and 15-20% of those in East Germany. Finally, there were more than 2400 German companies active in the United States, employing almost 500,000 employees in the given window of time.[217] An already close trade relationship was bolstered, moreover, by the creation of the German American Business Council in Washington in 1990 as well as by the Clinton administration's 'Showcase Germany Program,' which was intended to push U.S. exports in Germany. In addition to these concrete links between the German-American business communities, some politicians and foreign policy experts even advocated institutional changes in order to achieve an even closer economic relationship between the two partners.

Among those proposals were the call for a transatlantic free trade zone (TAFTA) by German Foreign Minister Klaus Kinkel and the idea to create an "Atlantic Union," tabled by Charles A. Kupchan, at the time senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations. Kinkel saw in TAFTA an opportunity to manifest an open transatlantic system of trade and investment. This initiative would have created another institutionalized pillar of U.S.-EU cooperation, with Germany profiting greatly as the prime export nation of the continent; this time not in the security but the economic realm. TAFTA was also at the heart of Kupchan's "Atlantic Union" proposal:[218] He envisioned an economic and political community that would have given all EU, WEU and NATO members a home under this new framework. Part of his idea was not only a transatlantic market place, but also an Atlantic parliament that would have been made up of representatives from the United States and Europe and would have been charged with overseeing the economic and political decisions of the Atlantic Union.

Neither of these ideas were ever pursued with ferocity nor bore fruit in the end for two reasons: On the one hand, Germany and the United States valued the established political and economic institutions and were hesitant to replace structures that had served them well in the past; on the other hand, there was scepticism on the merits of more consensus oriented, non-protectionist decision-making processes in vital economic areas such as agriculture and textiles.[219]

Finally, there was a third area in which the United States and Germany had opportunities to cooperate bilaterally in times of scarce resources and inward-looking publics. With the focus of a common enemy gone, pundits on both sides of the Atlantic argued for investing in comparative

[217] The economic statistics can be found in Westphal/ Arendth, *Uncle Sam und die Deutschen*, 289/295; Daniel S. Hamilton. *Beyond Bonn. America & the Berlin Republic* (Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1994), 53-81.

[218] Charles A. Kupchan, "Reconstructing the West. The Case for an Atlantic Union," *Atlantic Security. Contending Visions.* Charles A. Kupchan (ed.) (New York: Council on Foreign Relations, 1998), 64-91.

[219] See Klaus Kinkel, "Deutsch-amerikanische Partnerschaft – die transatlantische Agenda 2000". Rede vor dem Chicago Council on Foreign Relations am 19. April 1995 in Chicago," *Neue Wege transatlantischer Partnerschaft 1994/1995.* Weidenfeld, 45-53; Christopher Parkes, "U.S. cool to Kinkel's Atlantic trade plan," *FT* (20 April 1995), 3.

domestic policy initiatives that could be mutually beneficial. The establishment of a transatlantic learning community was deemed helpful in exchanging best practices and finding solutions for such pressing issues such as health care reform, demographic and environmental challenges, education and economic competitiveness, the fight against crime as well as the role of family in society. Kurt H. Biedenkopf even saw this approach as the new core of the U.S.-German relationship: "The future is the definition of the Atlantic community not as a defense community, but as a learning community."[220]

However, the German-American relationship was more than just a compilation of alliances on security, economic and domestic issues. In the global concert, it also served as an important catalyst for multilateral cooperation on a wide array of issues. A mission statement of joint German/European – American efforts in the international arena is the "New Transatlantic Agenda" that was signed at the U.S.-EU Summit in Madrid on December 3, 1995.[221] In this key document, both sides agreed to take leadership in four key areas:

- promoting peace and stability, democracy and development around the world;
- responding to global challenges;
- contributing to the expansion of world trade and closer economic relations;
- building bridges across the Atlantic.[222]

Even though the provisions of the new transatlantic agenda were seen as largely symbolic, due to the lack of concrete action plans, they nevertheless served as an important reaffirmation of the close transatlantic link and especially the German-American relationship.[223] Bonn had lobbied its European partners extensively behind the scenes to initiate and reach an agreement that reinforced its connection to Washington in a multilateral format. The "New Transatlantic Agenda" was also a prime opportunity to counteract the widespread belief that a fundamental rift within transatlantic relations was inevitable and even actively pursued by Washington. On the contrary to this assumption, the Kohl and Clinton administrations were convinced that their bilateral relationship was irreplaceable not only given its matching interests in Europe and beyond, but also on the basis of a shared heritage and value system. Both nations believed – and believe -- in democracy, human rights and market economy as the proper code of conduct for any state – a consensus that made them natural allies in a wide variety of strategic questions in international relations. The German-American relationship as the motor for a problem solving transatlantic relationship was therefore an important pillar in the post-Cold War world. Its durability and efficiency would be put to the test during President Clinton's first term, as the case studies on non-proliferation, Bosnia and the NATO East expansion will show.

---

[220] Original quote: "Die Zukunft: das heißt die Definition der atlantischen Gemeinschaft nicht als Verteidigungsgemeinschaft, sondern als Lerngemeinschaft." Kurt H. Biedenkopf, "Zur Erneuerung des europäisch-amerikanischen Verhältnisses," *Amerika in uns. Deutsch-amerikanische Erfahrungen und Visionen.* Beate Lindemann (ed.) (Mainz: Hase und Köhler, 1995), 16.

[221] See *New Transatlantic Agenda* (Washington, DC: Delegation of the European Commission to the United States, 3 December 1995).

[222] Ibid, 2.

[223] For an in-depth analysis and interpretation of the New Transatlantic Agenda see Karen Donfried, "The European Union and the United States: Political Aspects of the New Transatlantic Agenda of December 1995," *CRS Report for Congress* 96-87 F (Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, January 24, 1996); John Van Oudenaren, "Die neue transatlantische Agenda," *IP* 5 (1996), 49-52.

IV.2 What do Germans Think of the United States?

On a political level, public support for strong bilateral relations with the United States was in Germany's case a prerequisite to tackle the foreign and security issues of the post-Cold War era. At the same time, it is a reality that no elected government can afford to shape its foreign policy agenda in the long term without the consent of its voters. Therefore, it is worthwhile to spend a moment on the German public view of the United States during Clinton's first term. This has direct relevance on how closely the Kohl government could work with the United States without getting under domestic pressure. Hardly any German citizen – as in most other countries – did not have an opinion on the United States. In most cases, the process of forming an opinion on the United States was based on an individual interpretation and judgement of American values, its way of life as well as its actions in history and the present time. Hence, there was not one universal public view on the United States, even though two decisive camps stood out in the German debate.

On the one hand, there is the widely researched anti-Americanism within Germany that despises the American influence on Germany and other countries. In their 2004 book "Hating America," Barry Rubin and Judith Colp Rubin define anti-Americanism as being limited to having one or more of the following characteristics:

- An antagonism to the United States that is systemic, seeing it as completely and inevitably evil.
- A view that greatly exaggerates America's shortcomings.
- The deliberate misrepresentation of the nature or policies of the United States for political purposes.
- A misperception of American society, policies or goals, which falsely portrays them as ridiculous or malevolent.[224]

While certainly being a minority position within Germany, anti-Americanism is fed by various historical and ideological sources and is promoted by persisting stereotypes about the United States and its citizens.

Historically speaking, some elements of the political right and left within Germany cultivated anti-American resentments and formed an unusual coalition in their common disdain for the United States. Conservative anti-Americanism saw in Washington the epitome of an evil counter draft of their envisioned governmental and societal model. These circles projected their anti-modern, anti-egalitarian, anti-Semitic, and anti-democratic sentiments on the American society and saw in it the prime danger for the German way of life.[225] The political left also considered the United States as the enemy extraordinaire in the ideological fight about the ideal relationship between the state and its citizens (though obviously for very different reasons). As a promoter of a capitalist system as well as (what the left considered) an imperialist conduct of foreign policy, Washington was the prime target for propaganda that denounced the focus on individual material gain. With the United States being attacked as the mastermind and main beneficiary of globalization, these anti-American sentiments found new followers in the 1990s, as the demonstrations against the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) showed.[226]

---

[224] Barry Rubin/Judith Colp Rubin. *Hating America. A History* (Oxford: Oxford University, 2004), ix.

[225] Konrad H. Jarausch, "Missverständnis Amerika: Antiamerikanismus als Projektion," *Antiamerikanismus im 20. Jahrhundert: Studien zu Ost-und Westeuropa.* Jan C. Behrends et. al (eds.) (Bonn: Dietz, 2005), 37-39.

[226] Ibid, 39-41.

However, these public outbursts were not the only indication that some of the above mentioned streaks of anti-Americanisms prevailed. Gesine Schwan's prominent 1996/1997 elite survey in Germany revealed that only 50% of respondents disagreed with the two statements that "money rules in the United States" and that "the law of the jungle" is the guiding principle in American society.[227] In light of these findings, it is not surprising that the United States was portrayed at times as a country where rich people lived without exception in secluded and luxurious compounds, whereas the majority of the poor could be found in slums under despicable conditions. In addition, America was often seen through the prism of a militaristic and ruthless nation that had since its existence not shunned away from monstrosities to achieve its strategic goals. A representative example of this view is given by Alfred Mechtersheimer:

> The continuity of American bloody expansion ranges from the extinction of the Native Americans, the continuous intervention in Latin America, the war crimes of Dresden and Hiroshima to Vietnam and the massacre at Mutla Ridge, south of the Iraq city Basra in February 1991.[228]

As Dan Diner has observed, anti-American statements such as the one above were oftentimes closely tied to a fundamental criticism of Germany as well. This was not only grounded in German political support for U.S. policy actions in the 1990s, but had to do with a much more fundamental historical point: West Germany only secured its existence through the help of the United States after the end of the Second World War and borrowed heavily from American ideas in the following years to become once more a powerful country in the heart of Europe. What was hard to stomach for anti-American voices was the fact that Germany's identity, in essence, had been Americanized on the basis of the strong partnership with Washington in a decades-long fight against a common enemy. Accordingly, these forces showed a tendency to blame Germany's present shortcomings on its continued good relationship with its long standing ally on the other side of the Atlantic.[229]

West Germany had indeed followed American principals in rebuilding the country after 1945 by implementing a democratic federal state and a functioning (social) market economy. Through the Economic Recovery Program, the Marshall Plan and the continued support during the Cold War, the United States became the guarantor of the Federal Republic's (economic) security and emerged naturally as a role model for many Germans. While the government and elites tweaked American ideas and systems to make them work for their own country, the average German was profoundly grateful to their former enemy for offering the country a chance to rehabilitate itself after the Third Reich. Chancellor Ludwig Erhard commented on the steady process of Americanization in Germany by seeing his people becoming "more American than the Americans."[230]

---

[227] Gesine Schwan. *Antikommunismus und Antiamerikanismus in Deutschland. Kontinuität und Wandel nach 1945* (Baden-Baden: Nomos, 1999), 207-208.

[228] Original quote: "Die Kontinuität US-amerikanischer blutiger Expansion reicht von der Ausrottung der Indianer, über die Dauerintervention in Lateinamerika, die Kriegsverbrechen Dresden und Hiroshima, über Vietnam und bis zum Massaker am Mutla Ridge im Februar 1991 südlich der irakischen Stadt Basra." Alfred Mechtersheimer, "Antiamerikanisch – weshalb eigentlich nicht? Von der Pflicht, dem weltweit verheerenden Einfluß der USA zu widerstehen," *Der Krieg der Köpfe. Vom Golfkrieg zur neuen Weltordnung*. Helmut Thielen (ed.) (Bad Honnef: Horlemann, 1991), 114.

[229] Dan Diner, "'USA-SA-SS': Bundesrepublikanische Verschiebungen," *Verkehrte Welten: Antiamerikanismus in Deutschland; ein historischer Essay*. Dan Diner (Frankfurt am Main: Eichborn, 1993), 132.

[230] See Michael Ermarth, "The Germans talk back: Heinrich Hauser and German Attitudes toward Americanization after World War II," *America and the Shaping of German Society 1945-1955*. Michael Ermarth (Oxford: Berg, 1993), 102.

On top of the United States' political and military role in Germany and Europe, two additional factors were decisive for a rather speedy emergence of pro-American sentiment within the German public. First, there was no historical baggage between the United States and Germany that could have prevented either side to cooperate with each other. Even though Washington's engagement in two world wars spoiled Germany's dreams of hegemony, there were no long-standing traumata or imperial rivalries of the sort that the Germans had with the French, British and Russians.[231] The U.S. military stationed in Germany was able to build on these historical premises and became an important factor in people-to-people contact, helping to create a durable partnership between the two nations.

The second reason for an overall positive perception of the United States was its role as a cultural magnet. The emergence of American pop culture in the 1950s and 60s in Germany (symbolized by Elvis Presley, Coca Cola, and Rock n' Roll) was a vehicle for the younger generation to rebel against their parents and become an important feature of the zeitgeist. The popularity of American icons as well as the predominance of the country's music, entertainment and fashion industry stood the test of time and have had a lasting effect on German society until today.[232] In many cases, American mass culture also fuelled a desire to gain first-hand experience about the country from where it originated. According to the 1994 German tourism statistics, the United States was the most popular non-European travel destination and benefited from tourists' expenditures in the amount of 4.1 billion DM.[233]

During President Clinton's first term, Germany's public view on the United States was influenced positively by all these political, interest-based and cultural ties to its long-standing partner. The paramount support for reunification only a few years earlier had further enhanced America's standing with the German people. Concurrently, a 1994 RAND study found that 75% of Germans considered themselves pro-American and 89% expected the United States to continue to be an important ally of their unified nation.[234] This vote of confidence showed that despite existing anti-Americanism, the overwhelming majority of Germans looked favorably on the United States, thereby contributing their part to a solid and intact partnership.

IV.3 What do Americans Think of Germans?

History played an overarching role for American views on Germany in the early 1990s and served the pro- and anti-German camp as justification of their very different assessments of the German people and their trustworthiness. For Gebhard Schweigler, the origin of these diametrically opposed positions can be traced back to the American reaction to the early German immigrants from Hesse and later on from Bavaria: "The Hesse provided in many ways the enduring basis for the Americans' view of Germany: Depending on external circumstances, Germans could either be violent and cruel or efficient and diligent."[235] Historically speaking, the German-American

---

[231] See Josef Joffe, "Amerika und Deutschland: Die Weltmacht, der sanfte Hegemon und die natürliche Partnerschaft," *Deutschlands neue Außenpolitik, Bd. 3*. Karl Kaiser / Joachim Krause (eds.), 117-122.

[232] To give just one example: In 1994, eight out of the ten most popular movies in Germany were produced in the United States. Westphal/Arenth. *Uncle Sam und die Deutschen,* 295.

[233] Ibid, 296.

[234] Asmus. *Germany's Geopolitical Maturation*, 14.

[235] Original quote: "(D)ie Hessen lieferten in vielfacher Hinsicht die fortdauernde Grundlage für das Deutschlandbild der Amerikaner: Deutsche konnten, je nach äußeren Voraussetzungen, entweder gewalttätig und grausam oder aber tüchtig und fleissig sein. Gebhard Schweigler, "Das Deutschlandbild der Amerikaner," *Die Deutschen auf der Suche nach ihrer Identität?* Eduard J. M. Kroker / Bruno Dechamps (eds.) (Frankfurt am Main: Königsteiner Forum, 1993), 63.

relationship was ambivalent in the 19th and early 20th centuries: While Americans admired Germans' academic excellence, diligence, and were attracted to elements of German culture such as the Biergarten, Gemütlichkeit and Turnverein, they despised the country's anti-democratic form of government and its imperialistic policies. The atrocities committed by Germany during the First and especially the Second World War eradicated almost all positive sentiments toward the country as well as its people and tipped public opinion to a much more critical stance. Only the geopolitical constellation of the Cold War gave the Germans a chance to regain trust and support through a long process of working together with the United States toward a common goal.

From a 1990s American point of view, the analysis and interpretation of what happened in the two periods of 1914-1945 and 1945-1990 on the European continent determined in most cases the respective individual's opinion of Germany. Sceptics of a unified Germany argued that the country and its people had forfeited their right to be trusted due to the Holocaust. Even though a prosperous democracy had grown ever since the end of the war, proponents of this camp believed that the likelihood of a reappearance of the past hegemonic demons was still a given.[236] In Andrei S. Markovits' words: "In short, adherents to this argumentation do not trust the 'new' Germans. They worry that the old authoritarian, obedient, undemocratic, militaristic, and racist Germans will re-emerge in the not-too-distant future and once again threaten Europe in some pernicious fashion."[237] An important subplot of this notion was the claim in the early 1990s that the Federal Republic would loosen its Western roots and return to seesaw politics given the inclusion of 16 million East Germans and the newly acquired freedom in decision-making after unification.[238] Given these critical assessments of Germany's shortcomings and successes in the 20th century, it is not surprising that this camp favored a continuation of the culture of reticence in the politics of the Bonn and Berlin Republic.[239]

A majority of the American people took, however, another stance when asked about their feelings toward Germans. One explanation for this phenomenon was the high percentage of Americans that had German roots and naturally had a more positive attitude toward their former home country. The 1992 U.S. census bureau report serves as an illustration for the magnitude of this aspect given that 19.6% of Americans indicated German ancestry ('only' 13.1% reported Irish and only 11% claimed English heritage).[240] Furthermore, the role of U.S. military personnel stationed in Germany during the Cold War should not be underestimated in its impact for German-American understanding and friendship. According to Tim Kane, scholar at the Heritage Foundation in Washington, DC more than 10 million U.S. soldiers served on German soil between 1950 and 1999. Taking into account the additional number of relatives that accompanied their family members, it is apparent that U.S. troops not only contributed to Germany's security, but also became important stakeholders and ambassadors for the German-American relationship during and after their tenure.[241]

---

[236] See for a critical assessment of the American view on Germany: Leo Wieland, "Das Deutschlandbild in Amerika," *FAZ* (13 February 1997), 1.

[237] Andrei S. Markovits, "Germany and Germans: A View from the United States," *Germany Politics and Society* 13.3 (Fall 1995), 158/159.

[238] Compare Bowman H. Miller, "German Unity and the Politics of German History," *Europe in Transition.* J.J. Lee & Walter Korter (eds.) (Austin: University of Texas, 1991).

[239] For more information on the concept of the 'culture of reticence' please consult Hanns W. Maull, "Zivilmacht Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Vierzehn Thesen für eine neue deutsche Außenpolitik," *EA* 10 (1992), 269-278 and Hanns W. Maull /Philip H. Gordon. *German Foreign Policy and the German 'National Interest': German and American Perspectives* (Washington, DC: Johns Hopkins University, January 1993).

[240] Anne Cronin, "A Statistical Portrait of the Typical American; This is your life, generally speaking," *NYT* (26 July 1992), 5.

[241] Tim Kane, "Global U.S. Troop Deployment, 1950-2003," *Heritage Foundation Center for Data Analysis Report* CDA04-11 (Washington, DC, 27 October 2004). See also U.S. Department of Defense. *Military Personnel Historical*

In addition to the existence of this substantial Germanophile group within the United States, most Americans recognized that Germany had learned from its historic mistakes and turned the corner during the last 50 years. The American public valued West Berlin's role as a staunch ally during the Cold War and acknowledged its partner's achievement to anchor a well-fortified democracy and a prosperous social market economy in the heart of Europe. Public opinion polls in the early to mid 1990s showed that Americans had a generally positive sentiment toward the Germans: 73% of Americans were convinced that a unified Germany was a good thing for the United States; 60% believed that the Germans had changed a lot since the end of the Second World War; and finally, Americans ranked Germany at 62 percent (after Canada, 76 and Great Britain, 74) as the third most liked country in 1991.[242]

On a political level, this positive public opinion translated into American expectations toward a larger German role in international affairs. Elites in the United States even called on Germany to take on greater responsibility in the military field. Senator William Cohen, for instance, submitted an amendment to Congress in the middle of the Bosnian crisis that challenged Germany to "participate fully in international efforts to maintain or restore international peace and security."[243] The amendment passed with a vote of 96:1. For political strategists inside the Beltway, the issue of trust in Germany was therefore no longer the decisive factor in the equation.

At the core of their deliberations was the question of whether, the unified Germany, in determining its new role, was continuing to follow American leadership or if it was striving for a more independent approach. Ultimately, the path that Germany chose would also have implications for the way that Americans saw their long-standing partner after the end of the Cold War. A first litmus test in this regard was Germany's approach toward regional foreign policy decisions and international issues such as the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

V. Proliferation of WMD in the 1990s

V.1. State of Play

The proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and their carriers was a prime security issue for national governments in the early 1990s. While the transatlantic alliance attributed the greatest urgency to the safe handling of the nuclear capabilities stationed on the territory of the former Soviet Union, the international community was also worried about potential proliferation scenarios in the Middle East and South East Asia. The potential sources of conflict in these regions at the time were the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, North Korea's suspected nuclear program, as well as the rivalry between India and Pakistan. These conflict dyads had been on the radar screen of security experts for a substantial amount of time. In addition to these familiar controversies, the Sarin gas attack on the Tokyo subway in 1995 showed politicians and citizens alike the use of chemical and biological agents as terrorist devices and emphasized that WMD would continue to be a force in international politics. Therefore, it was without question that

---

Reports: Active Duty Military Personnel by Regional Area and by Country (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Defense, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, Statistical Information Analysis Division, 19 October 2004).
[242] Markovits. *Germany and Germans*, 144-145; John E. Rielly, *American Public Opinion (1991)*, 21.
[243] *U.S. Congressional Record* (Washington, DC, 31 January 1994), S433.

elected officials needed to reckon with the proliferation issue in order to ensure the safety of their citizens.

Hence, the Kohl and Clinton era of politicians had to contemplate, like their predecessors, rationales and dilemmas of WMD. As a matter of analysis, governments needed to dissect the underlying rationale of why state and non-state actors were seeking to obtain WMD. Security experts have identified six motives:

1. Arguably, the most dangerous players in the proliferation game are rogue or "crazy states" that are aspiring to obtain WMD capabilities in order to clinch supremacy within their region. An explicit rationale of their quest is to bully their neighboring states and to secure an ultimate insurance policy against international sanctions or interventions.
2. The use of nuclear, chemical or biological weapons by terrorist non-state actors as a means to infuse fear into societies is an equally appaling motif.
3. Security problems within a state's region are another incitement for WMD. This scenario applies to state actors that are suffering from a (perceived) hegemony within their immediate neighborhood predominantly caused by a neighbor with WMD. Thriving for own capabilities is seen as a strategic move in order to strike a balance in the regional security environment. In especially volatile regions such as the Middle East, the danger of proliferation chains is imminent (domino effect).
4. A nuclear capability can also be a vital and decisive tool in securing the existence of a nation. The most prominent example for this phenomenon is Israel.
5. A further motif for WMD aspirations is erupting inter-ethnic conflicts (such as in Yugoslavia and the Caucuses) in which policymakers are tempted to gain access to chemical or biological agents in order to improve their position.
6. An attempt to gain the status of a strategic actor in the international arena is another reason for (nuclear) proliferation.[244]

The above mentioned rationales for the acquisition of WMD serve as a backdrop for the complexity of the proliferation issue and lay the groundwork for three specific debates among the German-American security elites that occupied the early to mid 1990s.

The first debate centered on Germany's nuclear status after the end of the Cold War. Mostly conservative circles in the United States conjectured that Germany would produce nuclear material for military purposes in the near future, in order to become an even more strategic actor in the heart of Europe than it already was. An additional factor in support of this view was the technological determinist hypothesis, as Tanya Ogilvie-White describes it: "(The theory) posits that nuclear technology itself is the main driving force behind nuclear proliferation, and therefore that nuclear weapons will be produced as soon as it becomes technologically feasible to do so in each country."[245] While Germany certainly had the technological capacities and know-how to produce weapons-grade uranium and plutonium, it quickly became obvious that neither German

---

[244] These various motives have been discussed in the following publications: Michael Mandelbaum, "Lessons of the Next Nuclear War," *FA* 74.2 (March/April 1995), 22-37; Joachim Krause, "Proliferationsrisiken und   -szenarien in den 90er Jahren," *Kernwaffenverbreitung und internationaler Systemwandel. Neue Risiken und Gestaltungsmöglichkeiten.* Joachim Krause (ed.) (Baden-Baden: Nomos, 1994), 19-66; Harald Müller, "Rüstungs- und Zerstörungspotentiale als Herausforderungen der internationalen Politik," *Deutschlands neue Außenpolitik. Band 2: Herausforderungen.* Karl Kaiser/Hanns W. Maull (eds.) (München: Oldenbourg, 1995), 201-223; Graham Allison/Richard A. Falkenrath, "Kampf gegen die Nuklearverbreitung," *IP* 1 (1996), 11-18.
[245] Tanya Ogilvie-White, "Is there a theory of nuclear proliferation? An analysis of the contemporary debate," *The Nonproliferation Review* 4.1 (Fall 1996), 44.

politicians nor its citizens wanted to indulge in this idea. Germany had taken a conscious decision during the Cold War to refrain from nuclear weapons and left no doubt that it would continue on this path after 1990. In Erwin Häckel's words: "The German renouncement is not based on a one-time act of will, but is embedded over different times within four decades that sealed Germany's gradual transition from allied occupation to full sovereignty."[246]

In this spirit, the Kohl government endorsed and reinforced earlier provisions that deemed Germany a non-nuclear state, such as the Protocol to the Brussels Treaty (1955) and the Non-proliferation Treaty (1969), when Germany renounced nuclear weapons in the framework of the Two plus Four Treaty. Even though France and other allies regarded this concession as an important prerequisite for German unification, Berlin did not lament about this demand at all. On the contrary, the Germans were eager to pursue the same (non-nuclear) strategy as during the last 45 years, which had been an era of remarkable progress and wealth creation. Two factors were decisive in making this a fairly easy decision for the Germans.

First, Europe had become a continent whole and free with an overwhelming majority of well-functioning democracies in which WMD had been delegitimized as appropriate tools of fighting each other. Moreover, there was no immediate aggressor or threat within Germany's vicinity that pressed for a nuclear capability at the Chancellor's disposal. The probability of an attack on Germany had been further reduced by the country's track record of finding diplomatic and multilateral policy solutions to given issues at hand. Second, Germany continued to rely on a strong bilateral relationship with the United States. Most notably, the already existing security guarantee remained intact, thereby prolonging the U.S. commitment to its ally in Europe just as it had during the Cold War. The extension of this arrangement securely tied the United States to Europe's fate, even after the watershed moment of 1990 and provided a stable transatlantic link in security affairs.

While not exclusively directed against Moscow, this strategic decision pointed toward the core of the second heated debate during Clinton's first term: The future of the nuclear arsenal, material and know-how of the former Soviet Union. Knowing that all proliferation problems are "not global and generic but regional and specific"[247] the transatlantic relationship had a vested interest in securing a smooth reduction and transition of nuclear capabilities from the Cold War era into the 1990s. One of the worst case scenarios for Western security experts and governments was the transfer of nuclear weapons and material from the Soviet arsenal to third parties for monetary gain. These worries were fueled by a less than perfect accountability record of Russian nuclear facilities and several cases of smuggled plutonium detected by German authorities.[248] These incidents not only posed an immediate contamination threat to citizens, but also exemplified the danger that rogue states and non-state actors, such as terrorist groups, might try to obtain nuclear hardware from a region in transition.[249] The other dimension of this issue was the likely brain

---

[246] Original quote: "Die deutsche Verzichtleistung beruht nicht auf einem einmaligen Willensakt der Deutschen, sondern ist eingebettet in multilaterale Vertragswerke, die zu verschiedenen Zeiten binnen vier Jahrzehnten den stufenweisen Übergang Deutschlands aus der alliierten Besatzungsherrschaft in die volle Souveränität besiegelten." See Erwin Häckel, "Die nuklearpolitische Interessenlage Deutschlands," IP 10 (1996), 3-8.

[247] Harald Müller, "Viewpoint: Neither Hype nor Complacency: WMD Proliferation after the Cold War," The Nonproliferation Review 4.2 (Winter 1997), 65.

[248] For examples, please consult Bernd Schmidbauer, "Illegaler Nuklearhandel und Nuklearterrorismus," IP 2 (1995), 19-22; Harald Müller, "Nuklearschmuggel: Tödliches Risiko," IP 2 (1995), 23-30.

[249] William C. Potter, director at the Monterey Institute of international Studies came in his 1994 testimony to the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Foreign Affairs to the same conclusion: "My growing pessimism is due to: (1) credible reports – for the first time – that weapons-grade plutonium may have been smuggled out of Russia; (2) evidence of serious deficiencies in the national safeguards system in Russia and the other successor states which possess nuclear assets; and (3) growing pressures in Russia to subordinate the objective of stringent export controls

drain of Russian nuclear scientists that might find new job opportunities in WMD programs of questionable regimes such as Libya or North Korea, for lack of employment in their own country. Frank Buchholz, political scientist at the University of Munich, outlines the gravity of this problem:

> The whereabouts of designing engineers, production workers, technicians and nuclear specialists is developing into a problem, which will at least reach an equally high importance and become at least a very large proliferation threat as the elimination of nuclear weapons themselves. Until early 1992, 350,000 employees of armament factories in Russia have lost employment.[250]

Even though Russia faced these serious issues in its human capital and safeguard measures, it remained a strategic player in the WMD arena. When President Clinton came to power, the successor states of the Soviet Union still had roughly 27,000 to 30,000 strategic and tactical nuclear weapons at their disposal.[251] The nexus of a superior firepower combined with a volatile political situation in the early to mid 1990s let Moscow continue to be in the center of Western security concerns. For the United States, Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney described in his 1993 regional defense strategy the potential for an unfavorable development in Germany's East as follows:

> A successful transformation of Russia, Ukraine and other states of the former Soviet Union to stable democracies should clearly be one of our major goals. But we are not there yet. Our pursuit of this goal must recognize the as yet robust strategic nuclear force facing us, the fragility of democracy in the new states of the former Soviet Union, and the possibility that these new states might revert to closed, authoritarian and hostile regimes.[252]

The challenge to the transatlantic community was to avoid this scenario by helping the former Soviet Union in its transformation process, while at the same time strengthening the overall international non-proliferation regime. The strategies and specifics of this shared German-American mission constituted the third and most elaborate debate on this issue in Clinton's first term.

---

to those of hard currency exports and personal profit." See William C. Potter, "Viewpoint. Nuclear Insecurity in the post-Soviet States," *The Nonproliferation Review* 1.3 (Spring/Summer 1994), 61.

[250] Original quote: "Der Verbleib der Entwicklungsingenieure, Produktionsarbeiter, Techniker und Nuklearspezialisten entwickelt sich daher zu einem Problem, das mindestens ebenso große Dimensionen erreichen wird und von dem mindestens ebenso große Proliferationsgefahr ausgeht, wie von der Beseitigung der Atomwaffen selbst. Bis Anfang Juli 1992 haben in Russland bereits 350,000 Mitarbeiter aus Rüstungsbetrieben aller Art ihre Arbeit verloren." Frank Buchholz. *Das nukleare Erbe der Sowjetunion: Zum Proliferationsrisiko und zur Kontrolle von Atomwaffen* (München: Universität der Bundeswehr, 1992).

[251] See Thomas B. Cochran/Robert S. Norris. *Nuclear Weapons Databook: Russian/Soviet Nuclear Warhead Production* (Washington, DC: Natural Resources Defense Council, April 1992), 10.

[252] Dick Cheney. *Defense Strategy for the 1990s: The Regional Defense Strategy* (Washington, DC: Department of Defense, January 1993).

V.2. Non-proliferation Strategies and Initiatives

V.2.1. Russia on Our Mind

As a joint departure point of the debate, both sides of the Atlantic agreed that the proliferation of former Soviet nuclear assets undermined the transnational security of the alliance. Henry S. Rowen, former U.S. Assistant Secretary of Defense, outlined the countermeasures to be employed:

> International cooperation is needed on virtually every aspect of this topic: security policies, information gathering and assessment, technology transfer controls, economic and political sanctions, and military actions. (…) For the West this implies, wherever feasible, providing countries in question with security support and helping with their economic and political development. One of the main arguments is that the best single antidote to the spread of mass destruction weapons – and especially their use – is democracy.[253]

This tall agenda could only be achieved by a division of labor among the Western alliance. Given Bonn's geographical proximity to Moscow and Washington's strategic interest in the region, Germany and the United States became the two decisive players in helping Russia's transformation efforts. While Germany as non-nuclear state saw its role primarily in promoting a stable economic and political system in its East (by providing financial assistance), the Clinton administration employed a three-legged nuclear strategy which combined elements of deterrence with cooperative features.

The first key component of the strategy was to ensure that the United States continued to have a robust second nuclear strike capability and was able to defend its own territory and that of its allies in case of an attack. Two defense concepts were decisive in this effort: The national missile defense ensured the safety of the U.S. homeland, whereas the theater missile defense provided security for allies and U.S soldiers abroad. Both programs signaled to the world that the United States would continue to uphold its supreme firepower and was prepared to retaliate any attack from an aggressor.[254] The second pillar of the nuclear strategy arranged for cooperative measures with Russia and the other successor states in an attempt to safeguard nuclear facilities and prevent proliferation of materials and know-how to third state actors. Finally, counterproliferation measures were also part of the U.S. toolbox in addressing the challenge at hand. Especially the Pentagon emphasized that in case of a reemergence of a vital WMD threat to U.S. security, Washington was prepared to use all tools at its disposal. On the table were measures ranging from negotiations with the respective party, to economic and political sanctions

---

[253] Henry S. Rowen, "The Prospect for Weapons of Mass Destruction in a Radically Changed World," *Kernwaffenverbreitung und internationaler Systemwandel.* Joachim Krause (ed.) (Baden-Baden: Nomos, 1994), 85. See also Lawrence Freedman, "Great Powers, Vital Interests and Nuclear Weapons," *Survival* 36.4 (Winter 1994/1995), 35-52. On the importance of strengthening Russia's democracy, Franz-Josef Meiers observes: "A free and democratic Russia is the best insurance against the re-emergence of a dictatorship." Franz-Josef Meiers. *From Start I to Start II. Arms Control under Uncertainty* (Geneva: Program for Strategic and International Security Studies), 1994.

[254] With these strategic decisions, Clinton continued in essence U.S. nuclear policy under President Bush (see Jeffrey Smith, "Clinton decides to retain Bush nuclear arms policy," *NYT* (22 September 1994), A1) and delivered a blow to activists on both sides of the Atlantic that were trying to promote a nuclear free world. For an American proposal of this sort, please consult Andrew J. Goodpaster. *An Evolving U.S. Nuclear Posture, Second Report of the Steering Committee, Project on Eliminating Weapons of Mass Destruction* (Washington, DC: The Henry L. Stimson Center, December 1995).

against state actors and even military action if the administration came to the conclusion that the threat outweighed the costs of such an engagement (as it did in the case of Iraq prior to the first Gulf War). [255]

While the United States valued its established strategy of deterrence, Washington also saw a historic window of opportunity in the 1990s to reduce the total amount of tactical and strategic WMD on both sides of the Atlantic. The initial steps for a significant bilateral disarmament policy were taken under President Bush, but were continued and implemented in Clinton's first term. As early as November 1991, the Senate voted favorably on the "Soviet Nuclear Threat Reduction Act" in order to fund the dismantling and safe storage of former Soviet nuclear material. This "Nunn-Lugar Bill," named after the sponsoring U.S. senators of this initiative, was endowed with $400 million in the first year. In the following two years, U.S. Congress allocated $1.2 billion for its successor program, the "Cooperative Threat Reduction Program," and continued to invest in this important initiative.[256]

The core of Washington's bilateral disarmament policy, however, was the two strategic arms reduction treaties (START) with Russia and its successor states. Lothar Rühl, former State Secretary in the German Ministry of Defense, summarizes the rationale of the treaties as follows: "It was therefore START's task to generate strategic stability for a minimum of deterrence with flexible options and sufficient safety margin while at the same time excluding the ability for a disarming first strike."[257] Consequently, Russia and its successor states agreed with the United States upon a significant, but not comprehensive, reduction of warheads and carrier systems in their negotiations of Start I.[258] The treaty, which was signed by President Gorbachev and Bush on July 31, 1991 in Moscow determined the following target lines to be implemented by both parties until 1999:

- A maximum of 1,600 Strategic Nuclear Delivery Vehicles;
- A maximum of 6,000 accountable warheads;
- A maximum of 4,900 ballistic missile warheads;
- A maximum of 1,540 warheads on 154 heavy intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) for the Soviet side;
- A maximum of 1,100 warheads on deployed mobile ICBMs.[259]

---

[255] Compare Bernd W. Kubbig. *Aufrüstung vor Rüstungskontrolle. Amerikanische Raketenabwehr während der Clinton-Administration* (Frankfurt: Peace Research Institute, January 1996), 16.

[256] On the budget allocations for the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program, please consult Bernd W. Kubbig/Harald Müller/Annette Schaper. *Die strategische Rüstungskontrolle zwischen USA und Rußland: Erfolge – Probleme – Perspektiven* (Frankfurt: Peace Research Institute 1996), 37-39.

[257] Original quote: "Aufgabe von START war es daher, strategische Stabilität für ein Abschreckungsminimum mit flexiblen Optionen und ausreichender Sicherheitsmarge herzustellen unter Ausschaltung der Fähigkeit zum entwaffnenden Erstschlag." Lothar Rühl, "Rüstungskontrolle vor neuen Anforderungen," *Die Internationale Politik 1991-1992. Jahrbücher des Forschungsinstituts der deutschen Gesellschaft für Auswärtige Politik*. Wolfgang Wagner et al. (eds) (München: Oldenbourg, 1994), 200.

[258] The Start I treaty was signed before the Soviet Union seized its existence and did not include a roadmap on how to deal with Soviet nuclear capabilities that were stationed on the territory of the soon to be founded independent states of Ukraine, Belarus and Kazakhstan. In order to avoid an internal proliferation within the region, Russia and the United States convinced the three successor states to adhere to the regulations of the treaty by signing the Protocol of Lisbon (23 May 1992).

[259] *Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms* (Washington, DC: NTI Research Library, 31 July 1991).

Building on the foundation of this document, both parties agreed on a further reduction of nuclear warheads in the START II treaty, which was signed on January 3, 1993 by President Bush and Yeltsin in Moscow. The amount of accountable warheads was deemed to be phased out in two steps with an ultimate level of 3,000-3,500 nuclear warheads on each side in 2003. Even though the ratification of the Start II treaty ran into political troubles on both sides,[260] the START treaties minimized the nuclear arsenals on both sides of the Atlantic significantly and therefore contributed to a de-escalation in the nuclear disarmament issue.

Germany supported these U.S. cooperative denuclearization efforts in spirit and through a series of bilateral initiatives of its own. Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher coined an initiative in 1992 that shaped Germany's position toward the disarmament and non-proliferation issue. Its four key demands included:

- Enforcing harsher penalties on (German) companies and experts that contribute to the proliferation of nuclear materials by passing it on to third state actors.
- Imposing sanctions on states that try to obtain WMD material or know-how on the international black market.
- Urging further reduction of the Russian and American nuclear arsenals (exceeding the agreed upon quotas in the Start I and II treaties).
- Creating an international foundation with the goal to give unemployed Russian nuclear specialists an opportunity to use their expertise peacefully. The foundation's most prominent brain child is the "International Science & Technology Center" (ISTC) which was created after a joint German-American proposal.

In addition to the ISTC, the German government funded a number of concrete disarmament and non-proliferation projects on the territory of the former Soviet Union. On December 16, 1992, Germany and Russia signed a skeleton agreement in which Bonn agreed to provide technical equipment in order to dismantle nuclear facilities and warheads. A similar agreement was signed with Ukraine on June 10, 1993. Under these frameworks, Germany supported studies on how to use weapon grade plutonium as an energy resource and worked constructively with Russia and the other members of the Commonwealth of Independent States on dismantling missile and rocket silos. In the first two years of the Clinton presidency, the German government allocated a total of 19 million DM for these specific disarmament efforts.[261] Beyond these financial transformation efforts in a bilateral German-Russian framework, the Kohl government also was actively engaged in promoting international non-proliferation regimes. This path was not only in sync with Germany's multilateral policy approach, but also addressed efforts beyond the territory of the former Soviet Union.

---

[260] In the U.S. Senate, the majority of Republican senators held the ratification of Start II hostage in exchange for other political concessions in domestic and foreign affairs. In the Russian Duma, the parliamentarians tied the ratification to U.S. policy decisions on the continuation of the ABM Treaty and NATO enlargement.

[261] On concrete bilateral initiatives and budget allocations see Deutscher Bundestag. *Drucksache 13/1126 vom 13.4.1995. Unterrichtung durch die Bundesregierung. Bericht zum Stand der Bemühungen um Rüstungskontrolle und Abrüstung sowie die Veränderungen im militärischen Kräfteverhältnis (Jahresabrüstungsbericht 1994)* (Bonn: Deutscher Bundestag, 1995) and Deutscher Bundestag. *Drucksache 12/6985 vom 7.3.1994. Unterrichtung durch die Bundesregierung. Bericht zum Stand der Bemühungen um Rüstungskontrolle und Abrüstung sowie die Veränderungen im militärischen Kräfteverhältnis (Jahresabrüstungsbericht 1993)* (Bonn: Deutscher Bundestag, 1994).

V.2.2. International Non-proliferation Regimes

In the post-Cold War era, non-proliferation efforts are seen more and more as elements of international regulatory policy that stabilize global world order. While Germany as non-nuclear state always had advocated a strengthening of multilateral regimes, the collapse of the Soviet Union now also gave the United States the opportunity to "refocus from the peer competition threats associated with the Cold War strategic confrontation to the risk and hazards associated with proliferant threats".[262] This shift in U.S. strategy resonated with the stronger focus on prevention in the early and mid 1990s as the preferred approach against proliferation of WMD. The international non-proliferation regimes played a crucial role in this ambitious attempt to restrict the number of WMD holders and the amount of chemical as well as biological weapons in the international arena.

At the forefront of internationally established agreements was the Non-proliferation Treaty (NPT), which was arguably the most important arms control treaty. Negotiated in the 1960s, the NPT was a compromise between the already existing nuclear powers (Britain, China, France, the Soviet Union, and the United States) and the 'have-not' countries.[263] The treaty followed a quid pro quo logic: while the 'have-not' states agreed not to acquire nuclear weapons and accepted an international safeguard regime, the nuclear powers committed themselves to reduce their own arsenals and cooperate with the 'have-nots' on the development and usage of civilian nuclear programs for energy purposes. Both parties agreed not to pass on any nuclear material and equipment to third parties, unless it was regulated by the international safeguard system. An important milestone for non-proliferation efforts during the Cold War, the treaty effectively limited the total number of nuclear powers and legitimized an international inspections system that was tasked to verify the nuclear free status of have-not countries. After twenty-five years of existence, the NPT moved to the forefront of the non-proliferation agenda again during President Clinton's first term in office.

The founding fathers of the treaty had decided in 1970 that the document would need to be renewed in 1995, in order to give participating parties a chance to review its provisions and effect. Judging from the number of countries that joined the NPT in the last decades (over 160), the agreement had been a real success. However, the four meetings of the preparatory committee in the run-up to the review conference in April of 1995 indicated that an unlimited extension of the treaty was in jeopardy. During these deliberations, four key issues came to the forefront that 'have-not' countries were concerned about: "nuclear disarmament, export controls and peaceful uses of nuclear technology, universality of the treaty and the problem of Israel's abstention, type of extension of the treaty."[264]

On the first two issues, some have-not countries were convinced that the nuclear powers had not lived up to their promises, even though the START treaties had resulted in a reduction of nuclear weapons. The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), in charge of the global inspections system, managed the technical cooperation fund to the best of its ability. An additional issue, especially for the Middle Eastern signatories of the NPT, was Israel's decision to refrain from membership in the treaty, thereby not allowing international inspectors to enter its nuclear

---

[262] William S. Cohen. *Report of the Quadrennial Defense Review*. Compare also President Clinton's speech to the UN on September 27, 1993 where he said: "I have made non-proliferation one of our nation's highest priorities. We intend to weave it more deeply into the fabric of all of our relationships with the world's nations and institutions." William J. Clinton, "Confronting the Challenges".

[263] Under the existing framework nuclear powers are defined as those nations that have tested a nuclear bomb prior to Jan 1, 1967.

[264] Alexander Kelle, "The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Regime after the NPT Extension Conference – The Tasks Ahead," *The International Spectator* 30.4 (1995), 38.

facilities. Finally, the question about the most preferable duration for the extension of the NPT disclosed two competing motivations within the camp of the non-nuclear states: On the one hand, they had a strong interest in strengthening the non-proliferation agenda, which would have been best served by an indefinite extension, on the other hand, the 'have-nots' did not necessarily want to give up an opportunity to review the provisions of the NPT at a later stage.

The United States and Germany showed consensus in their assessment of the issue and both favored an unlimited extension of the NPT. Early on, the German government had indicated through a series of unilateral and multilateral declarations that it preferred this option. Among them were:

> The 10-point-Non-proliferation initiative by Foreign Minister Klaus Kinkel in December 1993, the EU's joint action in preparation of the 1995 NPT Review and Extension Conference, Declarations of G7, NATO/NACC, OSCE. The federal government was supported in these efforts by a large majority of the parliament (Resolution of the German Bundestag in March 1995).[265]

For Bonn, the unlimited extension of the NPT meant the continuation of an important pillar in its own security architecture. As a nuclear free state, Germany had a strong interest in stability in the non-proliferation system, as it ensured a controlled security environment and embedded Bonn solidly in a multilateral structure. By calling for an unlimited extension forcefully and early in the process, Germany also hoped to gain influence on the United States for additional proposals, such as the establishment of a transparent international plutonium regime in order to control the flow of fissile materials. The U.S. government itself lobbied hard for its position among the more sceptical have-not countries and served as a major linchpin in the successful campaign of making the NPT an axiom of international politics beyond the year 1995. The significance of the NPT review conference stemmed, however, not only from the fact that the nuclear powers and its allies struck a decisive victory in prolonging the treaty indefinitely, but also that the meetings gave the have-not countries a platform to put additional non-proliferation concerns on the international agenda.

This is evident in the case of demands for a comprehensive test ban treaty (CTBT). Have-not countries had been calling for decades for such an agreement, which would prohibit nuclear testing and, thereby seriously hamper the nuclear powers' ability to advance their arsenals. By the time of the NPT review conference, proponents of such a framework had made it a sine qua non for their approval of an unlimited extension. A change of U.S. policy now in favor of such a framework after the Soviet Union had collapsed was the key to rally international support for the CTBT. The United States and Germany led the campaign through unilateral bills and resolutions[266] and were both driving forces in the Conference on Disarmament (CD) in Geneva in which the details of the treaty were negotiated. After tedious deliberations, the CD referred the final document to the UN General Assembly, which accepted the CTBT with an overwhelming

---

[265]Original quote: "10-Punkte-Nichtverbreitungsinitiative von Bundesaußenminister Kinkel vom Dezember 1993; Gemeinsame Aktion der EU zur Vorbereitung der NVV- Konferenz 1995, Erklärungen von G7, NATO/NAKR, OSZE. Die Bundesregierung wurde dabei von einer breiten parlamentarischen Mehrheit unterstützt (Entschließung des Deutschen Bundestages vom März 1995)." Deutscher Bundestag. *Drucksache 13/4450 vom 24.4.1996. Unterrichtung durch die Bundesregierung. Bericht zum Stand der Bemühungen um Rüstungskontrolle und Abrüstung sowie der Veränderungen im militärischen Kräfteverhältnis (Jahresabrüstungsbericht 1995)* (Bonn: Deutscher Bundestag, 1996), 18.

[266] The U.S. Congress passed a test stop moratorium on October 2, 1992 until June 1993. President Clinton extended the moratorium for an additional 15 months and publicly called for a comprehensive test ban. The German Bundestag passed a resolution unanimously calling for an end of all nuclear testing on June 23, 1993. A similar resolution passed the European parliament only one day later.

majority (notable exceptions were India, Iran and Libya). The signatory and ratification phase started shortly thereafter.

A second long-standing demand has been the termination of the production of weapons-usable fissile materials. To incorporate such a cut-off treaty as an international non-proliferation regime would complement the CTBT perfectly: "The cut-off treaty is the logical supplement to the comprehensive test ban treaty. While the CTBT aims at abandoning the qualitative arms race, the cut-off treaty puts up barriers against the quantitative arms race."[267] For the United States and the other nuclear powers under the NPT, the cut-off treaty was a tool to integrate the three other states verified to possess nuclear weapons (India, Pakistan and Israel) into non-proliferation efforts.

Even though Washington invested heavily in a diplomatic compromise on this issue, the debate on the detailed provisions of a cut-off treaty stalled in the CD for predominantly two reasons: first, the agreement on the CTBT had taken up a lot of energy and political capital within the CD, which made negotiations difficult from the outset; and second, a significant camp of have-not countries wanted not only to ban future production, but also include already existing fissile materials, to which some nuclear powers, especially India, were vehemently opposed. The failure to reach a compromise on the cut-off issue was a reminder that the strategic objectives of individual nation states could seriously hamper the international agenda of tying non-proliferation and disarmament efforts together.

While the CD as an institution had failed to reach a break-through on a cut-off treaty, it had scored a decisive victory in agreeing on a chemical weapon convention (CWC) at the beginning of Clinton's first term. Germany led the international community in agreeing on far-reaching provisions to outlaw the proliferation and use of chemical weapons and material.[268] Article 1 of the general obligations of the CWC outlines the specifics of the agreement:

> Each state party to this convention undertakes never under any circumstance:
>
> (a) To develop, produce, otherwise acquire, stockpile or retain chemical weapons, or transfer, directly or indirectly, chemical weapons to anyone;
> (b) To use chemical weapons;
> (c) To engage in any military preparations to use military weapons;
> (d) To assist, encourage or induce, in any way, anyone to engage in any activity prohibited to a State Party under this convention.[269]

The newly founded 'Organization for the Prevention of Chemical Weapons' (OPCW) was tasked to work out the details of this international regime. Even though the convention had its

---

[267] Original quote: "Der Cutoff-Vertrag ist die logische Ergänzung des Teststop-Vertrages. Während der CTBT das Ziel hat, den qualitativen Rüstungswettlauf zu beenden, errichtet der Cut-off Vertrag Barrieren gegen den quantitativen Rüstungswettlauf." Constanze Eisenbart/Harald Müller/Annette Schaper. *Nichtverbreitung und Abrüstung von Nuklearwaffen. Friedensgutachten 1997* (Münster: Münster Literatur, 1997), 309.

[268] Compare two of Klaus Kinkel's speeches: Klaus Kinkel. *Rede des Bundesaußenministers vor den Vereinten Nationen: 47. Generalversammlung in New York am 23. September 1992* (Bonn: Bulletin des Presse- und Informationsamt der Bundesregierung, 25. September 1992), 949-953; Klaus Kinkel. *Rede des Bundesministers des Auswärtigen anlässlich der Unterzeichnung des internationalen Übereinkommens zur Ächtung chemischer Waffen in Paris am 13. Januar 1993* (Bonn: Bulletin des Presse- und Informationsamtes der Bundesregierung, 15. January 1993), 33-34.

[269] *Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on their Destruction* (The Hague: Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons, 13 January 1993). See also I.P. Khosla, "Another NPT: The Chemical Weapons Convention," *Strategic Analysis* 19.12 (March 1997), 1613-1626.

limitations, most notably its verification system, which foresaw only sporadic controls for the wide and complex range of different chemical materials, it nevertheless provided an international framework that not only prohibited the actions under Art. 1 but also fostered technical, financial and medical cooperation among the parties of the CWC. [270]

The international non-proliferation regimes contributed substantially to the series of successes of non-proliferation and disarmament efforts from 1993 to 1997. Understanding the historic window of opportunity, the United States and Germany were at the forefront of various bilateral, as well as multilateral initiatives in the early to mid 1990s in order to reduce the total amount of WMD and weapons capable materials. The breakdown of the Soviet Union was, however, not able to destroy the underlying rationale of WMD as ultimate insurance policies and a tool to project power. In an extension of Cold War logic and arrangements, for instance, Germany continued to profit from the U.S. security guarantee and the United States upheld its own arsenals in order to be able to deter any potential aggressor. As WMD remained an attractive asset for state and non-state actors in much more volatile regions than Europe or North America, the real challenge for the United States and Germany was to limit the flow of WMD materials outside of international agreements, thereby ensuring stability in the global non-proliferation system.

VI. The War in Bosnia-Herzegovina

VI.1 Origins and Characterizations of the Conflict

As one of the few non-aligned states, Yugoslavia had an exceptional status on the geopolitical chessboard of the Cold War and effectively maneuvered between the Western alliance and the Warsaw Pact. Its road to success in the second half of the 20th century was "a complex balancing act at the international level and an extensive system of rights and overlapping sovereignties" among the republics domestically, masterminded by Yugoslavia's long standing leader Josip Broz Tito.[271] These arrangements enabled the society as a whole to prosper and prevented social and political unrest within the ethnically diverse state. With the collapse of communism, more specifically, the fall of the communist party in Yugoslavia in January 1990 and subsequent multi-

---

[270] An excellent overview of the CWC is Alexander Kelle. *Das Chemiewaffen-Übereinkommen und seine Umsetzung – einführende Darstellung und Stand der Diskussion* (Frankfurt: Peace Research Institute, December 1996). There are two additional international non-proliferation regimes worth mentioning even though they were seriously hampered in their efforts to contribute to global security. On the one hand, there is the biological and toxin weapons convention (BTWC) which came into force on March 26, 1975. Even though more than a 160 nations had signed BTWC by the mid 1990s, the agreement lacked a detailed verification system and was not prepared to deal with the dual-use issue, i.e. the inherent nature of biological agents that could be used for peaceful and military purposes alike. On the other hand, there are international agreements on export controls such as the missile technology control regime (MTCR) that tries to prevent the proliferation of carrier systems for biological and chemical weapons. In contrast to the chemical weapons convention, this regime does not offer any positive incentives for non-participating parties. Hence, several producers of ballistic missiles remained outside the agreement to undermine its laudable purpose.

[271] Susan L. Woodward. *Balkan Tragedy. Chaos and Dissolution after the Cold War* (Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution, 1995), 45. On the history of Yugoslavia in the time period 1945 – 1990, please consult Friedrich Jäger. *Bosniaken, Kroaten, Serben: ein Leitfaden ihrer Geschichte* (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 2001); Gerhard Lozek (ed.). *Die ethnischen Konflikte auf dem Balkan in historischer Sicht* (Berlin: Helle Panke, 2000); John R. Lampe. *Yugoslavia as history: twice there was a country* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2000).

party elections in the republics between April and December of the same year, this carefully arranged international and domestic framework came undone.

The end of communism was, however, only the final catalyst of an unravelling process that had started after Tito's death in 1980 and had advanced in James E. Goodby's words a "slow fragmentation of the country, marked by devolution of authority to the republics and a disavowal by the leaderships of those republics of a real sense of responsibility for the future of Yugoslavia as a whole."[272] Pursuing nationalist ambitions became a clear-cut policy objective among the leaders of the republics and was used to counteract the idea of a central multiethnic core and a uniting civic culture already on display in the larger cities of the country. For Warren Zimmermann, last U.S. Ambassador to Yugoslavia, the desire of individual leaders for power retention through nationalism was hence the single most important factor in the dissolution of the country:

> The Yugoslav catastrophe was not mainly the result of ancient ethnic or religious hostilities, nor of the collapse of communism at the end of the cold war, nor even of the failures of the Western countries. Those factors undeniably made things worse. But Yugoslavia's death and the violence that followed resulted from the conscious actions of nationalist leaders who coopted, intimidated, circumvented, or eliminated all opposition to their demagogic designs. Yugoslavia was destroyed from top down.[273]

Advocates of national ambitions on all sides benefited from power-sharing provisions in the constitution that allowed the leadership of each republic a veto over decision-making in key areas of the country. The lack of political leadership and willingness to compromise resulted in a state of paralysis that finally culminated in the breakdown of the political system as a whole. On the grassroots level, the ethnically defined territorial structures of the Yugoslav system reinforced not only the political strength of the individual republics, but also contributed to a lack of a common 'Yugoslav identity'. While all leaders instrumentalized the divisions along ethnic lines within the country in order to strengthen their own political base, Serbian leader Slobodan Milosevic was the primus inter pares in pursuing nationalist ambitions without worrying about the consequences for his neighbors or the region as a whole.

In order to fulfill his vision of a 'Greater Serbia' in the Balkans, Milosevic tried to seize control of Yugoslavia's economic assets and attempted to expand Serbian rule in the region wherever Serbs lived or owned property. Immediately starting after his accession to power in 1987, he attempted to undermine the autonomy of Kosovo and Vojvodina in his pursuit for territorial gain, while at the same time pursuing more control over the decision-making of the union. With these policies, he represented a powerful synthesis between Serb nationalism and a prominent streak of conservatism in the country that supported the empowerment of centralist structures in Yugoslavia. The desire to implement his vision of a more powerful Serbia in the Balkans remained on Milosevic's political agenda throughout the crisis of the early 1990s and made him a key figure in the enfolding catastrophe in the region.

While the main reasons for the dissolution of Yugoslavia were of a domestic nature, the international community has to be blamed for underestimating the impact of the political crisis in

---

[272] James E. Goodby. *Europe Undivided. The New Logic of Peace in U.S.-Russian Relations* (Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace, 1998), 112.

[273] Warren Zimmermann. *Origins of a Catastrophe. Yugoslavia and its destroyers – America's last Ambassador tells what happened and why* (New York: Random House, 1996), vii.

the beginning and for its inability to find a coherent policy to end the war in the Balkans swiftly. For a significant amount of time, Europe and the United States disagreed on the appropriate strategy to bring peace to the region and in the process endangered the credibility of the Western alliance as well as trust in the principle of collective security.[274] The difficulty to solve the "problem from hell," as U.S. Secretary of State Warren Christopher described the ethnic conflict, was based on reconciling two fundamental principles of international law that stood on diametrically opposed ends in this unique historic situation: on the one hand of the equation was the ideal of territorial integrity and state sovereignty. On the other hand, the right of self-determination of peoples, as it had recently been implemented in the German unification served as an important factor.

At the heart of the dispute, through the eyes of the outside world, was the legal and political question of what constituted a nation and "how the international community should respond to the collapse of a multinational state and the onset of conflict among its peoples."[275] Proponents of either side of the debate argued their case at the time through the prism of defining the conflict either as a civil war within Yugoslavia or as act of (Serbian) external aggression against the other republics. The answer to this conundrum divided national governments as well as societies in Europe and the United States. Hence, the war in the Balkans was much more than a regional conflict that brought death and displacement to its citizens as it also raised important questions about international law and the way that (European) nations intended to react to conflicts on their doorsteps. In a truly fluid historic moment in the early 1990s, the events in Yugoslavia revealed a transatlantic community inept to address the crisis at hand in an appropriate way. Being in a transition state after the demise of the Soviet Union as a superpower, both sides of the Atlantic were forced to reassess their political and financial commitment to each other, as well as to the existing security architecture that they had helped to build in the course of the previous 45 years.

VI.2. Germany Recognizes Croatia and Slovenia

In the early stages of the unfolding crisis, Europe and the United States showed a strong preference for finding a resolution that did not tamper with the territorial integrity of Yugoslavia. Until the summer of 1991, Germany officially supported this approach as the declarations of the June European Council meeting in Luxembourg show.[276] The underlying reason for this decision at the time was based on a hesitancy to promote the creation of new states with a strong nationalist base in the Balkans and Eastern Europe as a whole. The case of Yugoslavia was only the most immediate and pressing in this regard – Bonn's eyes predominantly were fixated on the developments in the Soviet Union, which was undergoing similar secessionist ambitions in some parts of its former territory after the end of the Cold War. In the interest of stability, the German government initially decided to support the status quo, even though the internal and public debate about an alternative course forward was already in full swing.

Developments on the ground in Yugoslavia over the summer gave proponents of an alternative German strategy the upper hand and resulted in a policy change that bore fruit within the following six months. After referenda in Slovenia and Croatia and several declarations of intent

---

[274] On the debate about the impact of the Balkan wars on the international community, see for instance American Enterprise Institute. *What to do in the Balkans?* (Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute, 1992).
[275] Steven L. Burg & Paul S. Shoup. *The War in Bosnia-Herzegovina. Ethnic Conflict and International Intervention* (New York: M. E. Sharpe, 1999), 6.
[276] The European Council agreed on pursuing a strategy that should achieve the continued existence of Yugoslavia, facilitate a political dialogue among the domestic parties and outlaw any violence in the process thereof.

over the spring, both republics declared their independence from the union on June 25, 1991. These decisions had been in the making since the fall/winter of 1990 and were motivated by the republics' fear of being trapped in a Yugoslavia dominated by Serbia. The subsequent military responses of the Yugoslav's People's Army (JNA) against the secessions lasted only ten days in the case of Slovenia, but were much more intense in Croatia given the larger Serbian minority in the republic and the JNA's pro-Serbian sympathies. The desire of the Serb minority and its rebels to be part of a greater Serbia prolonged this conflict even to the point of an eventual spill-over into Bosnia.

Observing the intensification of the military conflict in Croatia over the summer and fall, Bonn came to the conclusion that recognition of the two republics was the only viable option forward in order to halt the confrontation. Given Germany's innate interest in stability on the continent, Yugoslavia's ethnic conflict posed a challenge to Bonn's paramount foreign policy interest that could not be tolerated. The key for the German foreign policy establishment and public at large was to contain and deter the Serbian aggressors, who were seen as the main perpetrators of the unfolding war in the Balkans.[277] Germany's rationale for recognition was furthermore grounded in its tradition of a values-based foreign policy that renounced violence as a means of politics, as well as its belief in the self-determination of peoples. As German diplomat Michael Libal, who worked on the Balkans portfolio in the Foreign Ministry at the time stated:

> The war waged by the Yugoslav military represented to many Germans, including those at the highest level of policymaking, a combination of almost everything they had come to loath since 1945: communism and militarism joining together in order to brutalize small and defenseless peoples.[278]

By actively pursuing a strategy of recognition for Croatia and Slovenia, Germany hoped to internationalize the conflict, thereby enlarging the options for the international community to put pressure on Serbia.

With this policy reversal, Germany put itself at odds with the majority of its European partners and the United States and produced a remarkable backlash of international criticism. While Germany had informally tried to gauge support for its new position over the summer, it came under mounting scrutiny and criticism after Genscher publicly informed the Yugoslav ambassador to Bonn on August 24, 1991 that Germany would recognize Croatia and Slovenia unless the JNA stopped its intervention in Croatia. Political leaders as well as numerous Balkan experts in European capitals and Washington considered this approach flawed and were also worried about the bullying tactics employed, which they perceived as a sign of new German assertiveness in foreign policy. Countries such as France, Great Britain and the United States deemed a selective recognition of independence of Yugoslav republics to be not only premature, but also as a likely cause for a broadening of the conflict into Bosnia-Herzegovina given its multiethnic society.[279] This position was also shared by UN Secretary General Perez de Cuellar, who even voiced his opposition to the German plan in a letter to Genscher. From the critics' point of view, Bonn undermined the ongoing peace efforts under Lord Carrington's leadership

---

[277] The domestic consensus on this assessment was promoted by the majority of mass media, especially FAZ and Die Welt, the Catholic Church and the CDU/CSU. Slovenia and Croatia being popular tourist destinations played an additional role why Germans sympathized with the republics' wish for independence.

[278] Michael Libal. *Limits of persuasion: Germany and the Yugoslav Crisis, 1991-1992* (Westport: Praeger, 1997), 106.

[279] In 1991, the national composition of Bosnia-Herzegovina was as follows: 31.4 % Serbs, 43.7% Muslims, 17.3% Croats, and 5.5% Yugoslavs. The fear of the international community was that the Muslim majority would be very hesitant to remain in a Yugoslav state after Croatian and Slovenian independence had been recognized.

and intended to create realities on the ground without a considered plan for the time after the republics had left Yugoslavia.

Irrespective of these doubts, Bonn continued on its path toward recognition. The German political leadership had come to the conclusion that Serbia would not honor any agreement in the current international framework and that therefore, the Kohl government did not destroy any leverage that Lord Carrington and other peace negotiators might have had.[280] Even though they did not have a master plan for the time after recognition and were aware of the potential dangers of widening the conflict through their actions, Bonn lobbied for its policy as the only viable option to dampen Serbian aggression in the region. Due to two developments in the late fall of 1991, the German position gained ground and was able to transform from a minority view to an at least acceptable (if not majority) position within the European Community (EC).

The Serbian rejection of the proposed EC peace settlement in early November 1991 constituted the first decisive event in opening the door for Germany's recognition strategy. Under its Dutch presidency, the EC had tried to find an end to the conflict by imposing a settlement on the warring parties, coming out of several rounds of conference negotiations in Den Haag. When Belgrade refused to sign up to the provision of special rights for minorities within the EC draft proposal, arguing that this constituted an internal Yugoslav affair, its interlocutors' hopes of dealing with a responsible partner diminished.[281] The EC reacted to this non-compliance by imposing trade sanctions on Serbia and Montenegro starting on November 8 and, more importantly, moved closer to the German position on the recognition question. In addition to these political developments, events on the battlefield in Croatia caused a rallying effect around the individual republics' efforts to gain independence. With the shelling of Dubrovnik and the destruction of the Croatian city of Vukovar, the JNA (and Serbia) showed further evidence of intolerable behavior for the West, which called for action. In addition, "the first of many reports from Amnesty International and Helsinki Watch of human rights violations, and the beginnings of the refugee crisis became a powerful force for the German side, and its consistent view of Serbia as the enemy and the army and the Serbs as aggressors."[282]

Bonn used the international outrage concerning these actions as window of opportunity to pursue its policy. Being pressured by its own parliament advocating to move forward immediately with its agenda, Chancellor Kohl announced in an address to the Bundestag on November 27, 1991 that Germany would recognize Croatia and Slovenia unilaterally by Christmas, even though an EC commission under the leadership of French lawyer Robert Badinter was exploring under which conditions republics could be granted recognition of their independence by the Europeans. Even when the EC foreign ministers agreed on the set of conditions that needed to be matched by individual republics, most importantly the commitment to internal democracy, an honest effort to peaceful negotiations of the disputes and respect for the UN Charter as well as the rule of law, Germany continued to pursue its role as driver of EC policy. Disregarding an EC decision in the foreign ministers' meeting of December 15-16, 1991 in which the Badinter Commission was tasked to recommend republics for recognition by mid-January, Bonn decided to stick to its own timetable and went ahead to officially recognize Croatia and Slovenia on December 23. Being confronted with a fait accompli, the EC followed suit on January 15, 1992 and was joined in this decision by the United States on April 7, 1992.

---

[280] Germany's rationale was outlined for instance by German Ambassador to the United States Immo Stabreit in the following article: Immo Stabreit, "Yugoslav Breakup: Don't blame Germany," *WP* (29 June 1993).
[281] Serbia argued that Serbs within Croatia should be granted the right of self-determination as well, thereby advocating dissolution of Croatian territorial integrity due to the Serb minorities' wish to join a greater Serbia.
[282] Woodward. *Balkan Tragedy,* 182.

In a remarkable change from Cold War times, Germany was able to achieve acceptance of its position, even though other European powers and the United States were originally opposed to its policy. Widely commented on at the time, this foreign policy success was not only a sign of new German assertiveness, but exemplified a larger trend of a European and transatlantic landscape being in flux.[283] The EC's decision to go along with the German proposal has to be seen in the context of the larger intra-European political consensus building at the time, which included the preparations for the Maastricht Treaty and the establishment of a common foreign and security policy. At this historic moment, it was unthinkable that Europe was divided on the crucial issue of war and peace on its very own continent. Perhaps not thrilled with the policy, European statesmen decided that it was better to be united around a somewhat contested decision than have a public fight about the best way forward. Across the Atlantic, the United States looked at the recognition debate from a distance and did not consider Yugoslavia a major foreign policy issue that touched on its prime national interests. On the contrary, Washington saw the European nations in the lead to fix an ongoing conflict in their own neighborhood. As the only superpower, the United States expected to be consulted, but was evidently not the architect of policy in this particular phase. Washington's passivity to claiming leadership in this area was, however, only one major reason for the enfolding catastrophe. The lack of a coherent post-recognition strategy as well as the prolonged lack of political will of European powers to enforce the implementation of policies by military means if necessary were equally central reasons for Yugoslavia's turmoil in the following months and years.

VI.3 Europe in the Driver Seat: Early Conflict Resolution Efforts

The high hopes that Germany had tied to the recognition of Croatia and Slovenia as a means to prevent spill-over effects of the enfolding conflict into Bosnia were not fulfilled. On the contrary, the internationalizing of the conflict triggered a set of events that inevitably brought the war to Bosnia-Herzegovina. In essence, the independence of the other two republics and subsequent military interventions by the JNA and Serbian army to prevent secession not only resulted in skirmishes on Bosnian territory that later intensified, but also caused a disruption in the heterogeneous multiethnic fabric of Bosnia, resulting in dissolution from within. Being faced with remaining in a rump Yugoslavia under Serbian control, the Muslim dominated Bosnian government strived for independence and called a referendum for February 29, 1992 to decide its political future following the recommendation of the Badinter Commission. While the Bosnian Croats and Muslims voted with an overwhelming majority for independence, resulting in international recognition in April 1992, the Bosnian Serbs refrained from the ballots under guidance of its political leadership to protest this move, as they wanted to be part of a larger Serbian state.

The division of population groups along ethnic lines was an essential element in the intensification of fighting in Bosnia in the following three years. With an extremely volatile domestic situation and faced with nationalist ambitions of its two neighbors, Serbia and Croatia, Bosnia developed into the main theater in which the future of the Balkans would be determined. In order to bring peace to the region, the EC and the international community initiated several diplomatic initiatives that tried to put an end to the three parties' conflict and find a solution to bring about a viable after-war political structure. In the timeframe of 1992 to the beginning of 1994, the EC served as the prime policy entrepreneur and tabled several proposals in an attempt to reinstall stability and security on the continent.

---

[283] Some examples of coverage on this debate are: Stephen Kinzer, "Europe, Backing Germans, accepts Yugoslav breakup," *NYT* (16 January 1992); Leslie H. Gelb, "Tomorrow's Germany," *NYT* (22 December 1991).

The interaction between diplomatic initiatives and developments on the battlefield emerged as a pattern at the outset of the Bosnian war and remained characteristic for the duration of the conflict. The first major diplomatic effort under EC auspices was spearheaded by Portuguese diplomat José Cutileiro, who summoned the leaders of the Bosnian Croats, Muslims and Serbs to Lisbon on March 18, 1992 in order to discuss the future of Bosnia-Herzegovina. He was able to reach an agreement with all representatives, which pledged to create three constituent nations divided along ethnic lines on Bosnian territory, each with the right to self-determination. Only days after the ink had dried on the Lisbon accord, the parties withdrew from the agreement due to dissatisfaction with the distribution of territory. As negotiations had not resulted in a durable compromise for the parties' claims, the stakeholders tried henceforth to improve their leverage on the battlefield.

The next diplomatic initiative came after Serbian military campaigns with substantial territorial gains in the fall of 1992 and was developed out of the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia (ICFY) in London. Under the leadership of its co-chairmen former British Foreign Secretary Lord David Owen (for the EC) and former U.S. Secretary of State Cyrus Vance (for the UN), the ICFY served as a clearing house for all international peace efforts in the second half of 1992. The diplomatic task ahead was momentous as Vance and Owen needed to

> find a solution to the multiple conflicts in former Yugoslavia by balancing recognition of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the post-Yugoslav states defined by former republic borders, with respect for individual rights, implementation of constitutional guarantees of the right of minorities, and the promotion of tolerance.[284]

The Vance-Owen plan tried to achieve this delicate balancing act through a variety of provisions. In terms of the political structure of the envisioned country, the negotiators argued for a centralized state in which the different provinces would carry out significant functions, but were still part of a multi-national Bosnia. The proposal envisioned a total of ten provinces in which there were alternating majorities between the (Bosnian) Muslims, Serbs and Croats, already taking into account some of the Serbian territorial gains. Vance and Owen also made preliminary suggestions for a constitution for the new state, in which the relations between the central and regional authorities would be determined, and called for the creation of a human rights court in order to deter ongoing ethnic cleansing and other war crimes.[285]

The greatest hurdle in the negotiations with the three parties was the concrete demarcations of the provinces. Therefore, the map became the main focal point of the deliberations in which Vance-Owen proposals were countered by the parties' suggestions for the division of territory. Especially the Bosnian Serbs were not content with the EC/UN proposal, as it strived to nullify a significant amount of their territorial gains on the battlefield, thereby blocking the vision of a unified Bosnian Serbian landmass on the border to Serbia. The envisioned empowerment of a

---

[284] Burg/Shoup. *War in Bosnia-Herzegovina,* 214.

[285] The issue of ethnic cleansing was at the heart of the humanitarian catastrophe as Serbian military and others forced inhabitants of their land in the pursuit of creating a unified territory. Historians estimate that 1/3 to 2/3 of the total population of former Yugoslavia had to leave their homes due to ethnic cleansing during the Bosnian war. For the European powers this development was more than a humanitarian concern as a great amount of displaced Yugoslavs became refugees in their own countries. For an insightful report on the specifics of the phenomenon in the early stages of the war, please see U.S. Senate. *The Ethnic Cleansing of Bosnia-Hercegovina. A Staff report to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate* (Washington, DC: U.S. Senate, 15 August 1992).

centralist government under the plan was an additional factor that was strongly opposed by the negotiators of the Bosnian Serbs.

An additional barrier to pressuring the non-consensus warring parties was the lack of strategic coherence and agreement on the part of the international community as whole. While the Vance-Owen plan represented a noteworthy attempt to ensure Bosnian unity through a complicated equation of ethnic autonomy, it lacked any credible enforcement provisions. It was clear to all parties involved that the implementation of the plan would require a substantial amount of troops over a long-term scenario in order to guarantee the success of the mission. The question of who would carry the main share of this burden was exactly the dividing line within the international community in late 1992/early 1993. UN Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali held the view that troops for this peace enforcement mission should be granted by the regional (defense) organizations (i.e. the EC or NATO), as the UN was not equipped for this kind of robust mission.[286] As for the EC, there was no major country willing to take a leadership role in this affair; France and the United Kingdom had already committed a substantial amount of troops to UNPROFOR making them the two largest contingents. Germany was still finding its place in Europe after reunification and argued against requests in this direction on the basis of its history in the Balkans as well as the legal question of whether, German Bundeswehr troops could operate outside NATO territory.[287] Within the NATO umbrella, all eyes were on the United States.

As described earlier, the Bush administration did not consider Bosnia a prime national interest and Washington's assessment did not change when President Clinton took office in January of 1993. In essence, there was a categorical unwillingness in this phase to become militarily involved in the conflict from the American side, even if it constituted being part of a peace enforcement mandate under the UN. The reasons for the decision were threefold: first, the Pentagon advised against any involvement on the basis that this was an unspecified prolonged engagement of U.S. military personnel in the region; second, the President did not want to divert any attention from his ambitious domestic agenda and third, Washington did not agree with the provisions of the proposed Vance-Owen settlement. On the last point, the Clinton administration criticized the plan's underlying principle of ethnic partition into majority-held provinces by one group and, even more importantly, denied its support because they saw the configuration of the envisioned Bosnian Serb provinces as a reward for their aggression. Unwilling to create a precedent in which the international community would honor new internal borders of a state being redrawn by force, the U.S. decided not to endorse the Vance-Owen plan on moral grounds as well as out of a conviction that a flawed settlement of this nature would not be able to guarantee long-term stability and peace for the region.[288]

---

[286] In addition, the UN was already involved in a peacekeeping mission in the Balkans through the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR). A contingent of 16,000 troops fulfilled the UN Security Council Resolution 743 of February 21, 1992 that was primarily focused on delivering humanitarian aid and monitoring the conditions in Croatia and eventually in Bosnia as well.

[287] Only when the Constitutional Court declared the legality of this action in 1994 could Germany support a military enforcement of a solution in the Balkans. In addition to the existing political culture and public opinion in the country, this legal question contributed to Germany's low profile in diplomatic initiatives after the initial recognition phase.

[288] The United States were especially worried about the Bosnian Muslims and the government in Sarajevo that was losing the war on the ground and needed to be protected from an unjust peace settlement from Washington's point of view. For more details of the intra-U.S. debate of this issue see "U.S. will not push Muslims to accept Bosnia Peace Plan," *NYT* (4 February 1993) and "Clinton and Mulroney fault Balkan Peace Plan," *NYT* (6 February 1993). See also the insightful interview with Lord Owen in which he addresses the claim that his plan rewards Serbian aggression "The Future of the Balkans. An interview with David Owen," *FA* 72.2 (March/April 1993), 1-9.

Without strong support of the United States or any viable enforcement scheme from other actors, the chances of success for the Vance-Owen plan were very limited. Being up against a lack of transatlantic unity on this issue, the negotiators, however, continued their talks throughout March/April of 1993 and were able to reach interim agreements on the plan from the Muslim and Croat side. When the Bosnian Serbs refused to accept the proposed conditions, the international community imposed a tightening of the already existing economic sanctions against Yugoslavia in order to pressure them into compliance.[289] Being aware of the Western unwillingness to commit military forces to the region in which they had the upper hand on the battlefield at the time, the leadership called for a vote in the Bosnian Serb assembly to decide on the acceptance of the Vance-Owen plan. The members rejected the plan in an overwhelming majority while at the same time the Serbian military started massive campaigns against Muslim cities in Eastern Bosnia.

The unsuccessful negotiations, in addition to an intensification of fighting in the republics, called into question the merits of the Vance-Owen plan and let the United States and Europe look independently from each other for solutions to contain if not solve the conflict.[290] Coming under domestic pressure in light of daily reports of displacement and crimes against humanity in former Yugoslavia, the Clinton administration decided to present its own initiative to counter the Serbian predominance in the ongoing conflict.[291] Without significant prior consultations in the ICFY or with its European partners, Washington tabled its "lift and strike" proposal in April 1993, thereby effectively diminishing any last hope for implementation of the Vance-Owen scheme. In essence, Bill Clinton proposed to lift the UN arms embargo that had been in effect since September 25, 1991 (Resolution 713) and threatened air strikes if the Serbs tried to prevent the other ethnic groups from receiving the new arms or training. The President's initiative was motivated by an attempt to level the military playing field in the Balkans, as the arms embargo had primarily benefited the Bosnian Serbs given their access to the inventories of the Yugoslav army.

When U.S. Secretary of State Warren Christopher was sent to Europe to gauge support for this policy, he only received harsh criticism from Washington's long-standing allies. The reason was not only the perceived undermining of a European peace effort through this initiative and the previous U.S. absence in the negotiations, but equally important was the fear that the infusion of new arms would cause a chain reaction of more violence in the region. Especially the governments in Paris and London denounced the U.S. plan as they were concerned about potential retaliatory attacks against their stationed troops in Croatia and Bosnia. The EC Foreign Ministers' meeting on May 10, 1993 in Brussels reinforced this criticism of the U.S. proposal officially, but also invited Washington to participate in an attempt to create a limited number of safe areas in order to prevent further bloodshed in much contested areas. President Bill Clinton was faced with two options: either pursuing his own strategy and consequently taking on prime responsibility for Bosnia or supporting an unwanted European proposal that did not necessitate

---

[289] The first economic sanctions of the EC reached back as far as November 1991 and were endorsed by UN resolution 757 (May 30, 1992). The UN Security Council Resolutions 787 (November 16, 1992) and 820 (April 17, 1993) reinforced and aggravated the sanctions regime. For a comprehensive overview, please consult Julie Kim. *Economic Sanctions and the Former Yugoslavia: Current Status and Policy Considerations through 1996* (Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, 16 December 1996).

[290] Even though the UN Security Council passed resolution 816 on enforcing the no fly zone over Bosnia, it was obvious that the transatlantic partners lacked a common conflict resolution approach causing enormous strain in their relationship.

[291] The role of the media played a crucial role in driving domestic public opinion especially in the United States. The phenomenon of the "CNN effect," i.e. pressuring governments into action due to the daily atrocities committed in the Balkans that their citizens would see on their TV screen, revealed the paradox of moral pressure to act without a strategic national interest to do so. Using the example of Clinton's lift and strike proposal, Thomas Friedman elaborates on this dichotomy in his article "Any war in Bosnia would carry a domestic price," *NYT* (2 May 1993).

Western use of force. President Clinton decided to pursue the latter option in an effort also to ease the already strained transatlantic relationship.

Containment became the overriding principle of international diplomacy for the Balkans case in this particular phase. With conflict resolution attempts being stalled in the multilateral bodies, a few powerful countries tried to move ahead and offer measures that would restrain the conflict to the local theater. The result of these efforts was the Joint Action Plan, an arrangement that was brokered between the United States, Russia, Spain, Britain, and France on May 22, 1993. The most important terms of agreement were the following:

- Continued enforcement of already existing conflict prevention and resolution measures, including economic and financial sanctions, the no fly-zone over Bosnia as well as humanitarian relief assistance;
- Rapid establishment of a war crimes tribunal;
- Implementation of the safe areas concept;
- Increased international presence in the Former Yugoslav republic of Macedonia and in Kosovo in order to contain the conflict;
- Placement of international monitors on the Serbian border to ensure compliance of the international arms embargo.[292]

On the part of the U.S. administration, this agreement was not an expression of a change of heart in the belief of a necessary more robust Bosnia policy ("lift and strike"), but was motivated by the desire to close an emerging transatlantic gap by allocating the leadership role to the Europeans.[293] Therefore, the Joint Action Plan was an excellent example of international diplomacy on the Balkans in 1993 in which the unity of the Western alliance took priority over a forceful response to the actions on the ground.

The intensification of fighting in the early fall of 1993 and especially the ongoing siege of Sarajevo, which led to a serious deterioration of living conditions within the city called for additional measures to force the warring parties to agree on a cease-fire and open the door for meaningful negotiations. In a remarkable display of seesaw politics, the Clinton administration returned under these circumstances to its original battlefield policy of threatening air strikes against the Bosnian Serbs if they continued the strangulation of Sarajevo, the attacks on UN personnel and blocked the transport of humanitarian goods within Bosnia. In circumventing the EC/UN channel (and the ICFY), Washington called on NATO, more precisely the North Atlantic Council (NAC), to discuss the issue and agree on a joint U.S.-EU strategy under this umbrella. This U.S. decision was also motivated by the understanding that the most successful military of alliance of the 20th century could not be standing on the sidelines in addressing a conflict on its very own borders.

Similar to the lift and strike debate earlier in the year, the European positions clashed with the American one on the issue of retaliatory attacks against stationed troops on the ground after threatened or executed air strikes. After eleven hours of negotiations in the NAC on August 2,

---

[292] *Text of Joint Action Program Released by the Office of the Spokesman* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of State, 22 May 1993).

[293] In addition, this particular policy move was much contested within the various branches of the U.S. government as well as within President Clinton's inner circle. On the details of U.S. policy in this particular phase and the complete run-up to the Dayton agreement, please consult Ivo H. Daalder. *Getting to Dayton. The Making of America's Bosnia Policy* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 2000).

1993, a consensus was reached that allowed for NATO-operated air strikes, but only under very limited conditions. In the face of European opposition, the U.S. administration had to make concessions to its original proposal; most importantly, that NATO and the UN needed to authorize those missions jointly before they could go into effect. This dual key arrangement was a compromise not only to the concerns of the French and British governments, but also to the position of the UN Secretary General as a clearing house for any military intervention in the Balkans. In the words of the final NAC press communiqué:

> In particular, the (North Atlantic) Council agrees with the position of the UN Secretary General that the first use of air power in the theatre shall be authorized by him. With respect to NATO, the NAC shall be the political authority that will decide on the conduct of air strikes, which will be carried out in coordination with the UN.[294]

Even though this agreement was able to generate a short term success in the sense that it forced Bosnian Serbian troops to loosen their grip of Sarajevo and prevented a deterioration of the humanitarian crisis, it proved to be a major stumbling block in future attempts to use air power in punitive strikes given the complex authorization process.

After this international consensus on the appropriate means of military deterrence against the (Bosnian) Serbs, the search for a long-tem viable solution to the ongoing conflict moved again to the top of the priority list. Under the leadership of Lord Owen and Thorvald Stoltenberg, the former Norwegian foreign minister who had replaced Cyrus Vance after the fading of the Vance-Owen plan, negotiations with the parties had started during the summer and moved to the forefront of the conflict resolution efforts in early fall. The result, the Owen-Stoltenberg proposal, stipulated the establishment of a "Union of Republics of Bosnia and Herzegovina," in which the republics were autonomous, with their own constitution and democratically elected government.[295] While a rotating presidency would serve as the unifying element of the confederation, the plan foresaw a de facto tripartite partition of Bosnia.

In a first round of deliberations, the parties were able to agree on the basics of a constitutional framework – however, when it came to questions such as the size of individual republics or the status of Sarajevo, the negotiators were unable to find a common denominator. Bosnian Muslims and Serbs alike criticized the proposal, although for different reasons: while the Muslims lamented their envisioned decrease of power given the creation of three republics and therefore the abolishment of a central government, the Bosnian Serbs were not willing to give up a significant amount of territory that currently was under their control. Without credible enforcement provisions and the political will to commit troops to the monitoring of an agreement, the Owen-Stoltenberg proposal suffered the same fate as its predecessors, being unable to rally the warring parties around a plan that would bring peace to the region.[296]

---

[294] NATO. *Decisions Taken at the Meeting of the North Atlantic Council on 9th August 1993, Press Release* (Brussels: North Atlantic Council, 9 August 1993), 52.

[295] "Nach dem Scheitern des Vance-Owen-Friedensplans. Der Westen findet sich offenbar mit der Teilung Bosniens ab," *SZ* (19 June 1993).

[296] A similar outcome was kept in store for the short-lived EU Action Plan of November 1993 that threatened the Muslims with a loss of international support unless they were willing to accept concessions on territorial questions. It also incentivized the Bosnian Serbs to do the same by offering a partially lifting of sanctions upon compliance. Stemming from a bilateral French-German initiative, the plan fizzled out eventually due to a lack of European willingness to commit meaningful military resources behind it. However, it was noteworthy for the territorial formula 51:49 that emerged during the negotiations, i.e. the Serbian acceptance of receiving 49% of the Bosnian territory in exchange for peace.

At the end of 1993, the international community and most prominently Europe, the driver of policy in the last twelve months, looked at a sobering status quo. Even though several policy initiatives with a variety of conflict resolution schemes had been tabled, the situation on the ground had deteriorated seriously and a comprehensive peace plan was far from within reach. Given the less than perfect track record of European diplomacy, its dominance in the negotiations was called into question and soon to be taken over by the United States. The fault had not been Europe's alone, as its peace efforts during this period had been seriously hindered by a lack of consistency in international action. Even with all the outrage about the ongoing humanitarian catastrophe in Bosnia, the national interests of the West were not grave enough to mandate military action.

VI.4 Enter Washington: Pre-Dayton Peace Efforts

Even though this dynamic of humanitarian catastrophe in the region vs. Western national interest remained intact for the following months, the appearance of the United States as an important force in the conflict resolution efforts increased the pressure on all actors to find a solution. Washington only gradually assumed a stronger leadership role in the handling of the conflict, as it was caught in a web of conflicting interests that hampered a forceful policy of engagement in the Balkans. While a majority consensus had emerged in the Clinton administration that the status quo after the unsuccessful Owen-Stoltenberg plan was unacceptable, the level of engagement was still under review and only developed into a meaningful change of U.S. policy through the events in 1994. Similar to the Europeans, the Clinton administration was mindful of its relationship to an internally unstable Russia under the leadership of Boris Yeltsin, as well as to the reaction of its own domestic audience if the U.S. became militarily involved in the region.

The shelling of the Markala marketplace in Sarajevo on February 5, 1994, in which a Bosnian Serb mortar killed 68 people and injured over two hundred forced the United States to a more active stance. While the January 1994 Brussels NATO Summit had already threatened the Bosnian Serbs with air strikes in response to non-compliance with UN Security Council resolutions, the alliance now mandated that all heavy artillery had to be removed from around Sarajevo within the following ten days. At the end of the ultimatum on February 20, the Bosnian Serbs had complied with the stipulations of the NATO demand, most prominently to clear their heavy weaponry within a radius of twenty kilometres from Sarajevo. This incident had not only important psychological ramifications on the international community, visible in the harsh condemnations on both sides of the Atlantic, but it also led to a more active engagement of Russia in the Balkans. Compared to the supporting roles that Moscow and Washington had played throughout 1993, they now were willing to invest more political capital of their own to find a solution.

From Clinton's point of view, the February incident was further proof that the Bosnian Serbs were prime aggressors in the conflict and consequently mandated that the military playing field in the Balkans had to be levelled in order to counter Pale's predominance in this area. Being especially concerned about the Bosnian Muslims, Washington had undertaken a diplomatic initiative behind the scenes since winter 1994/1995 to explore a cooperation of Bosnian Croats and Muslims. Through the prism of the Markala massacre, these efforts became of special relevance, were reinforced and bore fruit in the creation of a Muslim-Croat Federation in those Bosnian territories held by either of their troops. While the two parties agreed on a customs union, constitutional provisions and territorial matters, the main purpose of the settlement was to end any fighting between Bosnian Croats and Muslims and to create an effective alliance, which

had control over 1/3 of the Bosnian territory at the time, against the Bosnian Serbs. With the so called Washington Agreement, which was signed by the parties on March 18, 1995, the United States achieved its first significant diplomatic success in the Balkans since the outbreak of the war.

Further proof of – if at times reluctant – U.S. leadership came with the creation of the Contact Group on April 25, 1994 as the main forum for consultations and conflict resolution efforts of the international community. Actively pursued by Washington, the Contact Group was a structural response to past EC/UN negotiation efforts that had failed and was tasked "to eliminate alliance disunity and to avoid sending contradictory signals to the warring factions, problems that had plagued earlier initiatives."[297] Through the representation of the United States, Russia, France, the UK and Germany it constituted a circle of the most powerful members of the OSCE, the EU, NATO and UN that took on the challenge of spearheading the negotiations. In an effort to streamline their positions, the Contact Group members started to immediately discuss how a joint peace could look like, as well as what issues needed to be dealt with first, and then subsequently engaged in consultations with the parties.

In its deliberations, the Contact Group had come to a consensus that the map should be in the center of attention during the first round of negotiations. It approached this crucial issue with the formula of 51-49, which stipulated that 51% of the territory would go to the Muslin-Croat Federation and the Bosnian Serbs would receive 49%. Even though this ratio had been tabled during the EU Action plan in November 1993 and had found Bosnian Muslim agreement, as long as they could have a say in which territories would be part of their portion, the proposal constituted a major shift in U.S. policy and a break with the ICFY's principle of territorial integrity. The reason outlines Ivo Daalder: "The map accepted the de facto division of Bosnia, long the aim of the Serbs and a premise of European effort, but antithetical to the idea of a multiethnic and territorially intact Bosnia."[298] While the United States had budged on this issue, it was not willing to change its position on the sanction regime against the Bosnian Serbs; the European members of the Contact Group advocated to offer Pale a gradual lifting of sanctions in exchange for compliance with provisions of the envisioned plan, whereas Washington wanted to make the end of fighting a non-negotiable condition for this move.[299]

Notwithstanding disagreements about the sanctions regime, the Contact Group presented a map of future Bosnia on a take-it or leave-it basis to the parties on July 6, 1994 and offered a series of sticks and carrots for the Bosnian Croat-Muslim Federation and the Bosnian Serbs, among which granting financial assistance for the former, a lifting or tightening of sanctions for the latter and the future of the arms embargo for both were the most important tools. While the Federation approved of the plan after diplomatic pressure from the international community, the Bosnian Serbs remained unwilling to compromise even when Serbian President Milosevic announced the severing of economic ties and the closing of the border on August 4, 1994.[300] The main reason for Bosnian Serb non-compliance was that they did not see their demand for political autonomy

---

[297] Jutta Paczulla, "The long, difficult road to Dayton. Peace efforts in Bosnia-Herzegovina," *International Journal* 60.1 (Winter 2004/2005), 259. Obviously, this led to criticism from representatives of the existing negotiation efforts as Pauline Neville-Jones observes: "The creation of the Contact Group in April 1994 caused many ruffled feathers, especially in the EU, where it appeared to displace the role of the presidency and troika in conducting Union diplomacy." Pauline Neville-Jones, "Dayton, IFOR and Alliance Relations in Bosnia," *Survival* 38.4 (Winter 1996/1997), 46.
[298] Daalder. *Getting to Dayton,* 30.
[299] Germany was the only notable exception of this pattern as it sided oftentimes with the United States on questions of the lifting of sanctions and the arms embargo. As it had no troops on the ground it was able to take this position and also made an effort to find compromises between the European and American positions.
[300] See David B. Ottaway, "Bosnian Serb reply to peace plan," *WP* (21 July 1994) and John Pomfret, "Yugoslavia orders end of ties to Bosnian Serbs. Milosevic assails leaders for rejection of peace plan," *WP* (5 August 1994).

and territorial unity reconciled in the plan. Furthermore, the inability of the Contact Group members to find a unified position on the lifting of the arms embargo or the details of a Western military intervention proved to be major stumbling blocks for pressuring the Bosnian Serbs into an agreement under this framework.[301]

This fundamental disagreement between the United States and its European allies soured not only internal negotiations on the right way forward in Bosnia, but also had serious repercussions for transatlantic relations as a whole. These even deteriorated more when President Clinton, under domestic pressure from the newly elected Republican Congress, lifted unilaterally the arms embargo on November 10, 1994 and exposed the region to an influx of new weapons potentially harmful to the (European and other nations) UNPROFOR personnel on the ground.[302] The European reaction was overwhelmingly and overtly critical of this decision. As an immediate response, the French and British government publicly threatened to withdraw their forces from the existing peacekeeping mission as they were not willing to shoulder the main burden in the regional theater under these new circumstances. Washington's unilateral move also put the cohesion of the Atlantic alliance and the future of NATO on top of the agenda. The most successful military alliance of the 20th century suddenly found itself in a state of paralysis in this phase given the lack of consensus among its members.

With trust fading and the potential dissolution of NATO over the Bosnian crisis, the Clinton administration decided to put NATO unity first given its importance for U.S. foreign policy. Hence, the President informed U.S. allies and Congress on December 7, 1994 that the United States were prepared to commit 25,000 U.S. soldiers to the efforts in the Balkans in three specific scenarios: to implement a negotiated peace agreement, support a potential withdrawal of European troops or to help in an emergency extraction of a UN unit under attack. Washington had come to the realization that it had little if no leverage on the transatlantic decision-making process without the commitment of U.S. troops. By pledging its own soldiers under certain conditions, Washington had made another important step toward more forceful engagement in the Balkans.[303] At the end of another year, and the fate of the Balkans continuing to be in the fog of war, it was still uncertain to which mission the U.S. would send troops.

At the beginning of 1995, it appeared as if the withdrawal option was the one that would bring U.S. soldiers to the Balkans. Not only had Croatian President Tudjman threatened on January 12 that he would not extend the UNPROFOR mandate, which was up for renewal in March 1995, but Bosnian Serb forces had also repeatedly broken the December 1994 cease fire negotiated by former U.S. President Carter, thereby casting further doubt on the viability of the ongoing peacemaking mission. A new diplomatic initiative of the Contact Group in February 1995, in which the international negotiators offered the immediate suspension of sanctions in return for

---

[301] Further transatlantic ruptures were caused by the handling of the Bosnian Serb attack on the UN safe area Bihac after Bosnian Muslims had launched an offensive against their enemies' troops. Being concerned about a major escalation of the war, the United States lobbied successfully within the dual key arrangements for air strikes against a number of Bosnian Serbian targets. As retaliation, Bosnian Serbs detained UN peacekeepers and stopped the movement of other UN personnel within the territory that they controlled at the time. This episode exemplified a fundamental disconnect within the transatlantic alliance: while the United States were advocating for further air strikes, the Europeans did not want to put their troops on the ground in danger. From a European point of view only a massive influx of U.S. troops could give Washington's demands credibility and justice. In the end, the air strikes did not resume — leaving NATO and the UN looking indecisive and weak.

[302] Michael R. Gordon, "President orders end to enforcing Bosnian embargo," *NYT* (11 November 1994). Craig R. Whitney, "Move on Bosnia by U.S. alarms allies in NATO," *NYT* (12 November 1994). The lifting of the arms embargo would come up again in the course of 1995, when it became public that the Clinton administration had turned a blind eye toward shipments of Iranian weapons in support of the Bosnian Muslims. Daniel Williams/Thomas W. Lippman, "U.S. is allowing Iran to arm Bosnia Muslims," *WP* (14 April 1995).

[303] Douglas Jehl, "25,000 U.S. troops to aid UN force if it quits Bosnia," *NYT* (9 December 1994).

recognition of Croatia and Bosnia as well as the endorsement of the Contact Group plan for a settlement in Bosnia was also a non-starter as the Bosnian Serbs continued to be unwilling to return to the negotiation table.[304] Their focus, as well as that of the Federation, was on the battlefield in the early months of the year as both parties were getting ready for an intensification of the fighting once the weather conditions approved.

Despite several diplomatic initiatives in the past four years, these ensuing fights were needed to create the preconditions for a settlement at the end of 1995. Following an established pattern from the previous year, the Bosnian Serbs continued to show their disdain for the UN when they violated the NATO-guaranteed heavy weapons zone around Sarajevo and started shelling the city on May 25/26. NATO reacted with retaliatory air strikes against munitions depots outside of Pale until Bosnian Serb forces took UN personnel hostage and used them as human shields in order to prevent further bombing.[305] This provocation can be seen as a tipping point in European thinking on how militarily robust the international community needed to address the Balkan crisis, as Sabrina P. Ramet outlines:

> Although the UN shortly negotiated the release of its peacekeepers, albeit amid rumors that in exchange for their release local UN commanders had pledged never to use NATO airpower in Bosnia again, the humiliation was an object lesson to advocates of the "soft touch". The immediate impact was to prompt policymakers in Britain, France and other countries to establish a mobile "rapid reaction" force.[306]

Stemming from French President Chirac's camp, the 12,500 soldier strong, heavily armed rapid reaction force was tasked after its inception on June 16, 1995 to open a six-mile corridor from Sarajevo airport to the Bosnian controlled part of Sarajevo and to be helpful in redeploying and protecting peacekeeping forces.

In addition to a more militarily robust European involvement in the Balkans, the Bosnian Muslim/Croatian campaign that had been ongoing since the spring of 1995 served as a decisive element in changing the balance of power in Bosnia. Within only a short timeframe in the summer and early fall of 1995, the Croat forces were able to claim back territories that they had lost at very early stages in the war and also broke the psychological momentum of the Bosnian Serbian forces, which had earned a reputation of being invincible. Through its well-planned attacks under the name of "Operation Storm," the Muslim-Croat forces exposed the Bosnian Serb stronghold in North-Western Bosnia, created a homogenous Croat territory and increased their territorial holdings to more than 50% in Bosnia by the end of September.[307] Being in retreat on this front, the Bosnian Serbs concentrated their efforts on Eastern Bosnia and sought compensation of their losses by overrunning the UN safe areas Srebrenica and Zepa killing almost 8,000 Bosnian Muslims in the process.

---

[304] Daniel Williams, "U.S. revises approach to sanctions on Serbia; Administration tries long-shot bid for peace," *WP* (15 February 1995); Roger Cohen, "Serb leader rejects U.S.-backed proposal," *NYT* (21 February 1995).

[305] Roger Cohen, "NATO jets bomb arms depot at Bosnian Serb headquarters," *NYT* (26 May 1995); Roger Cohen, "Conflict in the Balkans: In Bosnia U.S. set to offer aid to reinforce UN Bosnia troops. Serbs now see peacemakers as the enemy," *NYT* (31 May 1995).

[306] Sabrina P. Ramet. *Balkan Babel. The Disintegration of Yugoslavia from the Death of Tito to the War in Kosovo* (Boulder: Westview, 1999), 235.

[307] While most European governments criticized the Croatian campaigns for employing military tools to tilt the balance in their favor in the process also increasing the amount of this time Bosnian Serb refugees, the United States and Germany expressed that a peaceful solution would have been preferable, but in essence were satisfied with seeing the Bosnian Serbs in retreat for the first time in the war.

As on previous occasions, NATO responded with a series of air raids against Bosnian Serb positions – this time, however, under a simplified regime after the Contact Group members had authorized NATO exclusively to determine when air strikes were appropriate as a retaliatory means in their London conference of July 27. The same tool came into play after Bosnian Serb forces again shelled Sarajevo on August 28, 1995, killing 37 people. The Atlantic Alliance immediately launched Operation Deliberate Force with more than 60 aircrafts that targeted Bosnian Serb missile and radar sites as well as ammunition depots and communication facilities. The attacks had the desired effect on Pale, as Thomas H. Henriksen describes: "Confronted by a modest air assault and the dramatically conditions on the ground, the Bosnian Serbs scaled back their territorial demands and became more amenable to NATO conditions."[308] In other words, only when the military balance of power had been shifted against Pale, was the Bosnian Serb leadership willing to return to serious negotiations on the basis of Washington's endgame strategy that had emerged during the fall of 1995.

VI.5 The Endgame and Beyond: Bosnia's Implications for the Transatlantic Relationship

Under the leadership of National Security Advisor Anthony Lake, the White House had been working on a new Bosnia strategy for President Clinton that would enable him to do justice to his role as a leader of NATO and within the UN without pursuing a unilateral course that could cause additional ruptures within the transatlantic alliance. To stop the Bosnian war had become more than a conflict resolution effort, as the credibility of the United States as a world power was running the risk to being damaged. From a domestic point of view, given the timetable of the presidential election in the fall of 1996, Bill Clinton wanted this complicated foreign policy matter resolved before the voters cast their ballots. After a lengthy inter-agency process and several high-level meetings of cabinet officials with the President, the specifics of an U.S. endgame strategy for Bosnia were determined. Following previous role models, the Clinton plan envisioned a combination of carrots and sticks in case of (non-)compliance with the various points of the initiative.

Most importantly, Washington's proposal included the call for a mutual recognition of Croatia, Bosnia and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, a comprehensive peace settlement along the lines of the earlier Contact Group plan and the suggestion for a constitutional framework of a united Bosnia. As an incentive structure, the White House announced sanctions relief for Yugoslavia as well as economic assistance after a successful settlement. In case this plan would not find approval by the parties, the United States foresaw UNPROFOR's withdraw from the region and explained what steps it would take under this probable scenario. First, Washington was prepared to lobby for a multilateral lifting of the arms embargo within the UN; second, it would work toward the presence of a multinational force to assist the Bosnian Muslims in defending their territory; third, it was prepared to provide arms and training to the Bosnian Muslims to level the military playing field; and finally, it would see to the enforcement of the no-fly zone and conduct air strikes in case of Bosnian Serb attacks.

During Lake's trip to European capitals shortly after the inter-agency agreement on the proposal, the National Security Advisor explained that the U.S. sought support from its long-standing partners for this strategy, but that the President of the United States had made a decision to

---

[308] Thomas H. Hendriksen. *Clinton's Foreign Policy in Somalia, Bosnia, Haiti and North Korea* (Stanford: Stanford University, 1996), 18.

implement this plan with or without consent, approval, or assistance from his allies. While the Europeans did not agree with every aspect of the strategy, the overall reaction was positive, let alone the fact that the U.S. was now heavily engaged in working toward a solution of the issue. President Clinton had finally come to the conclusion that the U.S. needed to lead the international community in this cause – the potential damage to NATO, military developments on the ground in the fall of 1995, as well as the prospect of having to deploy U.S. troops merely to oversee the humiliating withdraw of UN forces from the region were all important factors in his decision to make this commitment.[309]

With the assignment of Richard Holbrooke as the lead negotiator of the United States on August 14, 1995, the White House sent another powerful signal that it was determined to invest significant political capital and resources to end the war. Holbrooke immediately engaged in a fierce shuttle diplomacy effort to force the parties back to the negotiation table in order to find a joint solution on the contested issues. The U.S. negotiator was able to achieve a break through early on in arranging the first meeting in two years of the foreign ministers of Yugoslavia, Bosnia and Croatia in Geneva on September 8, 1995. The parties were able to agree on a series of basic principles that would become the core of the Dayton negotiations and made the ceasefire of October 5, 1995 possible. The details of this historic agreement were as follows:

1. Bosnia and Herzegovina will continue its legal functioning within the present borders and will be internationally recognized.

2. Bosnia and Herzegovina will consist of two entities. The Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina established by the Washington Agreement of 1994 and the Republic Srpska.

   - The ratio of 51:49 of the territorial proposal of the Contact Group is a foundation of the agreement. That territorial proposal is open for changes resulting from the joint agreements.
   - Either entity will continue to function with their respective constitutions (amended in the manner to these basic principles).
   - Either entity will have the right to establish special parallel relations with neighboring countries in conformity with sovereignty and territorial integrity of Bosnia and Herzegovina.
   - Either entity will take over reciprocal obligations (a) to hold the elections at all levels under international supervision; (b) to adopt and obey common international standards of human rights and obligations, including the obligation to allow the freedom of moving and enable dislocated people to regain the right on their houses or be justly compensated; to be involved in the binding arbitrage to resolve mutual disputes.

3. The entities have principally agreed on the following:

   - To appoint a Commission for Dislocated Persons entitled to fulfill (with the assistance of international entities) the obligations of either entity to enable dislocated persons to regain the right on their homes or be justly compensated.

---

[309] On an operational level, the withdrawal of UN peacekeepers from exposed positions in order to prevent them from being taken hostage in retaliation for NATO air strikes contributed to a sense of clarifying the situation on the ground. On the same token, President Milosevic's announcement of August 14, 1995 that he would be the spokesperson for a to be established joint Yugoslav-Bosnia Serb delegation in all future peace talks was a significant step toward simplifying the ongoing negotiation efforts.

- To establish a Commission of Bosnia and Herzegovina for Human Rights in order to fulfill the obligation of either entity to respect human rights. Either entity will stick to the decisions of the Commission.
- To establish public enterprises of Bosnia and Herzegovina which would have in their possessions and manage with traffic and other infrastructures for the benefit of either entity. They will jointly finance those enterprises.
- To appoint a Commission for Conservation of National Monuments.
- To work out and apply the system of arbitrage for resolving disputes between the two entities.[310]

Using these agreed upon principles as the starting point for further detailed negotiations, the negotiation team benefited also from the resolution of formerly strongly contested territorial issues, through events on the battlefield in the process of the Croatian military campaign.

Notwithstanding the neutralization of these disputes, the agenda at the beginning of the Dayton peace talks at the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in Ohio still was overwhelmingly complex. To break down the various disagreements between the warring parties into manageable segments, the structure of the negotiations was composed of four primary issue areas: the drafting of an internal map of Bosnia (among other points the future status of Sarajevo, Gorazde as well as the Posavina pocket); the Bosnian Serb withdrawal from Eastern Slavonia; the strengthening of the Croat-Muslim federation, and; the solution to legal as well as constitutional issues. In addition to these core elements, there were also sub-sets of negotiations focusing on the implementation of the envisioned peace settlement as well as detailed planning on economic reconstruction efforts following an agreement.

As Richard Holbrooke describes in his record, the negotiations were multi-layered, complicated and interminable as the parties looked for a compromise that could end the war and create durable stability.[311] While representatives of the Contact Group nations were present and involved in some deliberations, the U.S. negotiation team served as the lead negotiation team looking for consensus between the parties from the region led by President Slobodan Milosevic for Serbia, President Franco Tudjman for Croatia and Bosnian President Alija Izetbegovic.[312] Even though the talks were on the verge of collapsing several times, the Contact Group delegations stayed on course to find a comprehensive peace settlement.[313] Two factors were crucial for the international community's eventual success at Dayton: First, the U.S. made clear from the beginning that it was looking for a solution to the conflict and would use all means at its disposal to pressure the warring parties into compliance. Second, Tudjman and Milosevic were willing to negotiate outstanding territorial issues in a good faith effort. Particularly noteworthy was the Serbian President's concession on the city of Sarajevo, which had been at the center of three years of intensive fighting. "Milosevic decided the issue of Sarajevo unilaterally by conceding to Izetbegovic that the Muslims deserved to control both the city and a portion of the surrounding hills, thus transferring to Muslim control militarily, politically, and symbolically

[310] Contact Group. *Agreed Basic Principles* (Geneva, 8 September 1995).
[311] Richard Holbrooke. *To End a War* (New York: The Modern Library, 1999).
[312] The German Contact Group representative Wolfgang Ischinger had received from Bonn the instruction to promote a solution that would enable the return of Yugoslav refugees to their homeland.
[313] Ischinger considers Germany's contribution to the peaceful settlement crucial in the areas of refugee policy, arms control, the mandate of the High Commissioner as well as in the implementation of the civilian provisions of the settlement. See Auswärtiges Amt. *Deutsche Aussenpolitik 1995. Auf dem Weg zu einer Friedensregelung für Bosnien und Herzegovina: 53 Telegramme aus Dayton. Eine Dokumentation* (Bonn: Auswärtiges Amt, 1998), 34.

important territories."[314] In return, Tudjman gave up the Muslim demand on gaining control over land in the Posavina region.

After several additional compromises on the composition of the map and the other provisions, the negotiations came to a successful close on November 21, 1995, followed by the formal signing of the Dayton Agreement in Paris on December 14, 1995.[315] Reflecting the complexity of the negotiations, the document consisted of an umbrella document, eleven annexes and 102 maps outlining the details of the agreement as well as the roles and responsibilities of the former warring parties and the international community. The most important commitment of the international community came with the creation of a NATO implementation force (IFOR) that was tasked to enforce compliance with the regulations set forth in the agreement, such as the relocation of all heavy weapons, controlling Bosnian air space, and the withdrawal of forces. Replacing the UN-led troops in the region, the United States took on the lion share for IFOR in committing 20,000 out of a total of 60,000 soldiers to the effort, thereby reinforcing its status as a European power through the NATO umbrella.[316]

With IFOR taking up its work immediately after the ink had dried on the agreement, the West uttered a sigh of relief, but also started a review process in assessing the implications of the Bosnian war for the future of international organizations and transatlantic relations. The war in the Balkans served as a prime example that inter-state relations had not become less complicated with the collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of communism in Europe. The break-up of Yugoslavia along ethnic lines came at a time when the international community hoped to secure the peace dividends after the end of the Cold War and was, therefore, caught by surprise. Events in former Yugoslavia delivered a serious blow to the high hopes associated with the just rekindled concept of collective security and multilateralism as dominating ideas for the remainder of the 20th and the 21st century.

Furthermore, it raised the important structural question of how the international community intended to reconcile the principles of state sovereignty vs. national self-determination in multi-ethnic states in the post-Cold War world. Learning from the Balkan experience, Steven L. Burg describes a potential roadmap for future conflict resolution that has to be executed on a case by case basis given the history and circumstances of the matter at hand:

> This (the Balkan war) reinforces the conclusion that, if the international community is to facilitate the peaceful settlement of such conflicts elsewhere, it must devise instrumentalities for preventing ethnic domination and safeguarding human rights in such territories. In short, principles of sovereignty, territorial integrity, and national self-determination must be integrated into a single framework for determining the legitimacy for claims to political authority. And that framework must be based on the superiority of principles of human rights and democracy.[317]

---

[314] Burg/Shoup. *War in Bosnia-Herzegovina,* 363.
[315] For different assessments of the Dayton Agreement see Craig R. Whitney, "Balkan Accord: The Overview; Balkan Foes sign peace pact, dividing an unpacified Bosnia," *NYT* (15 December 1995); Roger Cohen, "Balkan Accord: The Implications, An Imperfect Peace," *NYT* (22 November 1995); Chris Hedges, "The Balkan Peace: The Outlook; Bosnia's Checkerboard Partition; Instability more likely," *NYT* (20 March 1996); Arthur Heinrich, "Danke, Amerika! Dayton und die Deutschen," *Blätter für deutsche und internationale Politik* 41.1 (1996), 35-44.
[316] The German Bundestag also pledged the support of the Bundeswehr within IFOR and its "Operation Joint Endeavor" during its session on December 6, 1995.
[317] Steven L. Burg. *War or Peace? Nationalism, Democracy and American Foreign Policy in Post-Communist Europe* (New York: New York University, 1996), 128.

The main prerequisite to executing this strategy is the need to come to a common understanding of the type of conflict and the role of the involved parties as aggressors or victims in order to be able to agree to a set of measures to be taken in defense of human rights and democracy. One important part of the fundamental rethink on how to tackle a "Bosnian war" in the future from an operational point of view is the need for the international community and the United Nations to change the guidelines and mandates for its peacekeeping and peace enforcing operations. There was consensus among foreign policy elites on both sides of the Atlantic after Dayton that only a robust mandate in which UN personnel could defend its mission's goals, if need be with military means, was a valuable tool in a conflict situation like this. Personnel being used as human shields by the aggressors shattered the reputation of the UN, created hardship for its personnel, but also taught policymakers a valuable lesson that well-intended humanitarian assistance on the ground can operate against a settlement if hostages are used as political bargaining chips by the opponent in trying to achieve a better deal.

In light of the UN's inadequacies in decision-making and conflict resolution mechanisms, the Bosnian war also reinforced the value of American leadership and the need for a functioning transatlantic relationship as a motor for finding a common strategy in the international community to counteract the crisis at hand. In the given case study, this lesson was only understood after a long period of disparity among the long-standing allies. Conflicting interests, lack of coordination as well as a lack of enforcement of agreed-upon objectives and finally an unwillingness to take the initiative in the Balkans irrespective of domestic political and financial consequences disunited the United States and Europe for most of the early 1990s. This resulted in a strained relationship as well as the paralysis of Western peacemaking efforts. While the majority view in the United States did not consider the Balkans a paramount national interest and was afraid of being drawn into a prolonged conflict as in Vietnam, the EU lacked the ability to back up its proposals with credible military threats to pressure the warring parties into compliance.

Though Europe had made progress in its common foreign and security policy, it became painstakingly obvious that it was not ready to single-handedly solve the ethnic conflict on its immediate doorstep given its lack of resources, capabilities and, most importantly, will.[318] Germany was a special case in this regard as the Kohl government had kept a very low profile in actively solving the conflict after the initial recognition phase in late 1991/early 1992, given constitutional restrictions, historical involvement of German troops in the Balkans and lack of public support for an involvement. However, Bonn concentrated its main efforts on alleviating the enfolding humanitarian crisis by granting asylum to refugees from former Yugoslavia and being heavily engaged financially in humanitarian efforts on the ground.

To bring peace to the region, it required the Clinton administration to take on the responsibility of leading the international community by committing substantial political, financial and military resources. While Washington's willingness to play this traditional part in international politics only developed gradually during the early 1990s given internal debate about the role of the United States in the post-Cold War world, it was able to infuse new energy into the peace process in the Balkans once it had made a decision to spearhead the international effort. For American political scientist Simon Serfaty the Balkans case is exemplary of a trend of continued U.S. engagement on the European continent in the future:

---

[318] See chapter II.4.2.

> What the crisis in the Balkans therefore teaches, if anything, is the depth of what the cold war has accomplished. The United States can no longer go home. It can no longer pretend, or at least not for long, that there is still a dividing line between Europe's problems and America's. Even while history moved on from one war to the next, geography, too, moved across Europe's national boundaries and across the Atlantic – creating a common and civil space not only among the nation states of Europe but also between them and America.[319]

Hence, even though the geopolitical situation and the threats associated with it had changed in the post-Cold War world, the presence of the United States in Europe remained essential for stability and democracy on the continent. The anchor for future American involvement on the military and political side was and continues to be NATO, which had been at the sidelines of the Bosnian conflict at the beginning, then gradually moved into a more prominent role throughout the process, culminating in taking over the mandate to monitor the regional peace settlement through IFOR; a first in the alliance's history. Through this mission, NATO could prove the utility of the most successful multilateral military alliance in the 20th century, in a post-Cold War environment.

VII. NATO Enlargement as Transatlantic Project

VII.1. Introduction

NATO faced a significant challenge after 1990, which was created by its very own success in the second half of the 20th century. Founded in 1949 as a military counterweight against the Soviet Union, NATO was the military and political framework in which Western Europe and the United States coordinated their joint responses to Moscow's Cold War policies for forty years. With their archenemy's loss of ultimate power over its empire and its political leadership in disarray, the question about the future of NATO moved to the forefront of the Western strategic and political discourse shortly after the fall of the Berlin Wall. What conclusions had to be drawn from the different geopolitical chessboard after the end of communism in Europe? Would NATO meet its demise as other successful alliances had in the past?

In addition to a re-evaluation of its mission statement, NATO also had to address the situation of the former Warsaw Pact states that enunciated their desire to be part of the West by joining the military alliance. Both debates were mutually reinforcing in the early 1990s and led some prominent analysts to call for a double enlargement, i.e. infusing new energy and legitimacy to NATO by widening the scope of its missions (so far geographically confined) and opening its doors to new members. In this regard, Republican Senator Richard Lugar highlighted that peace

---

[319] Simon Serfaty, "America and Europe Beyond Bosnia," *The Washington Quarterly* 19.3 (Summer 1996), 39/40. From a process-oriented view, Richard Holbrooke describes how Clinton's late decision to take the lead on Bosnia played domestically and internationally as follows: "By the spring of 1995 it had become a commonplace to say that Washington's relations with our European allies were worse than at any time since the 1956 Suez crisis. (…) The Clinton Administration was severely criticized for reneging on our commitments to European security and for lowering the general priority according to foreign affairs – in short, for weak leadership in foreign policy. (…) Dayton changed this almost overnight. Criticism of President Clinton as a weak leader ended abruptly, especially in Europe and among Muslim nations. Washington was not praised for its firm leadership – or even chided by some Europeans for too much leadership. But even those who chafed at the reassertion of American power conceded, at least implicitly, its necessity." Holbrooke, *To End a War,* 361.

and security for Europe – both core missions and achievements of NATO's work in the 20th century – might have to be defended on other continents in the future. He advocated that the Western allies had to accept and adjust to these new geopolitical realities by broadening its reach: in his words, NATO had to "go out of area or out of business."[320]

Along the same lines, the German Defense Minister Volker Rühe identified the following three challenges that needed to be addressed in order to guarantee and potentially improve Europe's security situation:

> First: we must vigorously adapt the Alliance to the conditions of the future. Our objective is, and will continue to be, a just and enduring order of peace in Europe. We must therefore find an answer to the question of how we can maintain and actively promote NATO's relevance in the future.
>
> Second: we must establish the necessary link between NATO reform and the process of deepening at the same time broadening European integration. NATO and the European security and defence identity are not at odds with one another; rather they are complimentary.
>
> Third: we must realize that the projection of stability to Central and Eastern Europe is the most important current challenge facing the Euro-Atlantic community. We must develop a viable concept for meeting this strategic challenge.[321]

Defense Minister Rühe's comments show his paramount concern for the future of the whole European security architecture in which NATO plays a decisive, but not the only role. While the alliance remained the first organization that policymakers from both sides of the Atlantic turned to, the extinction of the Cold War logic allowed some in the West to question the level of U.S. engagement in Europe for the first time in half a century. This question especially was raised domestically within the United States and went to the core of the future of NATO and a potential expansion of its members. Without Washington's leadership and commitment to Europe's security, a new strategy (potentially intra-European) would have been needed after 1990.

An equally important factor in the assessment of how to secure Europe for the 21st century was Russia's role as the successor to the Soviet Union. While opinions about Russia's future policies and the right approach toward them varied dramatically in the West – wavering between granting Russia a full seat at the Western table with all rights and privileges or continuing a strategy of deterrence against it – there is no question that Moscow continued to loom large in Western considerations as a force that needed to be wrestled with in order to produce viable outcomes in and for Europe. This was nowhere more true than in the process of enlarging NATO to the East.

---

[320] See Senator Richard Lugar. *NATO: Out of Area or Out of Business. A Call for U.S. Leadership to Revive and Redefine the Alliance* (Washington, DC: Overseas Writers Club, 24 June 1993). The issue was also intensely debated in the think tank community as this chapter depicts. Some of the early assessments on NATO's necessity to change include Jeffrey Simon (ed.). *NATO: The Challenge of Change* (Washington, DC: National Defense University, 1993); Richard L. Kugler. *The Future of NATO and U.S. Policy in Europe* (Santa Monica: RAND, 1992).
[321] Volker Rühe, "Adapting the Alliance in the Face of Great Challenges," *NATO Review* 6.41 (December 1993), 3.

It was against these important strategic considerations in which the debate about NATO enlargement enfolded in the United States, Western and especially Eastern Europe in the early 1990s. The following two chapters outline the most crucial arguments for and against NATO expansion that were used in the national and international discussions by the four respective parties at the core of the debate: the United States, Germany, the Central and Eastern European candidate countries and Russia. The latter subchapters follow a process-oriented approach in order to outline in-depth how the idea of an enlarged NATO, which seemed not much more than an unreachable vision in 1991 became reality.

VII.2. The Case for NATO Enlargement

The rationale for an enlarged NATO was fuelled by different strategic considerations and political convictions on both sides of the Atlantic. Given Washington's leadership role in the alliance, the debate about the merits of an expansion was most pronounced inside the Beltway. While the following seven arguments in favor of widening the circle of member states at NATO's headquarters in Brussels were not exclusive to the American debate, they served as the core of the case for NATO enlargement among decision makers in Washington.

The first argument for NATO enlargement was embedded in the belief that this move secured the main accomplishment of the Cold War – a Europe whole and free – once and for all. Proponents of this line of thinking saw this policy initiative as a logical continuation of the U.S. policy of promoting stability and peace through good neighborly relations and a strong transatlantic security component on the European continent. Referring oftentimes to Germany's security, but also economic development once it had joined NATO on May 6, 1955, advocates highlighted the need to give the former Warsaw Pact states a potential to be part of the West in order to fill the geopolitical security vacuum between Germany and Russia. The crucial role of Central and Eastern Europe for the stability of the whole continent was outlined by Richard Holbrooke, at the time Assistant Secretary of State for European and Canadian Affairs in the U.S. State Department:

> For the first time in history, the nations of this region have the chance simultaneously to enjoy stability, freedom, and independence based on another first: the adoption of Western democratic ideals as a common foundation for all of Europe. (…) The West must expand to central Europe as fast as possible in fact as well as in spirit, and the United States is ready to lead the way. Stability in central Europe is essential to general European security, and it is far from assured.[322]

The need to use this unique window of opportunity was strongly reinforced by the second line of reasoning for NATO enlargement. For many in the American (and European) political elite, the process of bringing Central and Eastern European nations into the alliance was a way to alleviate historic wrongdoings that were alluded to by the labels "Munich" and "Yalta". The collective failure of the West to stop Hitler's war of aggression (most notably symbolized by the Munich agreement of 1938 whose provisions tried to appease the dictator) and the compromises at the

---

[322] Holbrooke, "America, A European Power," 41/42. For a similar argument, see also Robert E. Hunter, "Enlargement: Part of a Strategy for Projecting Stability into Central Europe," *NATO Review* 43.3 (May 1995), 3-8 and Strobe Talbott, "Why NATO Should Grow," *New York Review of Books* (August 10, 1995), 27-30.

Yalta conference in February 1945 in which the allies granted Stalin's request to exercise control over Poland were considered decisive historic events leading to Soviet control over the region after the end of the Second World War. Regardless of how historians evaluated these agreements within a larger framework of objectives at the time, several stakeholders in the NATO enlargement debate derived from this past a moral imperative to securely anchor the former Warsaw Pact states in the West while the chance was at hand.

Third, proponents of this policy initiative argued that it guaranteed the United States a continued and enhanced footprint in Europe.[323] In their view, the lessons of the first half of the 20th century that had led to a strong U.S. commitment on the continent were still valid – Washington continued to be of utmost importance in preventing any re-emergence of nationalist tendencies in Europe that could once more lead to aggression and war. Even though this argument was based on historic analogies rather than an immediate concern about the policies of European nations in the 1990s, it nevertheless played an important – if sometimes unspoken – role in U.S. strategic thinking. Former National Security Advisor to Jimmy Carter, Zbigniew Brzezinski, referred to Germany as a keystone state in this matter by outlining "that the absorption of Central European nations into NATO resolved a problem that was considered impolite to mention: the 'disproportionate power' of Germany."[324]

In a continuation of Cold War logic, the U.S. presence was hence required to keep German power (and its potential aspirations down the road) in check in order to secure a stable European house. Once admitted, the addition of several Central and Eastern European states would prove to be beneficial in this regard, as NATO's consensus driven decision-making structure would force all existing members to listen to them, thereby further negating any power politics from larger European states within the alliance. In other words, through the inclusion of former Warsaw Pact states that only recently had won their freedom back, predominantly as a result of the steadfastness of American leadership, the strategic position of the United States within NATO and Europe as a whole would be further upgraded.

The fourth group of advocates saw in NATO enlargement a diplomatic tool in order to structure the bilateral U.S.-Russia relationship after the end of the Cold War. There are two very different policy approaches that are tied to using the expansion of the alliance as a way to come to terms with Moscow after the loss of its status as superpower. Most representatives of the Clinton administration belong to the first camp, which saw in enlargement an opportunity to draw Russia closer to the West. Madeleine Albright's following characterization of NATO expansion serves as an example of this view:

> NATO enlargement is not taking place in response to a new Russian threat. It is motivated by the imperative of creating an integrated Europe – one that includes, not excludes, Russia. The purpose of enlarging NATO to Eastern Europe, a region whose future stability is key to the future of Europe as a whole, is to create the same kind of security that has become commonplace in Western Europe.

---

[323] The importance of NATO for Europe was described by William E. Odom as follows: "It is precisely the American involvement in Europe, through NATO, that has provided Western Europe with what it has never had in modern times and is unlikely to attain any time soon on its own: a substitute for a supra-national political and military authority." William E. Odom, "NATO's Expansion. Why the Critics are Wrong," *The National Interest* 39 (Spring 1995), 41.

[324] Jane Perlez, "Blunt Reason for Enlarging NATO: Curbs on Germany," *NYT* (7 December 1997).

> Russia, no less than the rest of us, needs stability and prosperity in the center of Europe.[325]

In this line of thinking, NATO enlargement should be in Russia's own genuine national interest, as it improves Moscow's security position on its Eastern front and also exposes Russia to Western values and structures on its immediate doorstep, facilitating its very own transition along this role model.

The second subgroup of this category sees NATO enlargement as a means to secure the upper hand after the Soviet Union's defeat by expanding the circle of Western-minded nations to the East while Moscow is too weak to counteract this initiative. This position is often informed by an innate distrust in Russian objectives and a continued adherence to principles of deterrence and containment after the end of the Cold War. There is also an element of raw power politics involved in this logic that is prominently featured in the realist school of thinking as Adam Garfinkle outlines:

> The central argument made by realists who favour enlargement is that, in the nature of things, given its size and historical ambitions, a resurgent Russia is likely again in due course to threaten Central and Eastern Europe. (…) It is therefore best to seize the moment of opportunity and to move the line of confrontation east while Russia is weak. We should consolidate the historic outcome of 1989-91 while we can, permanently erasing the unnatural division of Europe represented by the Cold War.[326]

In other words, NATO enlargement is perceived as a time-sensitive project that will have to come to fruition before the unique window of opportunity closes and the chance to gain a hedge against the re-emergence of Russian power will be gone.

The fifth argument for NATO enlargement takes a more process-oriented view toward the (domestic) development of the candidate countries – in this rationale, opening the doors to the military alliance serves as a driver of change within Central and Eastern Europe. Acquiring NATO membership is tied to fulfilling certain criteria such as "democratic governance, free market reforms and rule of law, as well as civilian control of the military" that push candidate countries to transition themselves into "Western" societies.[327] Becoming part of the club is therefore much more than streamlining the military sector in order to enable interoperability

[325] Madeleine Albright, "Why bigger is better," *The Economist* (15 February 1997). See also Steven Greenhouse, "Clinton to tell Yeltsin that NATO is not anti-Russian," *NYT* (14 March 1995).

[326] Adam Garfinkle, "NATO Enlargement: What's the Rush," *The National Interest* 46 (Winter 1996), 102. A similar rationale for U.S. engagement in this initiative is also depicted by Stephen J. Blank: "The United States leads enlargement not mainly or solely out of idealism, but out of interest. NATO enlargement further extends U.S. leadership and security. The expansion of the democratic community of peace based on mutual interests and values remains a cornerstone of U.S. foreign policy and interests because democracy among NATO's members and its own political-military structure restrains members' and nonmembers' ability to act unilaterally. NATO membership and NATO's superior power vis-à-vis Russia thwarts other states from undertaking unilateral efforts to establish a hegemony in Europe." Stephen J. Blank. *European Security and NATO Enlargement: A View from Central Europe* (Carlisle: Strategic Studies Institute Publication, 1998), 19/20. See also Samuel Huntington's comments to the same effect in Michael Kramer, "The Case for Expanding NATO," *Time* (22 May 1995), 35.

[327] Gale A. Mattox, "NATO Enlargement: A Step in the Process of Alliance Reform," *Explaining NATO Enlargement*. Robert W. Rauchhaus (ed.) (London: Frank Cass, 2001), 107. Two early assessments of this motif can be found here Stephen J. Flanagan, "NATO and Central and Eastern Europe: From Liaison to Security Partnership," *The Washington Quarterly* 15.2 (Spring 1992), 142/149-50 and Alberto Coll, "Power, Principles and Prospects for a Cooperative International Order," *The Washington Quarterly* 16.1 (Winter 1993), 5-14.

between the own and allied forces, but requires a complete overhaul of the Central European political and economic structures with far-reaching consequences for national decision-making procedures. From this point of view, NATO enlargement is a carrot that incentivizes the potentially new members to follow an American societal role model promoting values and policies that had been at the core of the Western world for the last fifty years.

Closely tied to the promotion of internal reform in Central and Eastern European countries on its own merits is, as sixth argument, the interest of the United States and all other NATO allies to find additional partners that can contribute troops in support of ongoing and new missions. Through NATO enlargement, the alliance's collective defense abilities are boosted and long-term members are able to deflect some of their political and financial capital involved in NATO missions to other national priorities. The principle of burden-sharing that had been at the heart of NATO's strategy during the Cold War continues to apply in this regard. This paradigm is reinforced through the consensus view of existing NATO members that the door is only open for those candidates that fully accepted their duties – free-riders that attempt to benefit from NATO's privileges without contributing to the alliance's missions with their own assets will not be considered. Hence, promoters of this reasoning for the NATO expansion to the East are firm believers that alliances save money and are counting on reaping the benefits from a broadened circle of like-minded nations that coordinate jointly their defense efforts.

The seventh and final reason for Washington to lobby its European counterparts for inclusion of Central and Eastern European representatives within NATO was motivated by U.S. domestic reasons. Even though Clinton administration officials repeatedly downplayed the impact of NATO enlargement for 1996 presidential electoral purposes in those swing states of the Mid West and North East in which a strong Central and Eastern European minority was situated, the White House decided to make Detroit the place where President Clinton announced in a campaign speech the clearest timeline for NATO enlargement. He pledged that the first new members should join the alliance by 1999 at the latest.[328] In addition to securing political gain on a regional playing field, NATO expansion had become a topic on the national scale ever since the Republican Party had decided to make it part of its Contract with America prior to its landslide victory in the 1994 midterm elections. After the majorities in Congress had shifted half way through Clinton's term, both parties tried to outflank each other on NATO expansion by using the issue as a way to distinguish themselves in foreign policy matters.[329] But even before then, NATO enlargement was an appealing, forward-thinking foreign policy initiative for the White House that could counteract questions about Washington's lack of leadership in Europe in the early stages of Clinton's presidency, as James M. Goldgeier outlines:

> Politically, Clinton needed to demonstrate U.S. leadership. In 1993-1994 his administration's policy in Bosnia was failing miserably, and this failure overshadowed every other foreign policy issue at the time. Some administration officials argue that one rationale for saying something decisive (on enlargement) at the January 1994 NATO summit was precisely to show leadership in one part of Europe while the United States was doing so little in the Balkans.[330]

---

[328] News coverage of the speech can be found here Jurek Martin, "Clinton's pledge on NATO's expansion," *FT* (23 October 1996) and Michael Kranish, "Clinton sets '99 for expansion," *The Boston Globe* (23 October 1996).
[329] An in-depth description of this U.S. domestic policy battle is provided by Ronald D. Asmus. *Opening NATO's Door. How the Alliance Remade itself for a New Era* (New York: Columbia University, 2002), 85-86.
[330] James M. Goldgeier. *Not Whether but When. The U.S. Decision to Enlarge NATO* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 1999), 61.

In contrast to the wide range of domestic playing fields in the United States, the debate about NATO enlargement remained very much an elitist affair in Germany and focused on largely security and strategic considerations.[331] While Bonn shared a significant number of the expansion rationales with Washington, it put special emphasis on the argument that including new members from Central and Eastern Europe permanently improves its very own security situation in the heart of the continent. It is not surprising then that Volker Rühe was considered the most outspoken European proponent of this policy initiative by stressing the following point in support of enlargement: "Preemptive crisis management for us Germans means that we move the Western stability zone as far as possible to the East. It is not in Germany's interest to remain a state on the Eastern fringes of the Western prosperity zone."[332] By bringing in its immediate Eastern neighbors into the alliance, Bonn insured that the existing framework of Western values, policies and regulations was expanded to countries on Germany's borders, thereby reducing the impact on itself in the case of any future volatility or insecurity in the region.

A second crucial motivation to support and shape NATO's eastern expansion was a German majority view that saw the proposal as a logical continuation of Bonn's foreign policy after the end of the Second World War. The project fit perfectly into Germany's power-sharing foreign affairs approach that was characterized by trying to integrate and cooperate with its partners, while at the same time self-restraining German power in a multilateral framework. Widening the circle of allies under the NATO umbrella seemed especially worthwhile in light of the alternative to enlargement, namely the establishment of several bilateral relationships to former Warsaw Pact states that would undermine Bonn's overarching goal of promoting European integration for security, but also economic reasons.[333] Finally, it also offered an opportunity to underline Germany's reconciliation efforts with Central and Eastern European countries (especially with Poland) by serving as an advocate of these nations, which had suffered from Germany's action in the first half of the 20th century.[334]

From the candidate countries' point of view, membership in NATO was the prime facilitator and focus to satisfy their desire and interest to become part of the West. While this was also driven by the envisioned progress in the economic as well as social structures domestically, the paramount motivation to be part of the military alliance was to receive ultimate protection against any future aggression that could threaten the territorial integrity of these former Warsaw Pact states. Based on their very own history of the 20th century, Central and Eastern European policymakers wanted to ensure once and for all that their interests could not be violated by imperial policies of its neighbors. In the post-Cold War environment this concern was especially directed at the potential emergence of a revanchist Russia that in the not too distant future might pressure its neighbors into compliance as long as they were not part of a strong military alliance. In 1995, the Director of the Department of International Security in the Polish Ministry of Defense Andrzej Karkoszka described the strategic rationale for his country to join NATO as follows:

> In sum, the long-term vision of Russia's potential hegemonic desires makes it mandatory to forestall them. Central Europe's integration with NATO seems the most efficient and abiding way to hedge against future pressures from Russia. Moreover, Poland is convinced that only as a full-fledged member of the Alliance

---

[331] For instance, NATO enlargement was a non-issue in the 1994 federal election campaign that gave Helmut Kohl another four year term in the Chancellery.

[332] "Bonn wants East in updated NATO," *IHT* (8 October 1993).

[333] See also Lothar Rühl, "Deutschlands Interesse an der NATO-Osterweiterung," *IP* 11 (1996), 49-54.

[334] For further elaboration on this point please consult Peter Rudolf, "The Future of the United States as a European Power: The Case of NATO Enlargement," *European Security* 5.2 (Summer 1996), 180-183.

will she be able to cultivate the relations with her powerful neighbour without fear of domination.[335]

For all candidate countries, this argument was an emotional one, as it touched upon the very existence of their nation states, thereby complementing the geo-strategic, security and moral rationales put forward by proponents of NATO enlargement in the United States and Germany.

VII.3 The Case against NATO enlargement

Equally emotionally-charged was the Russian rejection of the alliance's plans to open its doors to Central and Eastern European countries that were situated in close proximity or even shared a border with the former superpower. While Western critics of NATO enlargement were also troubled by other aspects of the policy initiative that were non-related to Russia, the main reasons that rallied opponents to argue against an expansion of the Western alliance to the East were the Kremlin's anticipated reactions to this move. From the perspective of the Russian elites and majorities of the population, NATO enlargement was perceived as a threat, as it brought the most effective military alliance of the 20th century deep into Moscow's sphere of influence. In addition, Russian policymakers were concerned about a domino effect in the region that would align additional countries in the neighborhood with the West, thereby further minimizing the influence that Moscow could exercise on its regional security situation. In Anatol Lieven's words:

> Russians fear that NATO expansion will ultimately mean the inclusion of the Baltic States and Ukraine within NATO's sphere of influence, if not in NATO itself – and thus the loss of any Russian influence over these states and the stationing of NATO troops within striking distance of the Russian heartland.[336]

This development would not only force the political class to redirect much needed attention and money for domestic projects to regional security issues, but would also cement a strong division between East and West even after the end of the Cold War. Especially those forces within the former superpower that were lobbying for closer cooperation with Washington and Bonn were fearful that NATO enlargement would cut Russia off from the rest of Europe and permanently deepen the gap between these two international players. The speechwriter for former General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev, Alexei K. Pushkov, predicted that "the decision to spread NATO over the whole of Europe will leave Russia little choice but to assert itself as a force not necessarily antagonistic but different from the Western community."[337]

---

[335] Andrzej Karkoszka, "A View from Poland," *NATO Enlargement: Opinions and Options.* Jeffrey Simon (ed.) (Washington, DC: National Defense University, 1995), 75. A similar consensus view of Central and Eastern European representatives can be found in the following publication: August Pradetto (ed.). *Ostmitteleuropa, Rußland und die Osterweiterung der NATO. Perzeptionen und Strategien im Spannungsfeld nationaler und europäischer Sicherheit* (Opladen: Westdeutscher, 1997), 41-128.

[336] Anatol Lieven, "A New Iron Curtain," *The Atlantic Monthly* 277.1 (January 1996), 21. Arguing strongly in favor of a continued control of its near abroad, the Kremlin compared its policy to the Monroe Doctrine advocated by the United States or France's sphere of influence claim on certain areas in Africa given its colonial past.

[337] Alexei K. Pushkov, "A View from Russia," *NATO Enlargement*. Jeffrey Simon (ed.), 136. See also by the same author "Don't isolate us. A Russian View of NATO Expansion," *The National Interest* 47 (Spring 1997), 58-62.

Non-Russian enlargement critics shared this concern as they saw in NATO's eastern expansion an initiative that would not only weaken pro-Western democratic forces within Russia, but more importantly would also produce a backlash in Moscow's foreign policies.[338] Most notably, policy analysts were concerned with Russia taking a much more inward-looking orientation that would not consider any American and European interests in a whole variety of international issues. Some of the more frequently quoted policies through which Russia could show its disdain of NATO enlargement were a non-ratification of the already negotiated START treaties in the Duma, a much more frequent use of the Russian veto in the UN Security Council as well as a more assertive foreign policy on the Eurasian landmass and in the territories of the former Soviet Union. In the view of Michael Mandelbaum, professor of American Foreign Policy at the Johns Hopkins University at the time, NATO enlargement even had the potential to put Russia indefinitely at odds with the existing political structure in Europe after 1990:

> The greatest danger of NATO expansion, however, is its possible effect on Russian foreign policy over the long term. It has the potential to turn the country against the entire post-Cold War settlement in Europe, a settlement that is extraordinary favorable to the West. (…) NATO expansion therefore runs the risk of creating a consensus within Russia that not only this particular measure but also the entire post-Cold War settlement is arbitrary, unfair and anti-Russian.[339]

Mandelbaum considered Russia's geopolitical situation in the 1990s comparable to that of Germany after the end of the First World War, emphasizing the shared humiliation after the loss of a war and the subsequent rise of extremist forces in the states that called for reinstatement of national greatness and honor. The outspoken enlargement critic saw in the Western advocacy of this policy initiative the risk of contributing to an unstable democracy that is vulnerable to militaristic and anti-Western forces from within: in short, a state that he calls "Weimar Russia."[340]

In addition to creating a volatile domestic situation within Russia, enlargement critics saw the initiative as a symbol of Western lack of trust in the emerging democracy of the former superpower as well as a concerted effort to re-divide Europe by keeping Moscow indefinitely out of the European club. Without a serious offer to integrate Russia into Western structures, opponents of NATO's eastern expansion predicted a Russian reorientation toward South East Asia with permanent consequences for the geopolitical landscape and Moscow's role in the world. For Stanley Kober, a research fellow at the libertarian Cato Institute in Washington, DC, the rekindled relationship between Russia and China in the early to mid 1990s was the most worrisome outcome of the NATO enlargement debate, which could have serious implications for the United States in the future. He sketched out the following scenario as a result of opening the door to the NATO alliance:

> The emerging Moscow-Beijing axis is perhaps the most important reason why NATO expansion is so dangerous. No one can object to the improvement in relations between two countries, but if NATO expansion drives Russia and China together and thereby emboldens China to use military force against Taiwan, the

---

[338] For a concise depiction of this argument see Thomas L. Friedman, "Clinton's Folly," *NYT* (31 July 1997).
[339] Michael Mandelbaum. *The Dawn of Peace in Europe* (New York: The Twentieth Century Fund, 1996), 60/61. A shorter synopsis of the argument can be found here Michael Mandelbaum, "Preserving the New Peace: The Case Against NATO Expansion," *FA* 74.3 (May/June 1993), 9-13.
[340] Mandelbaum. *Dawn of Peace,* 62.

United States will be faced with an awful choice: either abandoning Taiwan or risking a conflict with China and possibly Russia as well.[341]

A total detachment from the West would be equally harmful for Europe considering the several political, economic and security issues that were at stake in the bilateral relationship, as well as on a global scale, in which Russia was of utmost importance as a responsible stakeholder. While Johan Galtung's view, which saw NATO enlargement as the starting point of the second Cold War, was a minority position in the camp of critics, opponents of NATO's eastern expansion pointed to the tools that were still at Russia's disposal in its relative state of weakness to counteract Western policies, such as its remaining nuclear arsenal – let alone its (un)willingness to work with the West constructively after an economic and military recovery.[342]

In addition to the worries of anticipated Russian behavior after an unwelcome NATO enlargement, there were also four additional sets of arguments to counter the rationale of enlargement proponents that were not directly linked to Moscow's behavior. First, opponents pointed to two incidents in which NATO's eastern enlargement tampered with previous agreements, which put it into the light of questionable international legality. The first case of this nature was linked to the negotiations around German reunification. In exchange for Bonn's NATO membership, the West had promised Russia that no allied troops would be stationed in the Eastern part of the country. In addition to this agreement, there were also legally non-binding assurances given on behalf of several Western countries that NATO would not enlarge any further to the East. Enlargement critics argued that even though Moscow did not have these promises in writing, it would constitute a violation of the agreed-upon accord at the time if NATO's eastern expansion moved forward.

The second legal discussion circled around the future of the treaty on Conventional Forces in Europe (CFE) after the dissolution of the Soviet Union and a potential membership of Central Eastern European countries in NATO. Being negotiated during the late 1980s, the "treaty was originally intended to reduce conventional military asymmetries in Europe, establish parity at a lower level between the alliances, and eliminate the danger of an all-out offensive or a surprise attack" by putting caps on land-based weapons as well as the total number of armed forces of each signatory state.[343] In the original calculations of apportioned armaments and troops sizes for Russia and Western countries, the Central and Eastern countries were not a factor in the equation as they were not aligned with any military alliance at this point. Enlargement critics saw in the potential NATO membership of these countries a conflict to CFE's provisions, as it would tilt the carefully negotiated balance in this sensitive security field toward the West. In the case of both described accounts, opponents of NATO's eastern expansion lamented that the initiative would lead to a loss of credibility on the part of the West, which could ultimately jeopardize its reputation as a responsible stakeholder in the global arena.

The second cluster of non Russia-related arguments against NATO enlargement was fuelled by worries about the future effectiveness of the alliance if former Warsaw Pact states joined it. There was concern about internal cohesion and the consequences of additional voices around the

---

[341] Stanley Kober, "Russia's Search for Identity," *NATO Enlargement. Illusions and Reality.* Ted Galen Carpenter / Barbara Conry (eds.) (Washington, DC: Cato Institute, 1998), 138-139. See also "Russia moves East, like NATO," *Russian Press Digest* (26 March 1997).

[342] Johan Galtung, "Die NATO-Osterweiterung oder der Beginn des zweiten Kalten Krieges," *Blätter für deutsche und internationale Politik* 43.2 (1998), 197-207.

[343] Hans-Joachim Schmidt. *NATO and Arms Control: Alliance Enlargement and the CFE Treaty* (Frankfurt am Main: Peace Research Institute, July 1996), 1.

NATO table for the already difficult task of finding consensus among the allies. Karl-Heinz Kamp's following intervention is representative of this particular anxiety:

> The admission of new members also engaged in a process of political and military redefinition because of their recent history would exacerbate NATO's difficulty in arriving at common positions. Communications and the decision-making process, already strained, could become more difficult still, or even paralyzed at times.[344]

This reservation toward opening NATO's doors to new members was complemented by a strong hesitancy in U.S. defense circles to take on new security commitments in the Russian sphere of influence. Since the U.S. military would have to shoulder the main burden in extending the nuclear protective shield and providing support for these countries in the case of an attack, defense planners called into question the U.S. public's willingness to send American soldiers for this mission to Central and Eastern Europe. Furthermore, critics had doubts about the eligibility of candidate countries for NATO membership on two fronts: on the one hand, the state of democracy in these countries was seen with a critical eye, on the other hand the handling of ethnic minorities within and among the different nation states in the region was frequently mentioned as an obstacle for membership.

Fred C. Ikle, former Under Secretary of Defense in the Reagan administration, serves as a spokesperson for the first concern when he characterizes former Warsaw Pact candidate countries as potential "Trojan horses" undercut by Russian spies in government leadership positions in order to infiltrate NATO.[345] With regard to the handling of parochial disputes among former Warsaw Pact states, Western critics of enlargement worried about "the extent of the possible ethnic entanglements if NATO offers membership to Central and East European states and how membership might embolden those states in their confrontations with neighboring countries – with NATO expected to pick up the pieces."[346]

The third group of critics that opposed NATO enlargement on its own merits argued that it constituted a fundamentally wrong strategic priority in the post-Cold War world. For isolationist voices in the United States, it was the wrong move as it perpetuated indefinitely the U.S. military and political engagement on the European continent, and therefore, the allies' unhealthy dependency on Washington for security issues.[347] There was also a strong populist feeling in the United States and in Europe that the 1990s should be the time to look inward and redirect focus on fixing social issues within Western societies that had been neglected during the Cold War. In this rationale, an ambitious foreign policy initiative like NATO's eastern expansion would commit political capital yet again to an outside cause without addressing the most pressing needs of the constituents at home.

Some foreign policy experts even criticized the position of NATO enlargement on governments' priority lists as they deemed the promotion of non-proliferation efforts to be much more important than inviting new members to the alliance given the significant amount of nuclear arsenals on the territory of the former Soviet Union. While there was an immediate urgency to address the nuclear proliferation issue, NATO enlargement should be considered as a tool to

---

[344] Karl-Heinz Kamp, "The Folly of Rapid NATO Expansion," *Foreign Policy* 98 (Spring 1995), 122.
[345] Fred C. Ikle, "How to Ruin NATO," *NYT* (11 January 1995).
[346] Ted Galen Carpenter. *Beyond NATO: Staying out of Europe's Wars* (Washington, DC: Cato Institute, 1994), 78. Of special relevance is the Hungarian Diaspora living in various countries in the region among them Serbia, Slovakia and Romania.
[347] Carpenter/Conry. *NATO Enlargement,* 53.

counteract Russian behavior if need be, but not as paramount Western foreign policy goal, as Michael E. Brown outlines:

> NATO expansion should not be a mechanistic process or tied to a rigid timetable as many of its supporters suggest. Rather, it should be linked to strategic circumstances: if Russia begins to threaten Eastern and Central Europe militarily, then NATO should offer membership and security guarantees to the Visegrad four and perhaps other states as well. NATO should declare that it will expand if necessary, but that it will not expand until strategic circumstances demand it.[348]

Finally, there was a fourth group of enlargement critics that were in favor of anchoring Central and Eastern Europe in Western structures, but argued that NATO was the wrong institution to fulfill this mission. Proponents of this camp promoted either the EU or the OSCE to take on the responsibility of integrating former Warsaw Pact states into the West. This view stemmed from the belief that the codes of conduct and the tool boxes of these two organizations, especially through their non-military conflict resolution as well as economic development efforts, were better equipped than NATO, as a military alliance, to satisfy the Central and Eastern European countries' desire to be part of the Western stability and prosperity zone. Membership of former Warsaw Pact states in either of the two organizations would also not be seen as threatening by Russia, thereby avoiding the effect that is created by pushing for NATO enlargement:

> NATO expansion threatens to create tensions and conflicts in the heart of Central and Eastern Europe that would otherwise not exist. For example, expansion puts back into geopolitical play most of the nations that are to be excluded from the first round of enlargement, making them again potential objects of renewed East-West rivalry.[349]

In this line of thinking, NATO enlargement constitutes a needless provocation of Russia, leading to a potential re-emergence of power politics, shifting alliances and a tilted military balance – elements that Europe had seen in its history before. Michael Mandelbaum called NATO enlargement, therefore, a "bridge to the nineteenth century".[350]

VII.4 Origins of the Debate

Irrespective of the arguments brought forth against membership in NATO, the political leadership and vast majorities of Central and Eastern European populations were strongly in favor of joining the military alliance. Not surprisingly, the start of the enlargement debate took its origins in the region itself, caused by the pronounced desire of former Warsaw Pact states to be part of the West. Even before the official dissolution of the Eastern bloc on July 1, 1991, its

---

[348] Michael E. Brown, "The Flawed Logic of NATO Expansion," *Survival* 37.1 (Spring 1995), 35. A similar case is made in the following article Christian Hacke, "Die Haltung der Bundesrepublik Deutschland zur NATO-Osterweiterung," *Ostmitteleuropa*. Pradetto (ed.), 231-249.
[349] Sherle R. Schwenninger, "The Case against NATO Enlargement: Clinton's Fateful Gamble," *The Nation* (20 October 1997).
[350] Michael Mandelbaum. *NATO Expansion: A Bridge to the Nineteenth Century* (Washington, DC: Center for Political and Strategic Studies, 1997).

former member states Poland, Hungary and Czechoslovakia had positioned themselves to appeal to Western institutions and lobby for inclusion. Recognizing the similarity of their position and their envisioned goal, the political leaderships of these countries decided to join forces in advocating their agenda in order to increase the pressure on Western capitals to take on their issues seriously and swiftly. In a joint declaration after their February 1991 summit in the Hungarian city of Visegrad, the three countries formulated their goal of achieving "full involvement in the European political and economic system, as well as the system of security and legislation."[351] Worried by the volatile domestic situation in the Soviet Union that saw an attempted coup against President Mikhail Gorbachev in August as well as the dismantling of the former superpower in the fall/winter of 1991, the Visegrad three called openly for NATO membership during their October summit in Krakow.

The Visegrad countries sent a strong signal of their desire to become part of NATO and pushed the alliance to go beyond the already existing proposals to bring Central and Eastern Europe closer to the West. In its July 1990 meeting in London, NATO had not only initiated a fundamental review of its mission, which resulted in the alliance's new 1991 strategic concept, but had also invited the former Warsaw Pact states "to come to NATO, not just to visit, but to establish regular diplomatic liaison."[352] In a noteworthy novelty, NATO offered hence its former enemies an institutional relationship that was met with great interest and allowed the former communist countries to send their diplomats to the alliance headquarters in Brussels. As a second step, both parties pursued a further intensification of their consultation on a variety of security and political issues by creating a unique framework for these discussions. Going back to a joint U.S.-German initiative, promoted by the foreign ministers James Baker III and Hans-Dietrich Genscher of both countries at the time, NATO founded the North Atlantic Cooperation Council (NACC) in June 1991 to fulfill this need. In the assessment of Berthold Meyer, the creation of NACC "was motivated primarily by the desire, following the dissolution of the Warsaw Treaty, to have some means of preserving the CFE I treaty, the working basis for which – namely, the meticulously calculated military balance – had at that very moment ceased to exist."[353]

In addition to this underlying strategic rationale, the NACC served also as a forum to discuss ways to ensure civilian control over the military, strategies to implement arms control agreements as well as tools to morph defense industries into civilian industries. While the establishment of the NACC strengthened the ties between Central and Eastern European countries and the Western military alliance,[354] the Visegrad nations were ultimately not satisfied with this framework as they had no decision-making power in this set-up and were told explicitly by NATO allies that they should not perceive the NACC as stepping stone for eventual membership. Gerald B. Solomon captured the situation at the outset of 1992 when he wrote: "The United States and Germany had moved with great speed to secure a united Germany in NATO, yet the NACC, diffused even further by the automatic admission of the former Soviet republics, seemed like a slow train with an unknown destination."[355]

---

[351] *Declaration on cooperation between the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic, the Republic of Poland and the Republic of Hungary in striving for European integration* (Visegrad, 15 February 1991).

[352] *London Declaration on a Transformed North Atlantic Alliance* (Brussels: NATO, 1990), 3.

[353] Berthold Meyer. *NATO Enlargement: Path to Unity or to a New Division of Europe* (Frankfurt: Peace Research Institute, June 1995), 19.

[354] Martin A. Smith observed in this regard: "In practical terms, the major step forward achieved by the NACC, and the co-operative programmes which it spawned during 1991 and 1993, involved going beyond the joint seminars and discussions which had already begun to take place at NATO and SHAPE and moving toward (though never attaining under the auspices of the NACC itself) the organization of joint exercises and training involving real armed forces from NATO member states and those of the partner countries." Martin A. Smith. *Building a bigger Europe: EU and NATO enlargement in comparative perspective* (Burlington: Ashgate, 2000), 28.

[355] Gerald B. Solomon. *The NATO Enlargement Debate, 1990-1997. Blessings of Liberty* (Westport: Praeger, 1998), 16/17.

In fact, NATO slid into a phase of introspection during 1992 in which the alliance tried to come to terms with its new strategic concept as well as to manage the pressing challenges of how to react to the enfolding crisis in the Balkans and to handle its relationship to a changing Russia. In light of the volatile situation in Eastern Europe, there was a strong hesitancy on the alliance's part to make any security commitments to individual states in this region in order to avoid an entanglement in a potential crisis. After geopolitical changes of the largest scale in the period 1989-1991, the alliance monitored closely the actions taken by the Russian Federation and its first President Boris Yeltsin, as they were of the utmost importance for the post-Cold War relationship with Moscow and also had an impact on how to proceed with the Central and Eastern European countries' wish to join the alliance. At the beginning of Yeltsin's tenure, the United States and Europe were pleasantly surprised that the Russian president promoted a Western orientation of the country and reached out to several Western leaders personally.[356] Throughout the year it became clear, however, that the fight over the right course for post-Cold War Russia was in full swing, as Yeltsin faced a fierce opposition of communist, conservative and nationalist forces that criticized him heavily and promoted a return to imperialist and anti-Western policies.

With Russia's domestic policies as well as its future role on the international stage difficult to predict, a consensus increasingly emerged in Europe and the United States that the former Warsaw Pact states needed to be anchored in the West. In this initial phase of the debate, eventual membership in NATO for these countries was by no means a foregone conclusion as Ronald D. Asmus outlines:

> The mainstream allied view at the time was that Central and Eastern Europe should focus first on getting into the European Union, not NATO. This was seen as a more 'natural' and politically easier way for them to integrate into the West, with Alliance membership coming later if at all.[357]

The most prominent proponent of this strategy was France, in tandem with Belgium and Luxembourg, in an attempt to integrate the Central and Eastern European countries into an exclusively European security and economic framework. In contrast to this intra-European approach, the United States, Great Britain and the Netherlands saw greater merits in giving the Visegrad countries a home in a transatlantic framework, thereby strengthening the role of NATO on the European continent as well. Even though the European Council had given Central and Eastern European countries a membership perspective during their meeting in Copenhagen on June 22, 1993, the political leadership of the candidate countries for NATO and the EU preferred to pursue NATO membership as their top priority. Their rationale was twofold: first, they had come to the conclusion that they had better chances to get into NATO, given the EU's cumbersome decision-making process; second, and more importantly, they trusted the leadership of the United States and wanted to manifest its presence on the continent to prevent the re-emergence of nationalism as a cause for inter-state conflicts, thereby also serving as an ultimate insurance policy against a renewed Russian dominance in the region.

In order to fulfill this ambition, the Central and Eastern European countries needed to gain support for their cause in the West – especially in those two countries that eventually emerged as the prime promoters of their NATO membership: the United States and Germany. A close

---

[356] In 1991, Yeltsin visited the European parliament in Strasbourg, NATO headquarters in Brussels, as well as Prague, Paris and Washington, DC for consultations.
[357] Asmus. *Opening NATO's Door*, 46.

analysis of the enfolding debate on enlargement in 1992-1993 shows the importance of policy entrepreneurs in Bonn and Washington pushing the issue as well as the impact of several key events leading stakeholders to realize the merits of opening the doors of the alliance. In the United States, the first advocates of NATO enlargement within the political arena could be found in the Bush administration. While certainly not a majority position at the time, remarks of Secretary of State Lawrence Eagleburger and Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney in 1992 indicated that they saw eventual NATO expansion as probable and desirable.[358] To position the United States in this question officially was left to the 42nd President, Bill Clinton: a president whose focus was placed on domestic policies once in office. Foreign policy only gradually gained an importance for his presidency and until then, the views of his closest advisors on issues such as NATO expansion were of utmost importance for the direction of U.S. policy.

Within the Clinton administration, there was consensus from early on that Central and Eastern Europe needed to be tied to the West through an institutional framework. An overwhelming majority of U.S. officials shared the Visegrad countries' assessment that this institution should be NATO, as George W. Grayson notes:

> Pro-expansionists argued for maintaining, even accelerating, momentum for political and economic liberalization in Central Europe. They contended that EU members – occupied by the Maastricht Treaty, the advent of the European Monetary Union, and the prospect of cheap imports from the East – lacked motivation to open their ranks in the near- to medium-term to Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and other former Soviet allies. Thus, NATO offered the only major institution that could selectively extend membership to its former enemies.[359]

One of the key architects of the U.S. policy of enlargement was National Security Advisor Anthony Lake, who actively promoted this initiative first internally and then publicly.[360] The struggle within the White House was not fought around the merits of an enlargement policy as a strategic rationale for post-Cold War U.S. foreign policy, but to what extend the timeline and details of the approach should be made contingent upon Russian approval of this measure. While one camp of advisors, headed by Lake, pushed a fast track approach for NATO enlargement, there was also a group around Strobe Talbott, at the time Ambassador-at large and Special Advisor to the Secretary of State on the New Independent States that cautioned a Russian backlash if the United States moved too quickly in this direction. Being one of Bill Clinton's closest advisors and friends, Talbott's credo in these early stages of the debate was more complex than what his critics called a "Russia first" paradigm for U.S. foreign policy, i.e. making Russian reactions to U.S. policy initiatives the ultimate compass of the White House's decision-making process. His concern with the swift pro-enlargement approach was rather that it did not present a comprehensive strategy for integrating Russia into a post-Cold War European security system. To create new realities on the ground, without finding an appropriate role for Moscow, in his view jeopardized the well-intended benefits of NATO enlargement and ran the risk of forcing Russia into isolation and opposition against the West.

---

[358] *Secretary Eagleburger's Parting Remarks to the North Atlantic Cooperation Council* (Brussels, 18 December 1992), 116. In addition to these two senior representatives of the Bush administration, Stephen J. Flanagan of the Policy Planning Staff made a noteworthy contribution to initiating the debate about enlargement at this early stage with his policy paper on creating a secure and free Europe. See Flanagan, "NATO and Central and Eastern Europe," 141-51.
[359] George W. Grayson. *Strange Bedfellows. NATO marches East* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1999), 77.
[360] See Lake. *From Containment to Enlargement.*

In 1993, three additional events occurred in the United States that did not solve the question about the right formulation of policy, but infused new energy into the NATO enlargement debate in Washington. First, the meetings of President Clinton with the presidents of Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic during the opening of the Washington Holocaust Museum in April 1993 served as an important stepping stone for Clinton's own thinking in this question. All three presidents highlighted NATO enlargement as the most important foreign policy goal of their countries and emotionally asked President Clinton to support their wish to join the West by becoming members of the military alliance. While these requests did not translate immediately into U.S. policy, the White House placed higher emphasis on the issue afterwards and increased their internal deliberations as well as consultations within NATO about crafting a suitable answer for the Central and Eastern European countries' proposal.

Second, the Visegrad countries actively promoted their interest of joining NATO not only in discussions with the executive branch, but also reached out to U.S. Congress in order to lobby for their inclusion in the alliance. They were able to build some early momentum for their cause as Boguslaw W. Winid outlines:

> 1993 also saw a major revival in lobbying for NATO enlargement among the Polish American community. Especially in the second half of the year – in connection with preparations for a NATO summit and President Clinton's trip to Europe – the Polish American Congress and several smaller organizations (frequently supported by other, less numerous ethnic groups) embarked on a comprehensive campaign to influence members of Congress and the Administration.[361]

The goal of these efforts was not only to educate a maximum number of Congressmen and Senators about the Central and Eastern European countries' cause, but also to identify advocates in key positions of the American political system who could lobby their colleagues on behalf of the aspiring NATO members. One of these key players on Capitol Hill was Senator Richard Lugar (R-IN), a well-respected member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, who had come to the conclusion early on that NATO needed to open its doors for new members and missions outside of the existing framework in order to remain relevant after the end of the Cold War.

His view was informed by the third factor of special relevance in the initial phase of the U.S. debate on enlargement, namely the work of the RAND scholars Ronald D. Asmus, Richard L. Kugler and F. Stephen Larrabee. In reaction to the political mainstream on both sides of the Atlantic at the time that saw NATO enlargement as a premature foreign policy initiative at best, the three policy analysts made the case why a rapid expansion of the alliance was beneficial for the United States, Western as well as Eastern Europe.[362] Long before the official publication of their ideas in an article in the Foreign Affairs magazine in September 1993, the troika had been able to present their views on Capitol Hill and to several senior staff members in the State

---

[361] Boguslaw W. Winid, "NATO Enlargement in US Congress in 1993-1996," *Polish Quarterly of International Affairs* 6 (1997), 63.

[362] U.S. Secretary of State Warren Christopher remarked at the North Atlantic Council Meeting in June: "At an appropriate time, we may choose to enlarge NATO membership. But that is not now on the agenda." Warren Christopher. *U.S. Leadership after the Cold War: NATO and Transatlantic Security. Intervention at the North Atlantic Council Ministerial Meeting* (Athens, 10 June 1993).

Department, Pentagon, and the White House.[363] Even though the overall reaction to their proposal of enlarging NATO was mixed at best in the beginning, their rationale shaped the thinking of important senior U.S. stakeholders and gave them an intellectual framework to argue in favor of opening the doors of the alliance to Central and Eastern European countries.

The work of the three RAND scholars had an impact on the debate beyond U.S. borders, as close ties existed between the analysts and senior advocates of NATO enlargement in Germany. These were more than mere personal connections, as the German Ministry of Defense under the leadership of Volker Rühe and his Head of Policy Planning Staff Vice Admiral Ulrich Weisser had hired RAND for consultative services on the issue of NATO expansion. Rühe had come to the conclusion very early in the debate that enlargement of the military alliance would significantly improve his country's security situation in the heart of Europe by extinguishing Germany's frontline state status and guaranteeing a continued role of the United States on the continent. Feeling confirmed by the U.S. think tank's work that this was a historic opportunity, he decided to actively promote NATO enlargement in a domestic as well as international framework. The German Defense Minister used the occasion of a speech at the International Institute of Strategic Studies (IISS) in London on March 26, 1993 in order to promote his views and call for an eventual membership of former Warsaw Pact states in NATO:

> We must not exclude our neighbors in the East from Euro-Atlantic security structures. Eastern Europe must not become a conceptual no-man's land. (…) We should now begin to discuss the issue of expanding the Alliance and actively conduct this debate in the appropriate Alliance fora. We should examine ways of representing the new quality of the transatlantic relationship and the task of crisis management in our institutional structures.[364]

With this proposal, Rühe was not only ahead of the transatlantic consensus at the time, as the reserved reaction of the London audience to his speech showed, but was also considered a minority voice within the German government. The Foreign Ministry led by FDP politician Klaus Kinkel was much more reserved in advocating NATO membership for the Visegrad countries as it also deemed the EU as an appropriate institution to anchor the Central and Eastern European countries to the West. The Chancellery and Helmut Kohl himself were non-committal, as exemplified by the fact that Germany did not have an official government position on the issue in 1993, even though a working group of senior representatives of the Foreign, Defense Ministry as well as the Chancellery already had been created in the fall of 1992.[365]

Kohl deliberately kept all his options open as he did not want to position Germany in the early stages of the debate, as the United States had not come to their official position regarding enlargement.[366] In the Chancellor's view, NATO expansion was a prime opportunity to crown Germany's reconciliation efforts with Central and Eastern European countries (especially with Poland) after the Second World War and strengthen the transatlantic link with the United States,

---

[363] Ronald D. Asmus/Richard L. Kugler/F. Stephen Larrabee, "Building a New NATO," *FA* 72.4 (September/October 1993), 28-40.

[364] Volker Rühe, "Shaping Euro-Atlantic Policies: A Grand Strategy for a New Era," *Survival* 35.2 (Summer 1993), 134/137.

[365] Part of the working group was Wolfgang Ischinger for the Foreign Ministery, Vice Admiral Ulrich Weisser for the Ministry of Defense as well as Joachim Bitterlich, Kohl's foreign policy advisor in the Chancellery. See Heinke. *Wechselnde Konstellationen*, 158.

[366] There was also a domestic motivation for not specifying Germany's position on NATO enlargement. In light of the upcoming 1994 federal elections, Kohl had no interest in highlighting the differences between the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Ministry of Defense on this issue.

but only if Germany's assessment of this policy initiative took Washington's view into consideration before making any commitments. In addition, Bonn was in a very delicate balancing act between supporting the interests of the former Warsaw Pact states and its attempts to offer Russia a closer connection to the West. Given its very own geopolitical location and interests in the heart of Europe, it was of utmost importance for Germany to offer Russia a perspective toward the West and at the same time to integrate its immediate Eastern neighbors into European/transatlantic security and economic structures. In the Chancellor's view, this complicated task could only be achieved in a multilateral framework and in conjunction with Germany's closest Western allies. As far as Bonn was concerned, Washington needed to show leadership – just as in Cold War times – in order to make significant progress on this agenda.

VII.5 The Partnership for Peace

While Germany was looking toward the United States for guidance, the White House closely followed the events in Russia throughout 1993 in order to formulate a sound policy that did not undermine Yeltsin in his domestic struggle for power against nationalist forces, but was also considerate of the other involved parties' interests. However, the Russian position on enlargement was far from clear as the Kremlin changed its view on the issue several times and government representatives did not speak with one voice. In August 1993, NATO expansion proponents were pleasantly surprised when President Yeltsin and his Polish counterpart Lech Walesa signed the Warsaw Declaration, in which the most important provision stated that Russia would not object to Poland's potential NATO membership:

> The presidents touched on the matter of Poland's intention to join NATO. President L. Walesa set forth Poland's well-known position on this count which was met with understanding by President B.N. Yeltsin. In the long term, such a decision taken by a sovereign Poland in the interests of overall European integration does not go against the interests of other states, including the interests of Russia.[367]

Through the Warsaw declaration and subsequent statements in the Czech Republic to the same effect, Yeltsin reconfirmed the provisions of a communiqué signed at the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact in February 1991, which stated that all countries were free in their future choice of alliances. Only one month later, Yeltsin revoked the Russian acceptance of Central and Eastern European countries' wish to join the alliance in a letter to Western governments claiming that NATO enlargement would violate the agreements reached at German reunification and would be diametrically opposed to Russian security interests.[368] The Russian flip-flopping on the issue of NATO enlargement was in this regard only one example of the volatility of the country's domestic situation and the ongoing struggle for the future path of the former superpower. The climax came in the late fall of 1993, when Yeltsin suspended the parliament and called for new elections that were expected to result in a strong showing for the nationalist forces around

---

[367] The most important passages of the Warsaw declaration can be found in these two sources "Officials seek to clarify position on NATO expansion," *FBIS Trends* (29 September 1993) and *BBC Summary of World Broadcasts* (EE/1778, 1993), A8.

[368] See Michael Mihalka, "Squaring the Circle: NATO's Offer to the East," *RFE/RL Research Report* 12 (25 March 1994), 3. With this letter Yeltsin echoed the statements of his foreign minister Andrei Kozyrev and domestic nationalist forces that saw Central and Eastern European countries in Russia's sphere of influence and should not be allowed to be part of NATO.

Vladimir Zhirinovsky Liberal Democratic Party in December.[369] However, before the Russians were able to cast their ballots, the President's parliamentary opposition voted to have Yeltsin removed from office, barricaded themselves in the parliament building and were only forced to surrender after the Russian military shelled the building on October 3, 1993.

Against this backdrop of an emerging crisis within Russia, the Clinton administration contemplated the right approach toward NATO enlargement. In addition to the already described range of opinions within the White House between Strobe Talbott and Anthony Lake at this time, the State Department and the Department of Defense found itself on opposing ends in their suggestions for the official U.S. government position on NATO expansion. While Secretary of State Warren Christopher's staff was more forward-leaning on the issue advocating to send a strong signal for enlargement in a limited time frame, the Pentagon was opposed to an inclusion of Central and Eastern European nations out of concern for the cohesion of the alliance and the responsibility to shoulder new security commitments with American troops. Furthermore, U.S. defense planners argued that priority should be put instead on intensifying military-to-military relations between NATO members and former Warsaw Pact states in order to integrate these countries' troops into Western structures.

Under the leadership of Supreme Allied Commander Europe (SACEUR) John Shalikashvili, the Department of Defense drafted a concept paper in the fall of 1993 that proposed to negotiate bilateral agreements with non-NATO-member OSCE countries in order to deepen defense cooperation in an open and transparent way on the European continent. At a Principals Committee meeting in the White House in October 1993, the key stakeholders of the Clinton administration agreed to the main provisions of the Pentagon proposal as a core for the new initiative Partnership for Peace (PfP) with one important addition: PfP also should be seen as a path for potential membership in NATO for those countries that aspired to become part of the alliance. Participating nations would need to sign up for a framework document obligating them to work on the following criteria:

- Develop "transparency" in its defense budget and planning in order for its public and other states to understand its military capabilities.
- Establish civilian control of its armed forces.
- Develop a capability in its military to contribute to operations under the authority of the United Nations and/or the responsibility of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE).
- Build cooperative military relations with NATO for the purpose of joint planning and training to be able to undertake joint missions for peacekeeping, search and rescue, and humanitarian operations.
- Improve the quality of its military forces for interoperability with NATO.[370]

---

[369] Martin A. Smith describes the impact of the 1993 Russian elections for the NATO enlargement debate in Europe and the United States as follows: "Many in the West had been surprised and concerned by the relative success of nationalist and communist candidates in the Russian parliamentary elections in December 1993. This may have had a material impact on toughening up support in the West for NATO enlargement in principle at the time of the Brussels summit, considering that this took place just one month after the Russian elections." Martin A. Smith, *Building a bigger Europe*, 39.

[370] See *Partnership for Peace – Invitation; and Partnership for Peace: Framework Document* (Brussels: North Atlantic Council, 10-11 January 1994). On the basis of the framework document, NATO then negotiated with each signatory country a presentation document in which individual activities were recorded such as joint trainings or budgetary outlays for improvement of armed forces. In addition, PfP participant countries were encouraged to send liaison officers to the NATO's Supreme Headquarters, Allied Powers Europe (SHAPE) as well as to NATO offices in Brussels. For more

From a U.S. government perspective, this initiative provided the best compromise for all parties involved at this moment in time: for NATO, PfP would give the alliance a chance to judge the ability of each candidate country to contribute to NATO's mission in case of membership; for the Central and Eastern European candidate countries, which desperately wanted to join the alliance, PfP put them on a trajectory to achieve this goal in the future while at the same time already intensifying their relations to NATO, as well as deepening their understanding of the obligations and rights that membership entails. And finally, for Russia, PfP did not constitute a guarantee for NATO membership of former Warsaw Pact states and allowed Russia to develop its very own ties with NATO as well. In the words of President Bill Clinton:

> The Partnership for Peace, I would argue, gives us the best of both worlds. It enables us to prepare and to work toward the enlargement of NATO when other countries are capable of fulfilling their NATO responsibilities. It enables us to do it in a way that gives us the time to reach out to Russia and to these other nations of the former Soviet Union, which have been almost ignored through this entire debate by people around the world, in a way that leaves open the possibility of a future for Europe that totally breaks from the destructive past we have known.[371]

In addition to the proposal for Combined Joint Task Forces, Washington had decided to make PfP the center piece of U.S. NATO policy for the next meeting of NATO heads-of-states. The overall reactions of the transatlantic community, despite official endorsement at the 1994 Brussels NATO Summit, were much more mixed, as the immediate aftermath of PfP's first presentation showed at the NATO defense minister meeting in Travemünde, Germany in October 1993. As the host of the meeting, the German government felt that the initiative was very satisfactory, as it left all options open for the future and did not force the Foreign and Defense Ministry to reconcile their strategic differences on how to handle the integration of Central and Eastern European countries into the West.[372] The camp of NATO enlargement critics was equally satisfied as the notion of a fast-tracked NATO expansion was abandoned according to the majority consensus at the time. In its first reaction, Moscow was especially pleased with the initiative as it interpreted PfP as a potential alternative to NATO enlargement and took special note of some NATO countries promises that even Russia could become a signatory of PfP and even member of NATO.

Other Western commentators, and especially the representatives of Central and Eastern Europe, were less content with the outcome of the 1994 NATO Summit. Their main criticism was that PfP did not immediately give the Visegrad countries their envisioned security guarantee under the NATO umbrella. In this camp, PfP was considered to be too focused on technical and operational details of military cooperation without providing a grand political and strategic vision

details on the PfP process see Anthony Cragg, "The Partnership for Peace Planning and Review Process," *NATO Review* 43.6 (November 1995), 23-25.

[371] William J. Clinton. *Remarks by the President at Intervention for the North Atlantic Council Summit* (Brussels: The White House, Office of the Press Secretary, 10 January 1994).

[372] The German press saw in PfP a defeat for Defense Minister Volker Rühe as prime European advocate for NATO expansion, who pointed out that PfP was a stepping stone toward and not an alternative to NATO enlargement. See Stefan Kornelius, "Die NATO verordnet sich eine lange Denkpause," *SZ* (8 January 1994); "NATO ministers back 'partnerships idea'," *The Washington Times* (22 October 1993) and Stephen Kinzer, "NATO Favors U.S. Plan for Ties with the East, but Timing is vague," *NYT* (22 October 1993). The official German government's response to PfP and the results of the January 1994 NATO Summit in Brussels can be found here Helmut Kohl. *Erklärung der Bundesregierung: NATO-Gipfel vom 10./11. Januar in Brüssel* (Bonn: Deutscher Bundestag, 12. Wahlperiode, 202. Sitzung, 13. January 1994).

for the inclusion of candidate countries in the alliance.[373] As it lacked a concrete action plan and timeline for NATO enlargement, critics of the PfP initiative also called into question the various offers toward Moscow, without giving the Central and Eastern European countries a much clearer perspective toward membership. There was a concern that NATO, through PfP, was giving Russia too much access and leeway into its very own structures, thereby setting the wrong priority in its attempt to integrate former Warsaw Pact states and Russia into the West.[374] The task at hand for the United States and Europe was to manage this process effectively by avoiding favoring Russian interests at the expense of its former satellite countries. While this balancing act was crucial for the entirety of the newly created relationship between East and West, the NATO enlargement debate and especially the provisions of the PfP bilateral arrangements were the immediate stage on which the nature of the new partnership was played out.

VII.6 Toward NATO Enlargement

Throughout 1994, the issue of NATO enlargement remained on the agenda of policymakers in the United States, Europe and Russia, as stakeholders tried to fill the PfP framework with substance and weighed their next steps in handling NATO expansion. In contrast to a widely-held perception of observers and allies at the 1994 NATO Brussels Summit who considered PfP a hedge strategy in order to delay enlargement for a long time, the United States took significant steps in the course of the year to move the process along. Bill Clinton himself, in taking advantage of the role of the President in the American political system, was of crucial importance in signaling domestically and internationally that the United States was committed to opening the alliance's doors for new members. By employing presidential statements to carry this message, he set the tone of the debate no earlier than on his January 12, 1994 trip to Prague when he characterized PfP as follows: "While the Partnership is not NATO membership, neither is it a permanent holding room. It changes the entire NATO dialogue so that now the question is no longer whether NATO will take on new members but when and how."[375] The President reaffirmed this message during his trip to Poland in a speech to the Polish Sejm on July 7, 1994 and spoke in favor of discussing the next steps on NATO expansion among the allies in the upcoming weeks and months.[376]

In addition to signaling to Europe that the White House's rapid enlargement rationale was maturing, this policy was also of domestic relevance as a reaction to Republican pressure on the administration to speed up the process even further. The GOP carried the weight of this issue as the call for rapid NATO enlargement found its way into the 1994 congressional election manifest "Contract with America" as one of the few foreign policy goals. This was a logical consequence of Republican initiatives on Capitol Hill advocating this cause prior to the midterms, most notably symbolized by the "NATO Expansion Act of 1994" – a non-binding bill in the House of

---

[373] See Charles A. Kupchan, "Strategic Visions," *World Policy Journal* 11.3 (Fall 1994), 112-122.
[374] In the American debate, this view was prominently advocated by Henry Kissinger and Zbigniew Brzezinski, who both pushed for rapid NATO enlargement. They put forward their ideas on this subject in the following publications Zbigniew Brzezinski: "A bigger and safer Europe," *NYT* (1 December 1993), Zbigniew Brzezinski, "A Plan for Europe," *FA* 74.1 (January/February 1995), 26-42; Henry Kissinger, "Be realistic about Russia," *WP* (25 January 1994).
[375] "The President's News Conference with Visegrad Leaders in Prague, January 12, 1994," *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States. Book I, January 1 to July 31, 1994.* William J. Clinton (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1995), 40.
[376] Vice President Al Gore emphasized this view at a conference in Berlin on 9 September 1994 when he stated: "Beyond Partnership for Peace and NACC, several countries have already expressed a desire to become full members of the alliance. We will begin our discussions on this important question this fall." See Al Gore, "Remarks at Berlin conference," *U.S. Department of State Dispatch* 5 (12 September 1994), 597-98.

Representatives sponsored by the Republican Congressman Benjamin Gilman.[377] In order to counteract the Republican claim that the Clinton administration was indecisive on this important U.S. foreign policy priority, the White House made several structural and personal decisions in 1994 that would prove to be central in facilitating policy in the following months and years.

Considering the President's speeches as a mandate for preparing the groundwork on NATO enlargement against internal government opposition, National Security Advisor Anthony Lake instructed his staff to draft a concrete action plan on how to turn Clinton's vision into reality. Three distinguished government officials of the National Security Council – Daniel Fried, Nicholas Burns and Alexander Vershbow – took on the challenge to outline gradual steps on the path to NATO enlargement. Given their direct link to Lake, this troika was able to sidestep the normal bureaucratic process of vetting any ideas before they reached the President's desk, thereby giving them the role of catalysts for U.S. NATO policy. Another important development for the enlargement cause came with the decision to bring back U.S. Ambassador to Germany, Richard Holbrooke, to the State Department as Assistant Secretary of State for European and Canadian Affairs in September 1994. As an experienced diplomat with in-depth knowledge about NATO and Europe, the Clinton administration saw in him not only the perfect candidate to reach out to its allies, but considered him the enforcer of enlargement policy in the internal government struggle as well. Holbrooke immediately created an inter-agency working group upon his arrival in Washington DC to establish a platform for all departments to be informed and on board with the policy.

Given these significant developments on the American side in the course of 1994, there was no doubt at the end of the year that the White House was in favor of NATO enlargement and was looking for ways to move on the initiative in a reasonable timeframe.[378] The U.S. domestic audience even became witness to a contest between Democrats and Republicans in the following three years over who could be the better advocate for this agenda. The German political landscape presented itself slightly differently: While the Kohl government was supportive of the agenda in principle, there was particular consideration of Moscow's position, which led to a more cautious approach by the Chancellery. As Helmut Kohl vividly describes in his memories, the German-Russian bilateral relationship was full of volatile issues that needed to be addressed at the time, including the withdrawal of Russian troops from German soil, Bonn's financial aid package for Moscow as well as non-proliferation concerns.[379] While NATO enlargement was a crucial issue for the German government – let alone due to its (moral) responsibility for the safe, secure and free future of Central and Eastern Europe – the foreign policy agenda of the reunited country was ripe with other fundamental topics that went to the core of Germany's role in the international community. The balancing act of creating an integrated Europe through NATO/EU enlargement and coming to terms with Russia in the post-Cold War world resulted, therefore, in a more careful German view on the specifics and timeline of NATO enlargement in 1994.[380]

---

[377] *NATO Expansion Act of 1994 – 103D Congress, 2D Session, H.R.4210* (Washington, DC, 1994).
[378] In the words of Alvin Z. Rubinstein, Albina Shayevich and Boris Zlotnikov: "By the end of 1994, enlargement completely overshadowed PfP's less ambitious menu of low-level cooperation in essentially military activities. PfP's purely military goals of participation, cooperation, confidence-building, and interoperability of forces were superseded by the political considerations and inherently contradictory strategic purposes of NATO enlargement: fostering security, promoting democracy, and dealing with Russia." Alvin Z. Rubinstein, Albina Shayevich, Boris Zlotnikov (eds.). *The Clinton Foreign Policy Reader: Presidential Speeches with Commentary* (London: M.E. Sharpe, 2000), 79.
[379] Helmut Kohl. *Erinnerungen 1990-1994* (München: Droemer, 2007).
[380] In addition, 1994 was a federal election year that predominantly focused the government's attention on domestic issues. Chancellor Kohl who won another term against his SPD opponent Rudolf Scharping also did not have an interest that NATO enlargement was discussed given the differences between his foreign and defense ministry. However, the Chancellery created an inter-agency working group on September 6, 1994 in order to draft an official government position on the issue that was negotiated by November 18, 1994. In addition to establishing criteria that

Germany's reluctance in this matter can also be explained by the Russian reactions toward the developments in the NATO expansion debate in 1994. The lengthy negotiations between NATO and Russia for Moscow's inclusion in the PfP program throughout the year exemplified the different outlooks on how to organize security on the European continent after 1990 and what Russia's role and involvement should be in this framework. While Moscow had agreed to be part of the program in principle, it came to the negotiation table with a series of demands for the details of the PfP framework document, which were very different from any other envisioned PfP signatory. Bonn received a first-hand impression of Russia's thinking during the German-Russian Defense Minister meeting from March 9-11, 1994. Russian Defense Minister Pawel Gratschow outlined that, at the heart of the Russian wish to join the initiative was the motivation to create a strong NATO-Russia link to guarantee stability on the European continent. Moscow's anticipation was that it would become part of NATO decision-making during this process as it related to Europe as well as global affairs. As long as Russian interests were affected, the Kremlin expected to participate in joint exercises and build up structures for a constant exchange of views between Brussels and Moscow.[381]

From a Kremlin point of view, these demands were consistent with Russia's weight in the international community after 1990 and in line with Moscow's rights in its 'near abroad,' the protection of which was a paramount foreign policy goal. This was by no means a new position, as President Yeltsin had already called for a special relationship between NATO and Russia in 1993 in order to secure Moscow's interests in its proclaimed Central and Eastern European sphere of influence. Russian foreign policy elites did not necessarily consider these demands as examples of (neo-) imperialistic policy, but saw in them rather a normal and justified expression of Russia's power on the European continent. When NATO headquarters received a read-out of the German-Russian Defense Minister's meeting, the alliance proceeded to formulate several red lines that should structure the ongoing negotiations and indicate what level of access NATO was willing to give to its former enemy through PfP. What came to be known as the "five nos," NATO outlined that it would not agree to any provisions that would give Russia the chance to veto decisions taken by its members (no veto), nor would it give Moscow a full vote at the NATO table (no co-decision) or accept a Russian sphere of influence in Central and Eastern Europe (no near abroad). In addition, NATO mandated that no decision on the NATO-Russia track should have an impact on Central and Eastern Europe (no new Yalta) and decisions taken by the two partners should not be understood as power projection (no condominium).

The Russian reaction to these proposals was very different than the earlier positive assessments of the PfP program – many saw NATO's rejection of a special status for Russia as an affront and felt that they were not considered an equal partner. This assessment was further enhanced when NATO conducted limited air strikes on the Bosnian Serbs on April 10-11, 1994 against Yeltsin's will – and in Moscow's reading a violation of the spirit of PfP of promoting consultations and joint decisions between NATO and Russia. Being under this immediate impression of NATO's actions and policies, the Russian position hardened to the extent that Russian Foreign Minister Kozyrev cancelled the announced signing of the PfP framework document for April 21, 1994 in Brussels on short notice. Only after NATO negotiators had reiterated convincingly that the alliance would not cave on its red lines (especially a Russian veto of any sort was off limits) did

---

candidate countries needed to comply with, the German government deemed the Visegrad countries as frontrunners for potential membership and emphasized the need to develop a more in-depth relationship with Russia. After this rather vague proposal was shared with the United States, Secretary of State Warren Christopher and President Bill Clinton contacted the German Chancellor and Foreign Minister to lobby for a more forward-leaning German position on the issue to further manifest their determination on enlarging the alliance.

[381] See Ulrich Weisser. *Sicherheit für ganz Europa. Die Atlantische Allianz in der Bewährung* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1999), 87/88.

Moscow sign the agreement on June 22, 1994. The fundamental disagreement on the role of NATO as an anchor in the European security architecture remained in existence, as Russian Foreign Minister Andrei Kozyrev's arguments in his Foreign Affairs piece "The Lagging Partnership" show:

> As for NATO, the 'Partnership for Peace' proposal answers the need of bringing Russia closer to the alliance for now. But this program should not stimulate NATO-centrism among the alliance's policymakers or NATO-mania among impatient candidates for membership. (…) The creation of a unified, non-bloc Europe can best be pursued by upgrading the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe into a broader and more universal organization.[382]

While Moscow was pushing the CSCE as primus inter pares among European security organizations and as a viable alternative to NATO, the alliance took the next step toward expansion by agreeing formally to conduct a detailed enlargement study at the NATO Foreign Minister's meeting in Brussels on December 1, 1994. Even though neither a timeline nor potential candidates for NATO membership were part of this examination process to be presented one year later, Moscow's reaction to the announcement was harsh and constituted a significant low in NATO-Russian post-Cold War relations. In response to the announcement, Russia refused to sign the PfP work program document and President Yeltsin warned at the December 1994 CSCE conference in Budapest that Europe was sliding into a 'cold peace' due to its enlargement policy and overall lack of concern for Russia's interests.

This characterization was very disheartening and worrisome, especially for European countries, as the alliance went into another year of balancing Russian expectations with NATO as well as Central and Eastern European interests. During Chancellor Kohl's visit in Washington, DC in February 1995, he indicated that it was of utmost importance for Germany and the U.S. to move in lockstep on enlargement and a deepening of relations to Moscow. Bonn, and Kohl himself, were in favor of NATO enlargement, but not at the expense of losing Russia again as a partner in the international community due to a reemergence of nationalist and confrontational policies against the West. The Chancellor's advice was to remain steady on the current course, but to move slowly for the rest of the year by concentrating all efforts on the NATO enlargement study, which was tasked to answer why and how NATO expansion should be pursued.[383]

U.S. President Bill Clinton agreed with Kohl's strategy given his desire to repair relations with Moscow after the irritations at the end of 1994. For both leaders, NATO enlargement was not only a way to secure stability and peace on the European continent through the inclusion of former Warsaw Pact states, but also a tool to promote the necessary changes in NATO's strategy and outlook after the end of the Cold War. With Kohl's visit in February 1995, the U.S.-German tandem became the driver of the enlargement policy based on the same political assessment on the issue as well as an intensity of personal consultations at the highest political and the working

---

[382] Andrei Kozyrev, "The Lagging Partnership," *FA* 73.3 (May/June 1994), 65. See also Andrei Kozyrev, "Russia and NATO: A Partnership for a United and Peaceful Europe," *NATO Review* 42.4 (August 1994), 3-6. The Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) was renamed Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) on January 1, 1995.

[383] This course was also appealing as the war in the Balkans took a significant toll on political as well as diplomatic resources and brought the United States several times in conflict with Russia on the right way forward. For details see Beverly Crawford, "The Bosnian Road to NATO enlargement," *Explaining NATO Enlargement*. Rauchhaus (ed.), 39-59. Hence, a de-escalation of the U.S.-Russia relationship was in the interest of the administration – at the same time, the Republicans kept the issue on the agenda through a series of hearings on the subject in Congress throughout the whole year.

level throughout the whole process. This joint leadership was obvious, for instance, during a four party meeting of the French, British, American and German Defense Ministers in Florida in March 1995, where the United States and Germany discussed with their European counterparts several detailed scenarios on how a concrete action plan for membership of a candidate country could look.

While there were several subsequent backchannel and public meetings of NATO allies about the specifics of the policy and process toward NATO enlargement, it was of utmost importance to come to a modus operandi with Russia in the spring of 1995. President Bill Clinton's visit to Moscow on May 1995 served as a platform to discuss NATO expansion with Yeltsin personally and to make progress on a separate NATO-Russia / U.S.-Russia intensification of relations agenda. On the Russian side, President Yeltsin was receiving harsh domestic criticism regarding enlargement of the alliance and faced parliamentary and presidential elections in December 1995, respectively June 1996, which made him hesitant to embrace the initiative. Therefore, the dynamics of the negotiations had not really changed: While the United States was advocating a transparent process of NATO enlargement in a reasonable timeframe and wanted to take the next step, Russia was more interested in delaying the initiative for as long as possible, while simultaneously calling for a special relationship with the West.

This was the backdrop at the outset of the meeting in which the two leaders managed to come to a remarkable compromise with which both parties could live with. President Clinton agreed to postpone the next major steps on enlargement, most notably, the timing as well as determination of the candidates for membership, until after the presidential elections in Russia, in order to help Yeltsin politically. In return, Yeltsin agreed to sign the PfP work program document and to make a good faith effort in filling the NATO-Russia relationship with new energy and substance. This agreement gave structure to the core of the NATO enlargement process, which helped all parties involved to prepare for the eventual membership of Central and Eastern Europe and a closer relationship between Russia and the West.

Even though the major decisions on NATO expansion were delayed through this deal, the United States and Europe continued to indicate their support for former Warsaw Pact states' wish to join NATO and also reaffirmed the alliance's interest in this move throughout the remainder of the year.[384] Of special relevance was the publication of the NATO enlargement study on September 20, 1995, which outlined the rationale, process and principles of NATO expansion. In officially summarizing the alliance's view on the issue, the study repeated several major points that had been advocated at earlier stages in the process, most notably the view that "enlargement will contribute to enhanced stability and security for all countries in the Euro-Atlantic community" as well as the role of the Partnership for Peace program as a bridge for those countries that aspire to become members of the alliance.[385] On the principles of NATO enlargement, the study that was prepared under the leadership of NATO's Assistant Secretary General for Political Affairs, German Ambassador Gebhardt von Moltke declared:

> New members will be full members of the Alliance, enjoying all the rights and assuming all the obligations under the Washington Treaty. There must be no

---

[384] In 1995, several senior Clinton administration officials reached out to political elites inside the Beltway and the public at large to promote the inclusion of Central and Eastern European states in NATO. The German government equally reached out to the candidate countries in order to send a clear signal of commitment to this cause, as Helmut Kohl's speech at the Polish Sejm on July 6, 1995 shows. Even though the major decisions were in a holding pattern, Germany wanted to show that Bonn was dedicated to ultimately achieve NATO enlargement.
[385] NATO. *Study on NATO Enlargement*, Chapter 5 (Brussels: NATO, September 1995).

'second tier' security guarantees or members within the Alliance and no modifications of the Washington Treaty for those who join.[386]

The document went on to identify political and military criteria that applicant countries needed to fulfill in order to become a member: conforming to democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law, demonstrating a commitment to and respect for OSCE norms and principles as well as being prepared to share the roles, risks, responsibilities, benefits and burdens of common security and collective defense. Even though every candidate country still had to make significant adjustments domestically in order to adhere to all of the provisions of the NATO enlargement catalogue, the feedback from capitals in Central and Eastern Europe was overwhelmingly positive, as the study cemented the alliance's commitment to expand and constituted a significant step into this direction.

In parallel to this development, the United States and Europe were also active on the other track of keeping Moscow engaged by developing different ideas on how to establish a new NATO-Russia relationship in the second half of 1995. These efforts received a boost through the settlement of the war in the Balkans and especially through Russian participation in NATO's Implementation Force (IFOR), thereby demonstrating NATO's ability to end conflicts and the fact that NATO and Russia could work together. Both parties were also heavily engaged in consultations on the details of an upgraded relationship with each other in security matters. The bilateral U.S.-Russian track especially made some progress on potential elements for a NATO-Russia framework document, including:

> A statement that NATO's mission had changed; a standing consultative mechanism (…); an explicit statement that Russia was not excluded from membership; no prohibition on the sales of Russian arms to new members; and 'guarantees' that there would be no NATO conventional or nuclear forces deployed on the soil of new members.[387]

In addition to infusing life into the NATO-Russia dialogue through concrete proposals, the United States and Europe also looked for other ways to draw Moscow closer into existing Western institutions. This approach was matched with genuine interest on the Russian side and was satisfied in this particular timeframe by Russia's membership in the Council of Europe starting on February 28, 1996 even though some nations had questions about Moscow's eligibility for this body.[388]

These activities made an important contribution to keeping the Russian side engaged and showed that Moscow could reap significant benefits through cooperation with the West. Building on these developments in the timeframe 1995/1996, the West pushed for NATO enlargement immediately after Boris Yeltsin had won another term as Russian President in June 1996. The first post-election impetus toward enlargement came again from Washington, when President Clinton sent a letter to European Heads of State on August 7, 1996 asking for support in enlarging the alliance and creating a formalized NATO-Russia agreement within a limited

---

[386] Ibid.
[387] Asmus. *Opening NATO's Door*, 109.
[388] At later stages of the process, Russia was also able to secure its membership in the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank and became part of the group of most important industrialized nations (G8).

timeframe.[389] The United States made its preference on the schedule clear when Secretary of State Warren Christopher called for the start of accession talks for potential NATO members by mid 1997 during a speech in Stuttgart on September 6, 1996.[390] This timetable emerged as a consensus view among NATO allies, as the Brussels Ministerial Meeting of the North Atlantic Council in December 1996 demonstrated. After a lengthy consultative process in the past five years, the alliance officially invited candidates to apply for membership – the decisive passage of the communiqué read as follows:

> A number of countries have long-standing aspirations to become full members of our Alliance and have undertaken intensive and wide-ranging preparations and reforms with this aim in mind. We are now in a position to recommend to our Heads of State and Government to invite at next year's Summit meeting one or more countries which have participated in the intensified dialogue process, to start accession negotiations with the Alliance. Our goal is to welcome the new member(s) by the time of NATO's 50th anniversary in 1999.[391]

VII.7 NATO-Russia Founding Act and Madrid NATO Enlargement Summit

A sine qua non for the successful implementation of this 1996 NATO decision was a legally binding agreement with the Russian side on future relations. Therefore, the alliance's attention after the North Atlantic Council meeting turned to alleviating Russian security concerns stemming from NATO enlargement, in an attempt to minimize Moscow's outward opposition to the initiative. Given the short timeline until the Madrid Summit, the alliance took the first step in this direction at the same NAC meeting when U.S. Secretary of State Warren Christopher addressed the prime Russian security concern with the following declaration: "We are declaring that in today's Europe, NATO has no intention, no plan, and no need to station nuclear weapons on the territory of any new members, and we are affirming that no NATO nuclear forces are presently on alert."[392] With this unilateral statement on behalf of the alliance, Christopher opened the door to serious negotiations on a new basis for cooperation between NATO and Russia in the first five months of 1997.

The official positioning of an enlarged NATO as a non-confrontational alliance in the post-Cold War environment was only one building block in far-reaching consensus with President Yeltsin on a new partnership between East and West. In order to overcome the obstructionist attitude of the Russian counterparts to the question of NATO expansion, the West needed leadership and commitment to the agenda, as well as close cooperation amongst itself to reach consensus with Moscow. Both ingredients for success fell into place at the beginning of 1997: on the one hand, President Clinton declared at the outset of his second term that he was dedicated to this mission and nominated a new U.S. Secretary of State, Madeleine Albright, who would play a crucial role

---

[389] The German government supported this approach as the provisions of an inter-agency position paper show in which Bonn called for a special NATO Summit in 1997 as venue for the formalization of both processes. See Weisser. *Sicherheit für ganz Europa,* 98/99.

[390] Secretary of State Warren Christopher, "A New Atlantic Community for the 21st Century," *USIS WF* (6 September 1996).

[391] NATO. *Final Communiqué. Issued at the Ministerial Meeting of the North Atlantic Council. Press Communiqué, M-NAC-2, (96) 165* (Brussels: NATO, 10 December 1996).

[392] Warren Christopher, "Fulfilling the Founding Vision of NATO," *U.S. Department of State Dispatch* 7 (9 December 1996), 601. See also William Drozdiak, "NATO pledges not to put nuclear arms in new member states," *WP* (11 December 1996), A16.

in finalizing enlargement;[393] on the other hand, the U.S-German partnership served as a motor to come to a final agreement between Russia and NATO.

The coordination and consultations between the highest level of the U.S. and German government, first and foremost between President Clinton and Chancellor Kohl, was the key to find the right balance between pressuring and courting the Russian side into moving rapidly on the details of an agreement. This partnership was crucial as the Russian government still publicly opposed NATO enlargement and was trying to achieve as many favorable concessions as possible, while simultaneously attempting to water down any official document as much as possible. Helmut Kohl received a first hand impression of Yeltsin's reluctance to embrace the initiative during his January 4, 1997 meeting with the Russian President. In the face of opposition, the Chancellor stood firm on the issue and on the envisioned timetable, reiterating Germany's support for the inclusion of Central and Eastern European countries in the alliance. In addition to the White House's own bilateral consultations with the Kremlin, the German Chancellor was an important source of information and support for the cause in subsequent weeks.[394]

In January 1997, the alliance nominated NATO Secretary General Javier Solana as the formal negotiator with the Russian government to formulate a document that Moscow and Brussels could agree on. While several rounds of negotiations made progress on a variety of details for the new NATO-Russia relationship, it required the weight of the United States (accompanied by Germany's support) to reach closure on the main issues of controversy, which centered around Russia's influence in NATO's decision-making procedure, the alliance's ability to move military infrastructure and forces to new NATO members, as well as the potential for future enlargement rounds. The bilateral U.S.-Russia Summit in Helsinki on March 20/21, 1997 became the venue in which the remaining hurdles for consensus were addressed by Presidents Clinton and Yeltsin. In preparation for the Summit, the U.S. side, in close cooperation with key NATO allies, had formulated red lines for the negotiations, i.e. the conditions that were non-negotiable in order to guarantee NATO coherence. These provisions included that NATO would reject any agreement that allowed Russia an explicit or implicit veto on the alliance's decision-making, excluded or delayed any candidate country from its potential membership, established a second class membership within the alliance, or subordinated NATO to any other international institution such as the UN.

Bill Clinton held firm on these conditions in his discussions with the Russian President and was able to receive silent consent from his counterpart on these points, even if only after long negotiations. In terms of tangible results at the summit site, the two leaders agreed to create a NATO-Russia Council that would serve as a consultative mechanism for the alliance as a whole and Moscow could use to exchange views and, ideally, come to a consensus on the issue at hand (this came to be known as the 16+1 format). The U.S. President also refused to exclude explicitly

---

[393] Bill Clinton outlined NATO enlargement as one of his foreign policy priorities in his 1997 State of the Union Address to the American people. See William J.Clinton. *1997 State of the Union Address* (Washington, DC, 4 February 1997). As a native Czech that fled from her home country in the 1930s and immigrated to the United States thereafter, Madeleine Albright had a special interest in a successful completion of the NATO enlargement initiative. See also Albright, *Madam Secretary*.

[394] Martin A. Smith describes the German-U.S. cooperation pro NATO-enlargement in this decisive period as follows: "One important feature of this western effort was the extent to which the Americans and Germans were working closely in tandem once again. This could be seen in the way in which U.S. and German diplomacy dovetailed at crucial times in the first four months of 1997. The first visit of the new U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright to Moscow in February had been immediately preceded by talks between the Foreign Ministers of Germany and Russia. Summit meetings between Boris Yeltsin and Bill Clinton in March, and between Yeltsin and Helmut Kohl in April, both helped clear the way for the formal NATO-Russia agreement." See Martin A Smith. *Building a bigger Europe*, 47.

or implicitly future NATO membership for former Soviet states, even though Boris Yeltsin was adamant about receiving this concession, especially with regard to the Baltic States. In exchange for the White House's resistance to budge on these issues, Bill Clinton offered compromise language on NATO's stationing of personnel in former Warsaw Pact states that was adopted by NATO only two days later. The alliance's second unilateral statement read as follows:

> In the current and foreseeable security environment, the Alliance will carry out its collective defense and other missions by ensuring the necessary interoperability, integration and capability for reinforcement rather than by additional permanent stationing of substantial combat forces.[395]

The U.S.-Russia Summit in Helsinki constituted a breakthrough for NATO enlargement even though both presidents agreed to disagree on the merits of the initiative and the reactions toward the agreed upon provisions were not entirely positive, as Western commentators feared that NATO had given away too much control over its decision-making procedures.[396] However, the crucial change in the dynamic of the process was that even though Russia was still in opposition to NATO expansion, Moscow had accepted that it was inevitable at this point. Boris Yeltsin had come to the conclusion that it was better for Russia to consent silently to NATO expansion in exchange for several concessions including membership in international organizations, an institutionalized NATO-Russia relationship, as well as the alliance's two unilateral statements. It was then no surprise that Yeltsin announced during a visit in Germany in April 1997 that NATO and Russia would sign an agreement on May 27 in Paris.

The final document carried the name "Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security between NATO and the Russian Federation" and outlined the goals, areas and mechanism of consultation, cooperation and joint decision-making between the two partners.[397] The Act stated that "NATO and Russia do not consider each other as adversaries" and pledged that the new partnership was based on an adherence to the following principles:

- Development, on the basis of transparency, of a strong, stable, enduring and equal partnership and of cooperation to strengthen security and stability in the Euro-Atlantic area;
- Acknowledgement of the vital role that democracy, political pluralism, the rule of law, and respect for human rights and civil liberties and the development of free market economies play in the development of common prosperity and comprehensive security;
- Refraining from the threat or use of force against each other as well as against any other state, its sovereignty, territorial integrity or political independence in any matter inconsistent with the United Nations Charter and with the Declaration of Principles Guiding Relations between Participating States contained in the Helsinki Final Act;
- Respect for sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of all states and their inherent right to choose the means to ensure their own security, the inviolability of

---

[395] See *Statement by the North Atlantic Council* (Brussels, 14 March 1997).
[396] See Henry Kissinger, "Helsinki Fiasco," *WP* (30 March 1997). In addition to these concerns, Clinton and Yeltsin had 'only' addressed the most contentious issues – there remained a great amount of work to be done on the details of the agreement that required substantial diplomatic finesse on the part of Javier Solana and his counterpart Russian Foreign Minister Yevgeny Primakov.
[397] *Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security between NATO and the Russian Federation* (Paris, 27 May 1997).

borders and peoples' right of self-determination as enshrined in the Helsinki Final Act and other OSCE documents;

- Mutual transparency in creating and implementing defence policy and military doctrines;
- Prevention of conflicts and settlement of disputes by peaceful means in accordance with UN and OSCE principles;
- Support, on a case-by-case basis, of peacekeeping operations carried out under the authority of the UN Security Council or the responsibility of the OSCE.[398]

The venue to address concrete issues in the spirit of the above mentioned principles was the newly created NATO-Russia Permanent Joint Council, which envisioned bringing together Russian and NATO representatives at the level of ambassadors monthly and serving as forum in which foreign/defense ministers of both partners meet twice annually. Importantly, this consultative mechanism did not constitute an opportunity for the Russian side to block any NATO decisions or use the channel as a means to disadvantage the interests of other states – in other words, the Kremlin had a voice at the table but no veto at its disposal in this format.

Even though the NATO-Russia Founding Act does not mention any candidate countries for NATO membership and Moscow was very keen on disentangling its new relationship to the Western military alliance from the enlargement issue, the two tracks came together through the agreement in Paris. Only the consensus on a new, legally-binding modus operandi for the NATO-Russia relationship gave the alliance an opportunity to move forward on the final steps toward NATO expansion. The most controversial issue in the preparation of the Madrid NATO enlargement Summit on July 8/9, 1997, was the decision on which countries would join the alliance in the first round of enlargement. Ever since the end of the Cold War and the start of the debate on a potential NATO expansion, Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic had not only been the most vocal on joining, but also complied fully with the military and political criteria outlined in the PfP agreement. Their adherence to democratic principles and military readiness serving not only as security importer, but also bringing important resources in the defense field to the table made them natural frontrunners for enlargement.[399]

While a consensus within NATO was emerging in favor of inviting these three nations to become members, a heated controversy erupted in the lead-up to Madrid around the question of potentially giving other countries the opportunity of joining the alliance. After having been on the sidelines of the debate for the majority of the process, the French and Italian government actively lobbied for the inclusion of Romania and Slovenia in the first round of enlargement, given their historic ties to these countries, arguing that membership would enable them to play an important role in stabilizing South-Eastern Europe.[400] The different views on this issue clashed at the NATO foreign ministers meeting in the Portuguese city Sintra only two days after the signing of the NATO-Russia Founding Act on May 29, 1997. While Paris and Rome positioned themselves as champions and proponents of a larger group for NATO membership, undertaking

---

[398] Ibid. See also President Boris Yeltsin's assessment of the Founding Act from a Russian perspective. Boris Yeltsin. *Remarks by Russian President Yeltsin at the Signing Ceremony of the NATO-Russia Founding Act* (Paris, 27 May 1997).

[399] See Stefan Fröhlich, "Die Osterweiterung der NATO erfordert die organisatorische Neugestaltung des Bündnisses," *KAS-Auslandsinformationen* 6 (1997).

[400] An additional factor in the debate was that even though nobody actively promoted an inclusion of a Baltic country in NATO in 1997, they were the case study for the alliance's interest in ensuring that all PfP signatory states remained active in working together with NATO even if they did not want or were not invited to join at this point. Prospective membership for Baltic nations was an important subset of the NATO enlargement debate at this stage. See Ronald D. Asmus / Robert C. Nurick, "NATO Enlargement and the Baltic States," *Survival* 38.2 (Summer 1996), 121-42; Carl Bildt,"The Baltic Litmus Test," *FA* 73.5 (September/October 1994), 72-85; Anatol Lieven, "Baltic Iceberg dead ahead: NATO beware," *The World Today* 52.7 (July 1996), 175-179; Siegfried Thielbeer, "Klare Worte an die baltischen Republiken," *FAZ* (20 June 1995), 8.

a substantive lobbying effort to win support for their view among other NATO members, U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright outlined Washington's preference for a smaller first round at the meeting.

The U.S rationale for this position was informed by several motivations that made this option more attractive from Washington's point of view. First, the White House wanted only to bring into the alliance those countries that were the strongest candidates at that given moment. Even though there were different assessments on how qualified Romania and Slovenia were for membership in 1997, the United States had come to the conclusion that they did not belong to the top tier. The Clinton administration was convinced that holding all candidate countries to the highest performance standards on all relevant military, political and economic criteria was in the national interest of the United States. Second, a smaller group of new members was advantageous in order to manage the already cumbersome, consensus-based decision-making procedures as well as to simplify the assimilation of the new members in the alliance. Third, opening the alliance's door for only Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic constituted an important political signal that future rounds of enlargement were not ruled out. Despite several statements to this effect from the American side, including in the bilateral negotiations with Moscow on the NATO-Russia Founding Act, U.S. President Clinton wanted to reinforce this message through the selection of a limited number of new NATO members. Finally, the U.S. administration had also an eye on the necessary ratification of NATO enlargement in the U.S. Senate after Madrid and believed that Capitol Hill would be most receptive to a smaller group.

The discussions at the NATO meeting in Sintra did not lead to any consensus among the representatives. While member states indicated informally their preference for how many countries should be invited to join, a majority was in favor of giving a larger group of candidate countries this opportunity. Only the United Kingdom and Iceland argued openly for a more restricted number, while Germany remained non-committal by vouching to support the consensus within the alliance in order to avoid the need to choose between Washington and Paris. Without a compromise at this last official NATO meeting prior to the scheduled Madrid Summit in July 1997, it was clear that the heads-of states were called upon to come to a decision how many invitations the alliance would extend. Before the leaders met in the Spanish capital, there were extensive bilateral discussions within the alliance about the right way forward on this issue – in the midst of various lobbying campaigns was Germany.

Being aware of Bonn's status as a key country in the process, Helmut Kohl consulted intensively with Presidents Clinton and Chirac on the issue. The Chancellor's visit to Washington in June 1997, gave him an opportunity to exchange views with Bill Clinton over a private dinner. At this stage, Kohl did not promise his counterpart ultimate support for the U.S. strategy, which was not only based on a concern how Paris would react to such a move, but also related to existing differences between the German Defense and Foreign Ministry. While Volker Rühe was backing the U.S. position on the issue explicitly, Klaus Kinkel also could envision five candidate countries in the first round.[401] With Washington's closest European ally not fully on board and growing uncertainty of individual NATO countries on how to position themselves given French lobbying, the White House decided to send an unambiguous signal of their position in the matter. President Clinton announced the official U.S. view on NATO enlargement during a press conference on June 12, 1997:

---

[401] Based on the same rationale, Chancellor Kohl discussed NATO expansion with his French counterpart during a Franco-German Summit on June 13, 1997.

> After careful consideration, I've decided that the United States will support inviting three countries – Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic – to begin accession talks to join NATO when we meet in Madrid next month. We have said all along that we would judge aspiring members by their ability to add strength to the Alliance and their readiness to shoulder the obligations of NATO membership. Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic clearly meet those criteria – and have currently made the greatest strides in military capacity and political and economic reforms. As I have repeatedly emphasized, the first new members should not and will not be the last. We will continue to work with other interested nations, such as Slovenia and Romania, to help them prepare for membership. Other nations are making good progress – and none will be excluded from consideration.[402]

Therefore, the U.S.-French disagreement was painstakingly obvious to the public and would continue during the proceedings at the Madrid Summit. In a series of long and very heated negotiations between the various NATO member delegations and their heads-of-states, it fell to the German Chancellor to tilt the balance in favor of inviting three candidate countries to become NATO members.[403] The crucial moment came in the restricted session of the Summit in which only the heads-of states and a few advisors were present when Helmut Kohl announced Germany's support for the American position. As compensation to the French and Italian government, he advocated recognizing the developments in Romania and Slovenia explicitly in the final communiqué, making them frontrunners for the next round of enlargement.[404] In order to support the efforts of the Baltic states toward integration into Western structures, Kohl was, furthermore, in favor of mentioning this region as long as it did not undermine the consensus on inviting only three countries in the first round.[405] With this crucial backing in the decisive phase of the process, German Chancellor Kohl had proven again to be U.S. President Clinton's closest political ally in Europe, making the U.S.-German partnership not only the motor of the NATO enlargement initiative but also the guarantor of its implementation, as the final communiqué exemplified:

> Today, we invite the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland to begin accession talks with NATO. Our goal is to sign the Protocol of Accession at the time of the Ministerial meetings in December 1997 and to see the ratification process completed in time for membership to become effective by the 50th anniversary of the Washington Treaty in April 1999.[406]

---

[402] William J. Clinton, "Press Conference on NATO enlargement," *USIS Wireless File* (Brussels: U.S. Mission to NATO, 12 June 1997).

[403] For an in-depth description of the rather chaotic negotiations on this point, please consult Asmus. *Opening NATO's Door*, 238-250.

[404] The respective part of the communiqué read as follows: "We reaffirm that NATO remains open to new members under Article 10 of the North Atlantic Treaty. The Alliance will continue to welcome new members in a position to further the principles of the Treaty and contribute to security in the Euro-Atlantic area. (…) With regard to the aspiring members, we recognize with great interest and take account of the positive developments toward democracy and the rule of law in a number of southeastern countries, especially Romania and Slovenia." See *Madrid Declaration on Euro-Atlantic Security and Cooperation. Issued by the Heads of State and Government, Press Release M-1 (97)81* (Madrid: Meeting of the North Atlantic Council, 8 July 1997).

[405] This suggestion also found its way into the final document: "The Alliance recognizes the need to build greater stability, security and regional cooperation in the countries of southeast Europe, and in promoting their increasing integration into the Euro-Atlantic community. At the same time, we recognize the progress achieved toward greater stability and cooperation by the states in the Baltic region which are also aspiring members."

[406] Ibid.

VII.8. Cost Assessments and Ratification

While the outcomes of the Madrid Summit constituted a great success for the U.S.-German cooperation on NATO enlargement, the Heads-of State's wish to expand the alliance still required ratification by all existing members to become legally binding. In the aftermath of the meeting, there were, in some instances, national debates about the merits of the initiative – an important subset of which was the question about the amount and distribution of costs for bringing Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic into the alliance. This was especially true in the United States in which a two-thirds majority vote in the Senate was necessary for ratification. Therefore, it was no surprise that the U.S. government put a great amount of thought into calculating the financial in addition to the political costs to enlarge NATO. The difficulty in this exercise was the dependency on a variety of factors including

> the nature of the projected threat environment; the strategy that NATO adopts to carry out new Article V missions and its associated force requirements; the timeframe used for assessing cost estimates; the criteria used for allocating costs among the countries involved; and the scope of defense efforts that would take place without enlargement.[407]

The first credible institution to address the task of providing policymakers and the wider public with a cost calculation on NATO expansion was the U.S. Congressional Budget Office (CBO). In their March 1996 study, the CBO outlined five different options over a 15-year period (1996-2010) for which total expenses varied between $60.6 billion and $124.7 billion. The five different scenarios included the need to "help a Visegrad state defend itself against a border skirmish or limited attack by a regional power" (option 1, $60.6 billion); moving "NATO air power east when a Visegrad nation is under threat from attack" (option 2, $79.2 billion); "the more traditional view that substantial friendly ground forces are needed to defend territory against their enemy counterparts" (option 3, $109.3 billion); prepositioning "military equipment on the territories of the Visegrad states so that troops can be flown in to operate during a crisis" (option 4, $110.5 billion); and finally, "the most ambitious and costly of the alternatives, permanently station a limited number of NATO forces (equipment and personnel) in the Visegrad states" (option 5, $124.7 billion).[408] The underlying rationale of all five options in this study was that NATO needed to be prepared for a conflict, if not war, against Russia.

In contrast to this strategic assumption, the 1996 autumn study of the RAND scholars Ronald D. Asmus, Richard L. Kugler and F. Stephen Larrabee stipulated that enlargement costs should be calculated on the basis of avoiding confrontation with Russia. Starting with the premise that the relationship between East and West in the post-Cold War era was more conducive to less threat-based scenarios in military planning, these policy analysts came to a very different range of expected costs for enlargement. RAND estimated the costs for expansion to be between $10 billion to $110 billion but argued that "the total costs are likely to amount to somewhere between $30 billion and $52 billion over the 10-15 year period, depending upon the level of capabilities

---

[407] U.S. Department of State. *Report to the Congress on the Enlargement of the North Atlantic Treaty organization: Rationale, Benefits, Costs and Implications* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of State, 24 February 1997).
[408] See Congressional Budget Office (CBO). *The Costs of expanding the NATO Alliance* (Washington, DC: CBO Papers, March 1996). The last option in this model calculation was rather of theoretical nature after NATO's second unilateral statement was included in the NATO-Russia Founding Act. The CBO study estimated that the total costs for the United States could be expected to be between $5 billion and $19 billion.

deemed necessary."[409] Similar to the CBO study, RAND offerered four different options that might come into play within the process of enlargement: first, the "self-defense support" option in which the alliance only would provide help in areas such as command, control, communication and intelligence (C3I), while new members would be able to rely on their own combat forces to meet their security needs (Costs: $10-20 billion); second, NATO provides, in addition, air power projection to the new members (Costs: $20-30 billion); third, the "joint-power projection" option includes that NATO also provides ground combat forces to Central and Eastern Europe (Costs: $30-52 billion); and finally, the "forward presence" option in which NATO also forward deploys large air and ground combat forces in Central and Eastern Europe (Costs: $55-110 billion). While RAND assessed the third option as the most likely in the given situation, the authors stressed that the choice between three political approaches to enlargement will determine the necessary capabilities and costs for expansion. In essence, these scenarios include

> an evolutionary path that assumes no imminent security threat in the area, a "promote stability" track that sees NATO membership playing a key role in fostering democracy and security in the region; and a "strategic response" that would be appropriate only if Russia were to emerge as a threat.[410]

A similar approach to calculating costs for NATO expansion was employed by the Department of Defense, whose financial assessments were published in an official report to Congress on NATO enlargement on February 24, 1997. The Pentagon prefaced its deliberations by arguing that "enlargement will take place in a European security environment in which there is no current threat of large-scale conventional aggression and where any such threat would take years to develop".[411] In addition, the report emphasizes that alliances save money and that "even higher costs would flow from a decision not to enlarge NATO at all. Such an action would send the message to the Central and East Europeans that their future does not lie with NATO and the West."[412] In terms of concrete financial projections, the Department of Defense estimated that the total costs associated with enlargement would fall between $27 and $35 billion from 1997 to 2009. These costs would accumulate as a result of three different activities, namely "new member costs for military restructuring" ($10-13 billion), "NATO regional reinforcement capabilities" ($8-10 billion), and "direct enlargement costs" ($9-12 billion).[413] The report to Congress also addressed the issue of burden-sharing of these costs within the alliance, as it suggested, without having consulted other NATO allies, that new members should pay for approximately 35% ($3-4 billion) of direct enlargement enhancements, current (non-U.S.) NATO members should pay for

---

[409] Ronald D. Asmus / Richard L. Kugler / F. Stephen Larrabee, "What will NATO Enlargement cost?" *Survival* 38.3 (Autumn 1996), 7.

[410] Carl Elk, "NATO Expansion: Cost Issues," *CRS Report for Congress* (Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, 26 February 1998), 10.

[411] U.S. Department of Defense. *Report to the Congress on the military requirements and costs of NATO enlargement* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Defense, February 1998), 8.

[412] Ibid, 9.

[413] Ibid, 14. The discrepancy between CBO's calculations and the Department of Defense and RAND's cost projections respectively are explained by Richard L. Kugler as follows: "The Congressional Budget Office tabled a higher estimate of about $125 billion, but the differences are readily explained. About $30 billion of the difference owes to CBO's inclusion of new member measures that DOD deemed as falling outside the NATO enlargement account. The remaining difference owes to CBO's decision to embrace a higher theory of threats and requirements. CBO costed a NATO reinforcement posture of 12 divisions and 12 wings, a difference of nearly $30 billion. CBO also included more robust measures for C3I systems, munitions and facilities. To CBO, these measures make military sense. DOD's estimate judges that they are not needed." See Richard L. Kugler, "Costs of NATO enlargement. Moderate and Affordable," *Strategic Forum* 128 (October 1997), 5. See also David C. Gompert, "NATO Enlargement: Putting the Cost in Perspective," *Strategic Forum* 129 (October 1997) and William Drozdiak, "NATO Expansion 'on the Cheap' may have surcharge," *WP* (12 March 1997), A1.

about 50% (4,5-5,5 billion) of the expected cost, while the U.S. would cover 15% ($1.5-2 billion) of the expansion costs.

While this unilateral decision of the U.S. government caused criticism among NATO allies, the overall reaction to the cost projections at hand for NATO enlargement was rather matter-of-fact among the allies. This was certainly true for Germany, where the Kohl government saw NATO enlargement as a political process and of paramount importance for its national interest, compared to which cost assessments were of secondary nature at best. In light of the different variables in the cost equations for NATO enlargement expenses, Bonn did not commission any calculations on its own and even refused to comment on any of the three studies outlined above.[414] The Kohl government felt reassured of its approach when NATO tabled its very own calculations on expansion costs after the Madrid Summit. The 1997 December NATO Ministerial meeting in Brussels adopted a report that estimated the need for common funding to fully integrate Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic into the alliance at "only" $1.5 billion over a period of 10 years.[415]

The lion share of these costs had to be managed by the candidate countries through a significant increase of their defense budgets as well as their contribution to the alliance's common-funded budgets (civil and military budget as well as the NATO Security Investment Program). For current NATO members, the incremental costs for NATO enlargement were, even in light of predominantly declining defense budgets in the 1990s, manageable[416] – the German government for instance planned to cover enlargement costs through a redistribution of their already allocated contributions to NATO budgets as well as through an annual contribution between 2000 and 2007 of no more than five million DM.[417]

The bottom line was that despite the importance to the cost issue (especially in the U.S. debate), this argument could be neutralized by governments on the path to ratifying NATO enlargement in member states. However, this was only one aspect of NATO enlargement in which legislatures were interested, as the most extensive ratification debate within the alliance, which took place in Washington, showed. To convince the U.S. Senate of the benefits of this policy, the Clinton administration was given the opportunity to explain the rationale in a series of official hearings on Capitol Hill throughout 1997. A key role in this process fell to U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright who lobbied for and explained the White House's policy to the wider public, and in front of the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee on October 7, 1997. In her testimony, she referenced four key reasons why NATO enlargement was worthy of ratification: first, the expansion of the Western military alliance broadened the circle of European nations in which

---

[414] See Deutscher Bundestag. *Antwort der Bundesregierung auf die Kleine Anfrage der Abgeordneten Gernot Erler, Uta Zapf, Volker Kröning weiterer Abgeordneter und der Fraktion der SPD: Osterweiterung der NATO und Abrüstung* (Bonn: Deutscher Bundestag, 13. Wahlperiode, Drucksache 13/7731, 20 May 1997).

[415] See *Final Communique. Ministerial Meeting of the North Atlantic Council held at NATO Headquarters, Press Release M-NAC-2 (97) 155* (Brussels: NATO, 16 December, 1997).

[416] The German defense budget saw a decline from 53.61 billion DM in 1991 to 46.29 billion DM in 1997. See also Karl Feldmeyer, "Folgen der Friedensdividende," *FAZ* (11 May 1995); André Uzulis, "Sparpläne für Bundeswehr: Union und FDP sehen Bündnisfähigkeit gefährdet," *Welt am Sonntag* (15 June 1997).

[417] See Deutscher Bundestag. *Antwort der Bundesregierung auf die Kleine Anfrage der Abgeordneten Angelika Beer, Winfried Nachtwei, Christian Sterzing, Ludger Volmer und der Fraktion BÜNDNIS 90/ DIE GRÜNEN: Die Reform der NATO und die Osterweiterung der Allianz* (Bonn: Deutscher Bundestag, 13. Wahlperiode, Drucksache 13/9693, 21 January 1998). This approach was subject matter in subsequent U.S.-German negotiations as Washington requested additional financial contributions from Bonn even though Germany was already second largest contributor to NATO's common budgets with 21.9% (540 million DM) after the United States. In return, Germany pledged to shoulder a fair part of the burden throughout the process without detailing its additional financial contribution. Compare Karl-Heinz Kamp, "Die Debatte um die Kosten der Osterweiterung in der NATO," *Die Debatte über die Kosten der NATO-Osterweiterung.* August Pradetto /Fouzieh Melanie Alamir (eds.) (Baden-Baden: Nomos, 1998), 147 and Klaus Kinkel, "Priceless Alliance," *WP* (4 November 1997).

wars were no longer happening; second, it enhanced the strength and cohesion of the alliance; third, NATO expansion gave the nations of Central and Eastern Europe an incentive to solve their own problems, and finally, in addition to these strategic rationales, there was also a moral imperative to open NATO doors for countries that had been behind the Iron Curtain during the Cold War.[418]

In addition to key Clinton administration officials making the case for NATO enlargement, there were a number of other sophisticated actors that campaigned on behalf of the candidate countries' inclusion in the alliance. First and foremost, the State Department's NATO Expansion Ratification Office (NERO), under the leadership of former NSC aide Jeremy Rosner became the clearing house for the administration's lobbying efforts. Rosner had only a small team available to fulfill his task of functioning as a seismograph on Capitol Hill in order to answer questions and alleviate concerns of U.S. Senators, who were not already fully on board. His strategy was to build a strong bi-partisan coalition for enlargement in the U.S. Senate that would include very conservative but internationalist-minded Republicans, in order to win support on both sides of the aisle. Of special relevance for the success of the Clinton administration's plan was to convince the Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee Jesse Helms to champion ratification efforts within the committee in order to collect more than the 67 votes necessary in the U.S. Senate. While Helms was a thorn in the Democrats' flesh on a whole variety of other foreign policy issues, he finally agreed to play this role, but only after his concerns related to the costs of NATO enlargement, the military rationale for expansion, and Russia's (non-existing) involvement in NATO decision-making procedures had been addressed.

While the excellent personal relationship between Jesse Helms and Madeleine Albright was an asset in facilitating this outcome, it was also helpful that U.S. Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott (R-MI) proposed the creation of an observer group on March 21, 1997 that would join "the administration in its negotiations on NATO enlargement and cut across party lines and committee jurisdictions."[419] In addition to this public effort, there were also several private initiatives and ways in which organized groups and citizens created an environment that was conducive for Senators to vote in favor of NATO enlargement. Among these, the most noteworthy was the U.S. Committee to Expand NATO (USCEN) which was incorporated as a non-profit, bipartisan corporation located in the American Enterprise Institute's Washington DC office in 1996 and headed by Bruce Jackson, Director for Strategic Planning for Lockheed Martin.

As a long-time Republican insider and working in tandem with Jeremy Rosner, Jackson complemented NERO's outreach activities on the Republican side in order to achieve the "admission of additional European nations to membership in NATO as a way to strengthen democratic institutions and market economies in these nations".[420] This agenda was certainly also in the interest of the Central and Eastern European diplomatic corps, which continued actively its efforts throughout 1997 to convince U.S. Senators and the wider public of the benefits of NATO expansion for the United States. Finally, all these pro-enlargement forces were able to secure several endorsements for their cause, including former administration officials, state

---

[418] See Madeleine Albright. *NATO Enlargement* (Washington, DC: Senate Foreign Relations Committee, 7 October 1997).

[419] Trent Lott, "The Senate's Role in NATO Enlargement," *WP* (21 March 1997). James M. Goldgeier assessed the role of this group as follows: "Truly bipartisan and with enough sceptics to portray advice and consent as a process with real meaning, the Senate NATO Observer Group played a vital role in the campaign to enlarge NATO." Goldgeier. *Not Whether but When,* 127.

[420] Grayson. *Strange Bedfellows*, 132.

legislatures and a series of national as well as regional newspapers, thereby augmenting the visibility of the initiative and the pressure on Capitol Hill to vote in favor of it.[421]

Against this overly positive environment for enlargement, the deliberations on the ratification of the initiate were held in the U.S. Senate, which led to a final vote on the issue on April 30, 1998. After several proposed amendments to the ratification of NATO expansion had been defeated by the pro-enlargement coalition in the run-up, the final vote showed a 80-19 majority for ratification with 45 Republicans and 35 Democrats supporting the bill.[422] The key to success for ratification in the American political system had been the bipartisan nature of support, in which parties could claim ownership of the initiative, a sophisticated and detail-oriented lobbying campaign that had been able to keep the momentum in favor of NATO enlargement and, finally, strong endorsements from political stakeholders that put pressure on Capitol Hill to welcome Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic as new members into the Western alliance.

Compared to the ratification debate in the United States, the German process to make NATO expansion legally binding for Bonn was a less time-consuming and intense exercise. Within Germany's political landscape at the time, a broad consensus had formed that enlargement constituted a paramount improvement of the country's security situation and, therefore, was worth supporting. In addition, enlargement was in line with traditional German foreign policy goals, as the initiative contributed to a strengthening of stability and security on the European continent through the promotion of democratic reforms in Germany's immediate neighborhood and the inclusion of new member states in a collective defense and security framework. It was, furthermore, an additional step toward abolishing a nationalization of defense policies in the post-Cold War era, which was another key foreign policy issue for the nation in the heart of Europe.

In terms of party and power politics, it was clear that the governing coalition of CDU/CSU and the FDP fully supported NATO enlargement as their key policymakers had played substantial roles throughout the whole process in order to see it come to fruition. Helmut Kohl's personal commitment to the agenda and his role as mediator within the alliance and on the NATO-Russia track served as a major additional incentive for these parliamentarians to vote in favor of ratifying NATO enlargement in the Bundestag. On the side of the opposition, the Social Democrats (SPD) had reached a majority pro-enlargement view after a long and somewhat controversial internal debate in the course of 1997. The SPD position on NATO expansion has to be seen in the context of a larger debate within the party about determining the new path of German foreign policy after the end of the Cold War.

With the opposition to Germany's military involvement in the war in Bosnia (in the shape of German soldiers participating in monitoring flights) and its subsequent defeat at the Constitutional Court in 1994, the SPD had become vulnerable toward claims that the party was not trustworthy in foreign affairs. In order to rebuild confidence domestically and internationally in its competencies and leadership in this area (that were also seen more often than not as a necessary asset for a party's ability to govern), the SPD was keen on supporting enlargement. This was of special relevance given the timing of the ratification debate in the Bundestag on March 26, 1998, which was only five days before the state elections in Lower Saxony that would decide the race on the next SPD candidate for Chancellorship.[423] In light of the opposition to NATO enlargement by the PDS as successor party to the former East German communist party SED, and the split within the Greens/Bündnis90 that resulted ultimately in abstention from

---

[421] For a detailed overview of endorsements, please consult Grayson. *Strange Bedfellows,* 128/129, 138.
[422] See *The Senate Resolution on NATO Expansion* (Washington, DC, April 1998).
[423] See Heisig. *Wechselnde Konstellationen,* 306.

voting on the issue, the SPD did not want to be associated with these (minor) political forces that saw in NATO enlargement a potential remilitarization of Germany and the European continent.

The major political forces in Germany were in line with their support for NATO enlargement as the Bundestag debate and voting pattern showed. Out of 622 parliamentarians, 555 members voted in favor, 37 opposed and 30 representatives of the Greens/Bündnis90 did not cast a ballot.[424] As one of the first NATO countries, Germany ratified NATO expansion sending a clear political signal to its allies and the candidate countries in Central and Eastern Europe. Together with the United States, Germany had taken on a leadership role throughout the whole process, which cemented not only the transatlantic partnership with Washington but also promoted security and stability on the European continent.

---

[424] See "Grosse Mehrheit im Bundestag für Ost-Erweiterung der NATO," *FAZ* (27 March 1998).

Conclusion

The German-American relationship remained a key strategic alliance in the immediate transition phase after the end of the Cold War. Despite intensive national debates about fundamental changes and potential reorientation in foreign and security matters, the partnership between both countries remained at the heart of the strategic outlook in the White House and the Chancellery. By bringing to light the major issues on the U.S. and German foreign policy agenda during the first term of U.S. President Bill Clinton, as this analysis has done, it is obvious that the center of gravity for policymaking in security matters continued to be on the European continent. Just as during the Cold War, European stability, freedom and economic prosperity continued to be of utmost importance on Washington's and Bonn's foreign policy agenda for the benefit of the transatlantic alliance and its populations. Taking on this leadership role jointly, Germany and the United States were the driving forces in the process, motivated by the strong belief that this approach was mutually beneficial. They built this assessment not on a theoretical assumption, but on their track record of cooperation in the previous forty years.

While the trust in the value of the bilateral relationship was intact, publics on both sides of the Atlantic had to come to terms with the monumental geopolitical changes caused by the dissolution of the Soviet Union at the same time. In a true fluid moment of history, governments and political elites tried to find a new strategic paradigm that could structure the way nations conducted their security policy and balance the importance of domestic and foreign policy in the post-Cold War era. An excellent example of the pertinent notion in the early 1990s that the great foreign policy battles had come to an end with the fall of the Soviet Union is Francis Fukuyama's theory of the "end of history," in which he proclaims the inevitability of Western liberalism as the organizing principle in world affairs. With American and European publics being hopeful that peace would endure after the past decades of Cold War, foreign relations moved out of the limelight of people's attention while societies attempted to focus exclusively, albeit unsuccessfully, on domestic priorities.

Samuel P. Huntington's theory of a clash of civilization offered a different paradigm that would arguably dominate international politics for the remainder of the 20th century and beyond. In his view, conflicts based on cultural heritage will be the dominating feature in the coming decades and will be much more important than economic or ideological motivations as source of violence between nations. He labeled the new structuring principle of global public policy as "the West versus the rest" arguing that the kin-country syndrome, i.e. the concept of civilization commonality, will force the Western nations to jointly defend their power, values, as well as economic prosperity within the global system against other civilizations. In addition to outlining the conflict potential between the Islamic and Western civilization, Huntington's theoretical construct also makes a strong case for the durability of the Western alliance on the basis of a shared cultural heritage.

Another important element of the post-Cold War debate was how power would be distributed in the global system after Moscow's loss of superpower status. Originating in the United States, a debate emerged over whether unipolarity, bipolarity or multipolarity in the global concert had the highest probability to lead to a balanced international order. The assessments of which structure should be considered prevalent and in the U.S.' best national interest varied and was heavily influenced by the defining principles of the different long-standing foreign policy schools. On the one hand, realists saw in unipolarity (or bipolarity at a maximum) the preferred power distribution scheme given their high regard for the nation state as an actor in the international arena and Washington's leverage as the only remaining superpower at this point in history. On

the other hand, liberal internationalists argued for multipolarity as a structuring principle on the basis of their belief in multilateral institutions as a framework in which competing national interests of states can be handled peacefully.

This well-known controversy between the two camps was infused by new energy due to the historic window of opportunity for a reevaluation of U.S. foreign policy in the early 1990s. In an attempt to come to a pragmatic U.S. foreign policy, the national debate among political elites focused on the extend Washington should include its long-standing partners in Europe and other regions of the world in the achievement of its strategic objectives. While recommendations from commentators and the public differed tremendously, the actions of policymakers in office during President Bill Clinton's first term show a continued international outlook at the White House, albeit a strong focus on domestic priorities. Following the role model of its predecessors, the Clinton administration reverted back to elements of collective security, multilateral and unilateral lines of thinking depending on the concrete situation at hand. This trend of continuity could also be witnessed in U.S. military strategy as the core rationale, prime objectives, and tools (two-war strategy and preventive defense measures) remained intact after the end of the Cold War. Within this framework, the higher priority on non-proliferation issues and the reduction of U.S. military personnel in Europe constituted important changes as a reaction to the developments in the former Soviet Union.

Similarly, the paradigm "continuity within change" can be used to characterize Germany's position within Europe and its role in the transatlantic partnership in the last decade of the 20th century. Obviously, the Bonn Republic was the prime beneficiary of the developments in 1989/1990, as it enabled the country's reunification, improved its security situation extraordinarily through the extinction of its front-line status and gave it the ability to regain its full sovereignty through the ratification of the Two plus Four Treaty. Despite these monumental changes, the country's foreign policy orientation remained in line with its post-1945 tradition that had made it a reliable partner for the United States and Europe. In having the German foreign policy compass continue to show West after reunification, the Kohl government found itself in line with the overwhelming majority of its people. This decision was not only based on gratitude for American and NATO protection during the Cold War, but also out of a strategic pursuit of future security and economic interests. Given its geopolitical location in the heart of Europe and its role as transit country and export nation, the Bonn Republic had a strong interest to remain firmly anchored in the family of Western nations.

On the political level, Germany continued its multilateral foreign policy tradition on the basis of closely-knit bilateral relationships as well as through its membership in several international organizations. The Bonn Republic's policy of responsibility as well as its role as bridge-builder between European nations and within the transatlantic alliance did also not cease to exist with the altered constellation on the geopolitical chessboard. In other words, Germany's consensus-oriented approach and its balancing acts as a mediator especially between Paris and Washington remained a crucial asset for its position in the post-Cold War world. This particular skill set and experience would also prove its importance in making progress on European integration and securely anchoring peace and stability on the continent.

The paradigm "deepening and widening" was crucial in this matter, as Germany strived to promote a strengthening of European decision-making procedures while at the same time intending to give the countries in Central and Eastern Europe a perspective for a seat at the table in Brussels. The first milestone on the former account came with the Maastricht Treaty, which laid out a detailed vision for a more streamlined European Union in the areas of economic and social cohesion, the formulation of common foreign and security policy as well as closer coordination on justice and home affairs. This treaty served as a building block for progress in

two of the above mentioned areas during the early to mid-1990s. First, the agreement on the creation of an economic and monetary union with the Euro as a common currency resulted in the foundation of a truly integrated economic realm on the continent. Second, under German-French leadership the Eurocorps marked the first steps toward a more integrated military approach on the continent and was later even linked to NATO in the combined joint task force model.

The question of how to anchor former Warsaw Pact states in the West was the other side of the coin and was debated in EU and NATO circles alike. There was broad agreement in the United States and Europe that a security vacuum on Germany's Eastern border had to be avoided by any means. In the course of President Bill Clinton's first term, NATO emerged as the frontrunner to fulfill this mission. While Brussels took important measures to prepare for an eventual membership of former Warsaw Pact states in the EU as well, its prime focus was the creation of a durable framework for intra-European decision-making procedures in the timeframe of this analysis. However, the tension between both strategic objectives continued to exist and resonated especially in Germany given its geopolitical location and standing after the end of the Cold War. The Bonn Republic was faced with higher expectations from its European, but especially American partners, to morph itself from a security importer to an exporter of stability through a normalization of its foreign policy. The Kohl government acknowledged these calls and tried to satisfy them by continuing its steady course of advocating German national interests within the European house and through a strong U.S.-German relationship. Despite the progress in European integration between 1993 and 1997, the need for strong bilateral relations to major European partners and Washington did not lose its importance for the Bonn Republic.

In the United States, Chancellor Kohl had a new partner for this mission in the White House as Bill Clinton successfully ousted incumbent George Walker Bush in the 1992 presidential elections. With the main promoter of German reunification voted out of office, Bonn needed to invest again in its ties to Washington in order to uphold and even intensify its excellent relations to the United States. The key to success was an in-depth understanding of the new Democratic President's personality and policies. Being born into a working class family in the South, politics came natural to Bill Clinton in his teenage years and adolescence. From early on, he was involved in several Democratic election races as a supporter as well as a staffer and found a mentor in William J. Fulbright who promoted his political career. As a Rhodes Scholar and graduate of Georgetown University and Yale Law School, Bill Clinton became a professor of law in his home state Arkansas before starting his own political career with an unsuccessful run in the 1974 congressional elections. His second campaign brought him into the governor's mansion where he would remain for the next decade with the exception of a short interlude between 1980 and 1983. After more than ten years of service as governor, Bill Clinton decided to enter the first presidential race after the end of the Cold War.

He positioned himself as a New Democratic and ran a progressive, but centrist election campaign that purposefully refrained from advocating big government solutions and avoided at all costs the impression that he would be a tax and spend President if elected. With a substantial economic program at the core of a campaign promising to be the key driver of change in America, Clinton succeeded in convincing the majority of his countrymen to vote for him. In office, the administration focused on two pressing domestic issues in the first two years of its term: the economy and health care. However, on both accounts, the White House proposal ran into major opposition from the Republican Party and Congress, resulting in stalemates and less ambitious bills than envisioned by the Clinton team.

For instance, the administration's economic stimulus package, which was intended to jumpstart the economy, was filibustered on Capitol Hill and its health care plan suffered the same fate after

a substantial investment of time and political capital. These defeats constituted significant blows to President Clinton's ambitious agenda for change and served as examples of the extremely partisan nature of the 103rd Congress. Further proof was the Republican "Contract with America," which helped turn the 1994 midterms from a series of local elections to a referendum on Clinton where the Republicans won a majority in the House of Representatives and the Senate. Being faced with even stronger opposition to his policies on Capitol Hill, Bill Clinton employed the triangulation strategy of his political consultant Dick Morris, i.e. taking on the role of an independent force between the two established parties as the new guideline for his actions in the second half of his term.

The defining struggle for the political supremacy inside the Beltway came then with the budget negotiations of 1995/1996. At its core was the fundamental disagreement between Republicans and Democrats about the role of the federal government in U.S. society. The conflict escalated to an extent in which the government was closed twice, as the White House did not agree to cutting social programs to the extent envisioned by Newt Gingrich and the GOP. In political terms, the President was invigorated by the outcome of the final budget compromise as his course was backed by a majority of the population. The economic upswing that had emerged in the country throughout his term and his steadfastness on the domestic agenda enabled him to carry the White House for the Democrats a second time.

The strong focus on the domestic reform agenda and the amount of invested political capital to respond to the Republican opposition on Capitol Hill made foreign affairs take a backseat at least in the initial two years of Bill Clinton's first term. Following the rationale that domestic reform was a precondition for the United States to continue an activist foreign policy, the President devoted most of his time to this agenda while delegating far-reaching responsibilities to his staff. The decisive players in the formulation of U.S. foreign policy in the early stages of the administration were Secretary of State Warren Christopher, National Security Advisor Anthony Lake and Ambassador to the UN Madeleine Albright. Being informed by the new interventionist school of thought, the post-Cold War U.S. strategy was based on replacing the containment doctrine with a strategy of U.S. engagement in the world. Paying tribute to Clinton's campaign promise of encouraging democracy promotion, the administration pledged to strengthen good governance around the world and to promote multilateral solutions to international problems without giving up the ability to act unilaterally. Furthermore, the White House saw foreign policy also as a tool to help the domestic reform agenda by promoting U.S. economic interests abroad.

The first two test cases for this neo-Wilsonian foreign policy strategy came with the international crises in Haiti and Somalia – conflicts that the administration had inherited from its predecessor. In line with its multilateral philosophy, Washington was engaged in the Latin American and African conflict theaters under an UN umbrella. However, the progress of events in both locations throughout 1993/1994 called into question Clinton's foreign policy priorities as well as the White House's priority on how American power should be used in the post-Cold War world. The need to station 20,000 U.S. soldiers in Haiti in order to secure the stability of the country as well as Washington's retreat from Somalia after failed peacekeeping efforts were seen as examples of a failed strategy. The criticism did not stop with the handling of these two individual cases, but extended to questions about the perceived lack of an overarching foreign policy doctrine, the focus on democratization through (UN) multilateralism as well as the President's level of involvement and dedication of his time to foreign and security matters.

In the face of this track record and mounting criticism among political elites and the public at large, the administration adjusted its policy on foreign and security matters. After the 1994 midterms, the trend toward a more self-constrained, pick and choose foreign policy that put more emphasis on continued world leadership of the United States, while at the same time asking

for more burden-sharing from Washington's partners, moved more to the forefront. Part of this evolution was visible not only in the definition of success and the choice of instruments of the Balkan and NATO East expansion cases, but also in the way that Clinton used foreign policy to look presidential. A prerequisite for the success of this more traditional power politics strategy was Washington's reliance on partners in Europe that supported the White House's goals. A key role in this matter was played by Germany as a long-standing ally of the United States.

A sine qua non for this trust was that the backbone of the bilateral relationship between both countries remained intact after the end of the Cold War in light of shared values, the continued need for cooperation in the security field and the intertwined nature of both economies that created a mutual dependency on each other. In addition to these traditional elements of the German-American partnership, there were also calls for the creation of a transatlantic learning community by exchanging best practice models on a variety of societal questions. This proposal was an attempt to establish an additional pillar for the German-American partnership – partially motivated as a response to looming challenges for the durability of the bilateral bond in the mid to long term. Promoters of German-American relations were troubled by the decrease in public funding for person-to-person exchanges, demographic developments within the United States that saw a rise of citizens with a non-European background as well as the change in political leadership in Congress in 1992 and 1994 that brought into office new policymakers without previous knowledge about Germany. Critical voices foresaw an erosion of the relationship over a longer period of time that could result in a lack of understanding and estrangement between both countries.

For the moment, political elites still could rely on an overall positive attitude of their citizens toward the partner on the other side of the Atlantic. While anti-Americanism was a factor, albeit a minor one, the majority of Germans valued the United States as a role model in economic and political affairs due to the continued support for West-Germany during the Cold War and in the reunification process. Other important underlying reasons for an overall pro-American sentiment were its attraction as a cultural magnet and prime travel destination for Germans. For Americans, the view on Germany depended on the individual assessment of the country's deeds in the 20th century. While a certain portion of U.S. society believed that the Germans had forfeited their right to be trusted due to the Holocaust, the cooperation between both countries during the Cold War had a positive impact on the majority of Americans assessment of the German people. The number of American citizens with German roots was an additional factor that propelled a pro-German sentiment in the U.S. population. On the political level, the established track record of cooperation and the positive prevailing mood was the basis for expectations toward a larger role in international affairs for the Bonn Republic after the reunification of the country.

The three case studies on non-proliferation, the war in Bosnia, and NATO enlargement have shown that Germany accepted its new responsibilities and was willing to engage itself in all three areas. The key non-proliferation issues included Germany's nuclear status after the end of the Cold War, the handling of the former Soviet Union's arsenal after its dissolution as well as developments in international non-proliferation regimes. On the first account, Bonn decided to stay under Washington's nuclear umbrella for the safety of its own territory, thereby contributing to a stable transatlantic link in security affairs after the watershed moment of 1990. In terms of the other two priorities on the agenda, the United States and Germany joined forces in order to lead the international community in confining the risks stemming from proliferation. The paramount concern for Western security experts and governments was the future of the nuclear arsenal and know-how of the former Soviet Union in light of the potential transfer of material and expertise to other non-responsible actors. The challenge to the transatlantic community was

to avoid this scenario by helping the former Soviet Union in its transformation process while at the same time strengthening the overall international non-proliferation regimes.

As a non-nuclear state, Germany saw its niche in contributing to this goal through the promotion of a stable economic and political system to its East by providing financial assistance to Moscow. The United States complemented this approach by employing a three-legged nuclear strategy that combined elements of deterrence with cooperative features. The continuation of a robust second nuclear strike capability was the first element of the strategy, which ensured the safety of the U.S. and its allies' territory. The second pillar of U.S. policy in this area arranged for cooperative measures with Russia through a series of projects that safeguarded nuclear facilities and material. Third, counter-proliferation measures ranging from political and economic sanctions to military action in the most severe cases were also part of the toolbox.
Another decisive feature of the German and American nuclear strategy was the focus on achieving a significant reduction of nuclear weapons in the post-Cold War world. The United States led this effort through bilateral consultations with Moscow resulting in the START treaties and played a leadership role together with Germany in the extension of the Non-proliferation Treaty and the passing of a comprehensive test ban treaty. While the foreign policy newspaper headlines at the time were dominated by the war in Bosnia and NATO enlargement, transatlantic cooperation on the proliferation issue proved to be vital in checking an imminent threat of significant magnitude for the security of both countries.

If the non-proliferation case was an example of well-functioning consultations across the Atlantic, the handling of the Balkan crisis revealed the weaknesses of both partners in bringing peace swiftly to the region. Being confronted with the dissolution of Yugoslavia and the ensuing fights between the ethnic groups in the early 1990s, the United States and Europe disagreed for a long time on the appropriate strategy to end the fighting in the Balkans. Due to the lack of political will to come to a joint approach, the transatlantic partnership found itself in a state of paralysis that eventually threatened the overall credibility of the Western alliance. The underlying reason for the painstakingly obvious transatlantic disunity was the juxtaposition of two fundamental principles of international law: the ideal of territorial integrity and state sovereignty vs. the right of self-determination of a people. Therefore, the war in the Balkans was much more than a regional conflict that brought death and displacement to it citizens, but it also raised important questions about international law and the way that (European) nations intended to react to conflicts on their immediate doorstep.

At the early stages of the emerging crisis, Germany played an important role through its recognition of Croatia and Slovenia. After referenda in both republics that resulted in declarations of independence, the German government had decided to grant these requests as it had come to the conclusion that the internalization of the conflict was the best chance to find a peaceful solution in the Balkans. Serving as the promoter of this policy within the European Union and the transatlantic relationship, the Bonn Republic was able to bring its European and American critics around at the beginning of 1992. The decision of Germany's partners to do so after having previously been in favor of not tampering with Yugoslavia's territorial integrity was strongly influenced by ulterior motives not linked to the region. While the United States saw in the Bosnia crisis a test case for having Europe take on a leadership role in conflict resolution on their very own continent, Bonn's European partners considered a unified position in this issue of utmost importance given the simultaneously ongoing negotiations about the Maastricht Treaty and Europe's future.

Croatia's and Slovenia's independence did not have the envisioned effect and could not stop the escalation of the fighting onto Bosnian territory that was fuelled by the Bosnian Serb opposition to the Bosnian Croat and Muslim call for independence of their republic. In 1993, the

international community, under European leadership, engaged in several diplomatic initiatives in order to stop the fighting in the region and find an agreeable compromise for the parties involved. Even though the Cutileiro proposal, the Vance-Owen plan, Clinton's lift and strike proposal, the Joint Action plan, the NATO/UN dual key arrangement and the Owen-Stoltenberg proposal produced important milestones on the way to Dayton, it was clear that all these proposals suffered from the lack of clear enforcement provisions. Europe learned a painful lesson in realizing that it continued to be in need of a committed and engaged partner on the other side of the Atlantic in order to come to terms with a conflict on its immediate doorstep.

With the shelling of the Markala marketplace in Sarajevo in the spring of 1994 and Washington's successful brokering of a Bosnian Muslim-Croat Federation that was able to counteract Serbian military campaigns on the battlefield, the situation on the ground changed. The United States had sent a clear signal to the warring parties and its allies that it was willing to invest more political capital and attention to the conflict in light of the erosion of trust into the United States' and NATO's leadership abilities. With the subsequent creation of the Contact Group, Washington indicated that it was in need of partners to accomplish the mission, but had accepted its role as primus inter pares in finding a solution to the crisis. Further proof of this gradual change in the U.S. administration's assessment of the situation was Clinton's decision to commit 25,000 soldiers to the region in case of a negotiated peace settlement or as support for a withdrawal of stationed UN or EU forces.

Through the strong military showing of the Muslim-Croat Federation in conjunction with NATO bombings against Bosnian Serbian positions, the situation on the ground became more conducive in the course of 1995 to bring all parties back to the negotiation table. At this critical juncture, the key initiative to pave the way to the Dayton Agreement was developed in the White House and included the call for a mutual recognition of Croatia, Bosnia and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, a comprehensive peace settlement as well as the suggestion for a constitutional framework of a united Bosnia. Under the leadership of Richard Holbrooke, the United States and its Contact Group partners succeeded henceforth in a series of complicated and intense negotiations on the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in Ohio to end the fighting in the Balkans. The international community pledged its support for the durability of the compromise through the creation of a NATO implementation force (IFOR) that was tasked with enforcing the provisions of the agreement.

The war in Bosnia had a significant impact on the German-American foreign and security relationship. First, it exemplified that inter-state relations had become not less, but more complex with the collapse of the Soviet Union. The notion to focus exclusively on domestic concerns, as envisioned in the early 1990s, lost its validity in the face of ethnic warfare on the European continent. Second, the events in the Balkans delivered a serious blow to political elites who wanted to see a strengthening of the collective security concept as the problem-solving path for the international community. Especially the role of the UN in the conflict was seen with a critical eye given its inadequacies in decision-making procedures and the lack of enforcement provisions in the mandate that served as a framework for its operations in the region. Third, the temporary paralysis of the West during the conflict made it clear that the United States continued to be irreplaceable in its role as leader of the Western world in conflict resolution efforts. Despite the progress that Europe had made on the formulation of a common foreign and security policy, Brussels was still in need of its transatlantic partner to ensure stability and security on the continent. For Washington, the lesson learned was that it could not turn away from its obligations as European power and needed to stay engaged – the anchor to do so was the same as during the Cold War: NATO.

As the most successful military alliance of the 20th century, NATO was, however, facing its very own challenges in the early to mid 1990s. With the dissolution of the Soviet Union, NATO had lost the original motivation for its creation, resulting in a debate about its future purpose after its archenemy of forty years vanished. In response to critical voices that questioned the continued usefulness of the alliance, political stakeholders on both sides of the Atlantic advocated a double enlargement of the alliance, i.e. widening the (geographic) scope of NATO missions and allowing new members to join its ranks. It was especially this second aspect of showcasing the alliance's unchanged value to the security of the United States and Europe that dominated the thinking of governments in Washington and Bonn.

Proponents of an enlargement of the Atlantic alliance based their view on a multitude of arguments that exemplified the rationale for the inclusion of former Warsaw Pact states in NATO. For the United States as leader of the alliance, NATO enlargement secured stability on the European continent and alleviated historic wrongdoings of the 20th century that had caused Central and Eastern Europe to be on the communist side of the Iron Curtain. From a geo-strategic point of view, the initiative gave Washington an enhanced footprint in Europe that allowed the United States to continue its role as power balancer. It also can be seen as a diplomatic tool to structure the U.S.-Russian bilateral relationship anew, either as an opportunity to draw Moscow closer to the West or as a way to expand the circle of Western-minded nations to the East at a time when Russia was too weak to counteract this move. In addition, the Clinton administration was hopeful that the perspective for membership served as a driver of change within the candidate countries that would lead to an improvement of democratic structures within these nations. Washington was equally interested in opening the doors of the alliance for burden sharing reasons, i.e. to widen the circle of countries that could engage immediately with troops and financial means in ongoing missions. Finally, there was also a U.S. domestic political reason that supported NATO enlargement: This initiative gave Bill Clinton the chance to showcase his leadership skills and speak to an important part of the electorate with Central and Eastern European backgrounds in swing states of the 1996 election.

For Germany, the expansion of NATO was an appealing concept as the inclusion of additional countries to its East in the alliance improved Bonn's security situation significantly and permanently. Enlargement was more than just a relief of Germany's status as NATO's most Eastern outpost, but was also considered in the country's interest as a continuation of its power-sharing, inclusive foreign policy approach after the end of the Second World War. Of special relevance was Bonn's emphasis on reconciliation efforts toward its Central and Eastern neighbors, especially Poland. For the candidate countries, two motivations based on the countries' historic experiences were decisive in their desire to join the alliance: First, NATO was the prime facilitator to satisfy their desire and interest to become part of the West; second, membership was considered the ultimate protection against any future aggression against the territorial integrity most likely emerging from a revanchist Russia in the future.

The camp of opponents to NATO enlargement was predominantly, but not exclusively, worried about what impact this political move would have on Russia. Moscow's political elites were opposed to the initiative as they considered NATO's advancing to Russia's immediate border an intrusion of the Kremlin's sphere of influence in the region. The result was that the political leadership decided to redirect much needed political capital and earmarked financial assets for domestic priorities to regional security efforts. Some Western observers of Russia criticized enlargement as they were fearful of Moscow's anticipated retaliatory reaction to the initiative in other policy fields and were convinced that it would weaken democratic forces inside the country. In addition to their assessment of NATO enlargement as a needless provocation of Russia that would produce a backlash in the country's foreign policies, opponents argued that the expansion

of the military alliance constituted a dangerous re-division of Europe by keeping Moscow outside of the "Western club" at the beginning of a new era.

Other concerns against the admission of former Warsaw Pact states in NATO included the notion that NATO expansion tampered with previous agreements and promises that the West had given to Russia during Germany's reunification, jeopardizing the alliance's credibility by putting it into a grey area of international legitimacy. In addition, some stakeholders in the debate worried that NATO's effectiveness was called into question by enlargement given the impact that the new members would have on the already complicated decision-making structures within the alliance. For American and European proponents of a less international foreign policy, the enlargement project diverted much needed attention from domestic problems and constituted a fundamentally wrong priority setting of national governments in the post-Cold War world. Finally, there was also a group of critics that recognized the importance of securely anchoring Central and Eastern European countries in the West, but argued that the EU and the OSCE were the appropriate organizations to fulfill this task.

This idea was forcefully rejected by the former Warsaw Pact states from the beginning of their quest to become part of the Western military alliance as a paramount national foreign policy interest after the end of the Cold War. Establishing themselves as the driver of the process as early as February 1991, the Visegrad countries (Poland, Hungary and Czechoslovakia) voiced their desire to join NATO as full members with all rights, privileges and duties. The long term key to success for the Central and Eastern European governments was to gauge support for their position in the United States and Germany as well as show perseverance in the face of Russian opposition and NATO's initial hesitancy to grant their request. At the outset of the debate, the support within Western governments for enlargement was mixed at best, given NATO's future utility being called into question and several members' concerns about Moscow's reaction to this initiative.

The Kohl government and the Clinton administration were internally divided on the issue at the beginning of the process. While German Defense Minister Volker Rühe was an outspoken promoter of NATO enlargement, the Foreign Ministry under the leadership of Klaus Kinkel held the view that NATO and the EU were equally viable options to give former Warsaw Pact states an institutional home in the West. The Chancellery avoided officially reconciling these two positions in order to maintain its flexibility in decision-making, especially as Washington had also not presented a unified position on NATO enlargement. On the U.S. side, National Security Advisor Anthony Lake actively lobbied for fast-tracking the expansion of the military alliance while Strobe Talbott, due to the administration's lack of a comprehensive strategy toward Russia in the post-Cold War era, and the Pentagon, out of hesitancy to extend additional security guarantees to Central and Eastern European countries, were arguing against a rapid opening of the alliance's doors. Bill Clinton himself was leaning toward giving former Warsaw Pact states a position in the alliance after he had met the presidents of the Visegrad countries in April 1993 but was also mindful of the internal cohesion of his administration.

Both camps within the United States government were eventually able to find common ground in the Partnership for Peace proposal that sought to deepen defense cooperation through bilateral agreements between NATO and non-NATO OSCE countries. Endorsed by the 1994 Brussels NATO Summit, the initiative was also set up as a path for potential membership in NATO for those participating countries that aspired to this goal. Originally perceived as a hedge strategy by the alliance in order to delay enlargement for a long term, President Clinton clarified that PfP was not a permanent holding room for candidate countries, but rather a useful instrument to help candidate nations familiarize themselves with NATO protocols. Therefore, much of the alliance's

attention in 1994 was dedicated to moving this process along while at the same managing its relationship to Moscow.

After an initial acceptance to participate in PfP on President Yeltsin's part, it soon became clear that Russia and the West were at odds about the strategic rationale of the initiative and the merits of enlargement altogether. In response to the end of the Cold War, Russia was looking for a special relationship with the West that would grant the country access to NATO's decision-making process in order to protect its national interests in the near abroad and in the international arena. From a Kremlin (misguided) point of view, PfP was seen as a way to block NATO enlargement in exchange for a series of bilateral defense agreements. The notion that Russia, as a powerful actor in the global concert, was part of the PfP framework with the same rights equal to much smaller countries among which some had been under the control of the Soviet Union in past decades, was inconceivable for Russian political elites.

When NATO was unwilling to grant Moscow a special status in the PfP process and proceeded on the expansion track by calling for the preparation of an enlargement study during a meeting of the alliance's foreign ministers in December 1994, President Yeltsin warned that Europe was sliding into a cold peace due to the overall lack of concern for Russian interests. This statement reinforced the necessity to come to a modus operandi with Moscow in the question of NATO expansion as well as overall security matters after the end of the Cold War. A first breakthrough on this agenda came with the compromise between Clinton and Yeltsin during the May 1995 bilateral summit in which both leaders reached agreement to postpone the next major steps on enlargement until after the Russian presidential elections, in exchange for Moscow's signing of the PfP work program document and the promise to make a good faith effort in filling the NATO-Russia relationship with substance.

As second major step, the official publication of the NATO enlargement study in September 1995 gave the alliance a framework in which the rationale, process and principles of expansion were described in meticulous detail. After the reelection of President Yeltsin in June 1996, this strategy could be implemented to structure the enlargement process - resulting in the invitation for candidate countries to apply for membership at the NATO meeting in December 1996. A prerequisite for the successful opening of the alliance to new members was to show Russia the advantages that it could reap from an engagement and cooperation with the West. Moscow's acceptance into the Council of Europe, International Monetary Fund, World Bank and G8 were important milestones in this process that were complemented by an agreement on the NATO-Russia level.

Building on a series of previous bilateral negotiations, the U.S.-Russia Summit in Helsinki in March 1997, was the decisive meeting in which the final hurdles for an agreement were overcome. The compromise on the sensitive issues between NATO and Russia stipulated that Moscow received a voice at NATO's table through the creation of the NATO-Russia Council, but no veto over the alliance's decision-making. The Kremlin's demand to limit the enlargement of the alliance to one round only was rejected; in exchange, President Clinton offered as a concession the guarantee that NATO would not station any personnel or nuclear weapons on the territory of new members. These bilateral negotiations found their way into the legally binding "Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security between NATO and the Russian Federation" that gave the alliance the opportunity to take the last actions toward its expansion.

The Madrid Summit in July 1997 became the forum in which the Western military alliance decided to open its doors to former Warsaw Pact states. There was agreement within NATO that invitations should be extended to Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic in the first round; however, the alliance was disunited on the question if Romania and Slovenia should also be

considered at this point. While the United States favored a smaller group of new members in order to keep the door open for future rounds of enlargement, the French and Italian government lobbied heavily in favor of including the other two candidates immediately in order to stabilize South-Eastern Europe. After extended negotiations about the issue in Madrid, Helmut Kohl pledged the support of his government for the U.S. position in the restricted session of the summit proceedings, thereby tilting the balance in favor of this solution. At the same time, he advocated to explicitly state Romania and Slovenia's progress in the final communiqué, effectively making them natural frontrunners for the next round of expansion, as well as to recognize the Baltic States as potential candidates for future membership.

The subsequent ratification process of NATO enlargement reemphasized the crucial role that Germany and the United States had played in the accomplishment of this agenda all along. On both sides of the Atlantic, Clinton and Kohl were able to win support of their legislatures to ratify NATO enlargement. While Bonn ratified the initiative with an overwhelming majority in the Bundestag as one of the first NATO members, Washington also made a convincing case at home as to why enlargement was in the best American national interest and took the high hurdle of swiftly achieving a two-thirds majority in the U.S. Senate. The leadership of both countries in the NATO enlargement process was crucial for its successful outcome and was based on a willingness to invest political capital and will to work jointly on a common agenda that was central to both countries' national interests.

At the end of U.S. President Clinton's first term in the White House, it was obvious that the United States and Germany were still in need of each other as trusted partners in the global concert. The past four years had shown that if Bonn and Washington decided to join forces and work together on an agenda, such as non-proliferation or NATO enlargement, the chances for success were most probable. Where Europe and the United States decided to go it alone or were disunited, as in the Balkans case, the transatlantic bond was put under strain with harsh consequences not only for the credibility of the Western alliance, but more importantly for the lives of citizens on both sides of the Atlantic. This lesson had to be learned anew after the end of the Cold War, as the dissolution of the Soviet Union and the fall of the Berlin Wall had given Germany and the United States new flexibility in the way that they could shape their common foreign and security policies.

For Germany, the fully regained sovereignty and the progress on the European integration project in the early to mid 1990s constituted important changes compared to Cold War times, whereas the United States, on the other side of the Atlantic, found itself as the only remaining superpower that could project its power virtually unchallenged in Europe and beyond. The watershed years of 1989/90 were the starting point of a new era that gave Germany and the United States a newly defined international playing field and enhanced positions on the geopolitical chessboard. However, in this new environment the German-American relationship was still a cornerstone of both governments' foreign policies on the European continent. Based on the commonality of values, shared interests as well as an established track record of partnership in previous decades, both countries continued to consult and cooperate successfully on matters of international security. In essence, the mission of securing the stability and economic prosperity of Europe had not lost its validity after the end of the Cold War as the need to focus its foreign and security efforts on Bonn's immediate doorstep remained at the heart of the German-American cooperation during President Clinton's first term. As Chancellor Kohl clearly stated at the commemoration of the Berlin Airlift and the occasion of President Clinton's visit in Berlin in 1998:

Our goal is to complete the construction of the European house - with a permanent right of residence for our American friends - and enable the family of European nations to live together side by side in lasting peace. (…) Close cooperation between our two countries remains the key to progress towards this goal. Our common commitment to human dignity, freedom and democracy remains the central premise of all we undertake. We are traveling the same road. Let us now go forward with a sense of pride in what we have together accomplished and with a clear vision of a future in peace and freedom![425]

[425] Hemut Kohl. *Speech by Chancellor Helmut Kohl at the ceremony at Tempelhof airport to commemorate the Berlin Airlift on the occassion of the visit of President Clinton* (Berlin: Auswärtiges Amt, 14 May 1998).

Bibliography

All monographs, autobiographies, speeches, legal documents as well as journal and newspaper articles appear in alphabetical order. Sources by the same author are listed in chronological order from past to present.

A National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement (Washington, DC: The White House, Office of the Press Secretary, July 1994).

Madeleine Albright, "Why bigger is better," *The Economist* (15 February 1997).

Madeleine Albright. *NATO Enlargement* (Washington, DC: Senate Foreign Relations Committee, 7 October 1997).

Madeleine Albright. *Madam Secretary* (New York: Miramax Books, 2003).

Graham Allison and Gregory F. Treverton (eds.). *Rethinking America's Security. Beyond Cold War to New World Order* (New York: Norton & Company, 1992).

Graham Allison/Richard A. Falkenrath, "Kampf gegen die Nuklearverbreitung," *IP* 1 (1996), 11-18.

American Enterprise Institute. *What to do in the Balkans?* (Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute, 1992).

Robert J. Art/Seymour Brown (eds.). *U.S. Foreign Policy. The Search for a New Role* (New York: Macmillan, 1993).

Timothy Garton Ash, "Germany's Choice," *FA* 73.4 (July/August 1994), 65-81.

Ronald D. Asmus. *The New U.S. Strategic Debate* (Santa Monica: RAND, 1993).

Ronald D. Asmus / Richard L. Kugler /F. Stephen Larrabee, "Building a New NATO," *FA* 72.4 (September/October 1993), 28-40.

Ronald D. Asmus. *Germany's Geopolitical Maturation. Public Opinion and Security Policy in 1994* (Santa Monica: RAND, 1994).

Ronald D. Asmus / Robert C. Nurick, "NATO Enlargement and the Baltic States," *Survival* 38.2 (Summer 1996), 121-42.

Ronald D. Asmus / Richard L. Kugler / F. Stephen Larrabee, "What will NATO Enlargement cost?" *Survival* 38.3 (Autumn 1996), 5-26.

Ronald D. Asmus. *Opening NATO's Door. How the Alliance Remade itself for a New Era* (New York: Columbia University, 2002).

Philip Auerswald/Christian Duttweiler/John Garofano (eds.). *Clinton's foreign policy: a documentary record* (The Hague: Kluwer Law International, 2003).

Auswärtiges Amt. *Deutsche Aussenpolitik 1995. Auf dem Weg zu einer Friedensregelung für Bosnien und Herzegowina: 53 Telegramme aus Dayton. Eine Dokumentation* (Bonn: Auswärtiges Amt, 1998).

Background Briefing by Senior Administration Officials (Bonn: The White House, Office of the Press Secretary, 11 July 1994).

Arnulf Baring (ed.). *Germany's New Position in Europe. Problems and Perspectives* (Oxford: Berg, 1994).

Arnulf Baring, "Wie neu ist unsere Lage? Deutschland als Regionalmacht," *IP* 4 (1995), 12-21.

Arnulf Baring. *Scheitert Deutschland? Abschied von unseren Wunschwelten* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlagsgesellschaft, 1997).

Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany: promulgated by the Parliamentary Council on 23 May 1949, as amended up to and including 20 December 1993 (Bonn: Press and Information Office of the Federal Government, 1994).

BBC Summary of World Broadcasts (EE/1778, 1993), A8.

Jan C. Behrends et. al (eds.). *Antiamerikanismus im 20. Jahrhundert: Studien zu Ost- und Westeuropa* (Bonn: Dietz, 2005).

Manfred Berg (ed.). *Macht und Moral: Beiträge zur Ideologie und Praxis amerikanischer Außenpolitik im 20. Jahrhundert* (Münster: LIT, 1999).

William C. Berman. *From the Center to the Edge: The Politics and Policies of the Clinton Presidency* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2001).

Michael R. Beschloss / Strobe Talbott. *Auf höchster Ebene. Das Ende des Kalten Krieges und die Geheimdiplomatie der Supermächte 1989-1991* (Düsseldorf: Econ, 1993).

Carl Bildt, "The Baltic Litmus Test," *FA* 73.5 (September/October 1994), 72-85.

Stephen J. Blank. *European Security and NATO Enlargement: A View from Central Europe* (Carlisle: Strategic Studies Institute Publication, 1998).

Sidney Blumenthal. *The Clinton Wars* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2003).

"Bonn wants East in updated NATO," *IHT* (8 October 1993).

Willi Brandt. *Begegnungen mit Kennedy* (München: Kindler, 1964).

Michael E. Brown, "The Flawed Logic of NATO Expansion," *Survival* 37.1 (Spring 1995), 34-52.

Zbigniew Brzezinski, "A bigger and safer Europe," *NYT* (1 December 1993).

Zbigniew Brzezinski, "A Plan for Europe," *FA* 74.1 (January/February 1995), 26-42.

Patrick Buchanan, "America First – and Second, and Third," *The National Interest* 19 (Spring 1990), 77-92.

Frank Buchholz. *Das nukleare Erbe der Sowjetunion: Zum Proliferationsrisiko und zur Kontrolle von Atomwaffen* (München: Universität der Bundeswehr, 1992).

Bundesakademie für Sicherheitspolitik. *Ziele und Interessen. Deutschlands Sicherheit in der veränderten Welt – Arbeitsergebnisse des Seminars für Sicherheitspolitik 1992* (Bonn: Bundesministerium der Verteidigung, 1992).

Steven L. Burg. *War or Peace? Nationalism, Democracy and American Foreign Policy in Post-Communist Europe* (New York: New York University, 1996).

Steven L. Burg & Paul S. Shoup. *The War in Bosnia-Herzegovina. Ethnic Conflict and International Intervention* (New York: M. E. Sharpe, 1999).

Colin Campbell / Bert A. Rockman (eds.). *The Clinton Presidency. First Appraisals* (Chatham: Chatham House, 1996).

Ted Galen Carpenter. *Beyond NATO: Staying out of Europe's Wars* (Washington, DC: Cato Institute, 1994).

Ted Galen Carpenter / Barbara Conry (eds.). *NATO Enlargement. Illusions and Reality* (Washington, DC: Cato Institute, 1998).

George Carpozi, Jr.. *Clinton Confidential. The Climb to Power. The Unauthorized Biography of Bill and Hillary Clinton* (Del Mar: Emery Dalton Books, 1995).

E.H. Carr. *The Twenty Years' Crisis* (New York: Harper & Row, 1939).

Dick Cheney. *Defense Strategy for the 1990s: The Regional Defense Strategy* (Washington, DC: Department of Defense, January 1993).

Warren Christopher. *U.S. Leadership after the Cold War: NATO and Transatlantic Security. Intervention at the North Atlantic Council Ministerial Meeting* (Athens, 10 June 1993).

Warren Christopher, "A Foreign Policy that Strengthens America's Economic Future. Washington, DC, 20 October 1993," *U.S. Department of State Dispatch* 4 (1 November 1993).

Secretary of State Warren Christopher, "A New Atlantic Community for the 21st Century," *USIS WF* (6 September 1996).

Warren Christopher, "Fulfilling the Founding Vision of NATO," *U.S. Department of State Dispatch* 7 (9 December 1996), 601.

Warren Christopher. *In the Stream of History. Shaping Foreign Policy for a New Era* (Stanford: Stanford University, 1998).

Jonathan Clarke, "The Conceptual Poverty of U.S. Foreign Policy," *The Atlantic Monthly* 272.3 (September 1993), 54-66.

Hillary Rodham Clinton. *Living History* (New York: Scribner, 2003).

William J. Clinton / Al Gore. *Putting People First. How we can all change America* (New York: Random House, 1992).

"Clinton and Mulroney fault Balkan Peace Plan," *NYT* (6 February 1993).

William J. Clinton. *1993 State of the Union Address* (Washington, DC, 17 February 1993).

William J. Clinton. *Remarks by the President at American University Centennial Celebration* (Washington, DC: The White House, Office of the Press Secretary, 26 February 1993).

William J. Clinton. *Address of President William Jefferson Clinton before a Joint Session of Congress: 'Health Care Security for all Americans'* (Washington, DC, 22 September 1993).

William J. Clinton, "Confronting the Challenges of a Broader World. Address to the UN General Assembly," *U.S. State Department Dispatch* 4 (New York, 27 September 1993).

William J. Clinton. *Remarks by the President at Intervention for the North Atlantic Council Summit* (Brussels: The White House, Office of the Press Secretary, 10 January 1994).

William J. Clinton. *Address before a Joint Session of Congress on the State of the Union* (Washington, DC, 25 January 1994).

William J. Clinton signs PDD establishing "U.S. Policy on Reforming Multilateral Peace Operations" (Washington, DC: The White House, Office of the Press Secretary, 5 May 1994).

William J. Clinton, "President Clinton: SZ Interview mit Bill Clinton: Deutschland muss eine Führungsrolle übernehmen. Der U.S.-Präsident vor seiner Europareise: Die Bundesrepublik kann sich nicht vor ihrer Verantwortung zurückziehen," SZ (4 July 1994).

William J. Clinton. *Remarks by the President at Luncheon with German Officials* (Bonn: The White House, Office of the Press Secretary, 10 July 1994).

William J. Clinton. *Address of the President to the Nation* (Washington, DC: The White House, Office of the Press Secretary, 13 June 1995).

William J. Clinton. *Remarks by the President in Freedom House Speech* (Washington, DC: The White House, Office of the Press Secretary, 6 October 1995).

William J. Clinton. *1996 State of the Union Address* (Washington, DC: The White House, Office of the Press Secretary, 23 January 1996).

William J.Clinton. *1997 State of the Union Address* (Washington, DC, 4 February 1997).

William J. Clinton, "Press Conference on NATO enlargement," *USIS Wireless File* (Brussels: U.S. Mission to NATO, 12 June 1997).

William J. Clinton. *My Life* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2004).

William J. Clinton, "How we ended welfare, together," *NYT* (22 August 2006).

Thomas B. Cochran/Robert S. Norris. *Nuclear Weapons Databook: Russian/Soviet Nuclear Warhead Production* (Washington, DC: Natural Resources Defense Council, April 1992).

Roger Cohen, "Serb leader rejects U.S.-backed proposal," *NYT* (21 February 1995).

Roger Cohen, "NATO jets bomb arms depot at Bosnian Serb headquarters," *NYT* (26 May 1995).

Roger Cohen, "Conflict in the Balkans: In Bosnia U.S. set to offer aid to reinforce UN Bosnia troops. Serbs now see peacemakers as the enemy," *NYT* (31 May 1995).

Roger Cohen, "Balkan Accord: The Implications, An Imperfect Peace," *NYT* (22 November 1995).

William S. Cohen. *Report of the Quadrennial Defense Review* (Washington, DC: Department of Defense, May 1997).

Alberto Coll, "Power, Principles and Prospects for a Cooperative International Order," *The Washington Quarterly* 16.1 (Winter 1993), 5-14.

Commission on Presidential Debates. *The First Clinton-Dole Presidential Debate* (October 6, 1996)

Commission on Presidential Debates. *The Second Clinton-Dole Presidential Debate* (October 16, 1996).

Congressional Budget Office (CBO). *The Costs of expanding the NATO Alliance* (Washington, DC: CBO Papers, March 1996).

Consolidated version of the treaty establishing the European Community (Brussels: Office Journal of the European Communities, 24 December 2002).

Contact Group. *Agreed Basic Principles* (Geneva, 8 September 1995).

Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on their Destruction (The Hague: Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons, 13 January 1993).

Anthony Cragg, "The Partnership for Peace Planning and Review Process," *NATO Review* 43.6 (November 1995), 23-25.

Anne Cronin, "A Statistical Portrait of the Typical American; This is your life, generally speaking," *NYT* (26 July 1992), 5.

Ivo H. Daalder. *Getting to Dayton. The Making of America's Bosnia Policy* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 2000).

Ian Davidson, "Alive but ailing: NATO is not the solution to the future security needs of Europe," *FT (*12 January 1994), 24.

W. Phillips Davison. *The Berlin Blockade. A Study in Cold War Politics* (Princeton: Princeton University, 1958).

Declaration on cooperation between the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic, the Republic of Poland and the Republic of Hungary in striving for European integration (Visegrad, 15 February 1991).

Declaration of the Heads of State and Government. Ministerial Meeting of the North Atlantic Council / North Atlantic Cooperation Council (Brussels: NATO, 10-11 January 1994).

"Defense Planning Guidance – Excerpts from Pentagon's Plan: Prevent the Re-Emergence of a New Rival," *NYT* (8 March 1992), 1/14.

Jason DeParle, "The Man Inside Bill Clinton's Foreign Policy," *NYT* (20 August 1995).

Deutsche Gesellschaft für Auswärtige Politik. *Jahrbuch Internationale Politik 1993-1994.* (München: Oldenbourg, 1996).

Deutscher Bundestag. *Drucksache 12/6985 vom 7.3.1994. Unterrichtung durch die Bundesregierung. Bericht zum Stand der Bemühungen um Rüstungskontrolle und Abrüstung sowie die Veränderungen im militärischen Kräfteverhältnis (Jahresabrüstungsbericht 1993)* (Bonn: Deutscher Bundestag, 1994).

Deutscher Bundestag. *Drucksache 13/1126 vom 13.4.1995. Unterrichtung durch die Bundesregierung. Bericht zum Stand der Bemühungen um Rüstungskontrolle und Abrüstung sowie die Veränderungen im militärischen Kräfteverhältnis (Jahresabrüstungsbericht 1994)* (Bonn: Deutscher Bundestag, 1995).

Deutscher Bundestag, *Drucksache 13/4450 vom 24.4.1996. Unterrichtung durch die Bundesregierung. Bericht zum Stand der Bemühungen um Rüstungskontrolle und Abrüstung sowie der Veränderungen im militärischen Kräfteverhältnis (Jahresabrüstungsbericht 1995)* (Bonn: Deutscher Bundestag, 1996).

Deutscher Bundestag. *Antwort der Bundesregierung auf die Kleine Anfrage der Abgeordneten Gernot Erler, Uta Zapf, Volker Kröning weiterer Abgeordneter und der Fraktion der SPD: Osterweiterung der NATO und Abrüstung* (Bonn: Deutscher Bundestag, 13. Wahlperiode, Drucksache 13/7731, 20 May 1997).

Deutscher Bundestag. *Antwort der Bundesregierung auf die Kleine Anfrage der Abgeordneten Angelika Beer, Winfried Nachtwei, Christian Sterzing, Ludger Volmer und der Fraktion BÜNDNIS 90/ DIE GRÜNEN: Die Reform der NATO und die Osterweiterung der Allianz* (Bonn: Deutscher Bundestag, 13. Wahlperiode, Drucksache 13/9693, 21 January 1998).

Dan Diner. *Verkehrte Welten: Antiamerikanismus in Deutschland; ein historischer Essay* (Frankfurt am Main: Eichborn, 1993).

Carroll J. Doherty, "GOP sharpens budgetary knife over international programs," *Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report* 52.49 (17 December 1994), 3566.

Bob Dole. *1996 Republican Convention Speech* (San Diego, 15 August 1996).

Karen Donfried, "The European Union and the United States: Political Aspects of the New Transatlantic Agenda of December 1995," *CRS Report for Congress* 96-87 F (Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, January 24, 1996).

Elizabeth Drew. *On the Edge. The Clinton Presidency* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1995).

Elizabeth Drew. *Showdown. The Struggle between the Gingrich Congress and the Clinton White House* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996).

William Drozdiak, "NATO pledges not to put nuclear arms in new member states," *WP* (11 December 1996), A16.

William Drozdiak, "NATO Expansion 'on the Cheap' may have surcharge," *WP* (12 March 1997), A1.

Secretary Eagleburger's Parting Remarks to the North Atlantic Cooperation Council (Brussels, 18 December 1992).

Hans-Georg Ehrhardt (ed.). *The New Germany in a Changing Environment* (Kingston: Queen's University, 1994).

Constanze Eisenbart/Harald Müller/Annette Schaper. *Nichtverbreitung und Abrüstung von Nuklearwaffen. Friedensgutachten 1997* (Münster: Münster Literatur, 1997).

Carl Elk, "NATO Expansion: Cost Issues," *CRS Report for Congress* (Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, 26 February 1998), 1-20.

Michael Ermarth. *America and the Shaping of German Society 1945-1955* (Oxford: Berg, 1993).

Ambrose Evans-Pritchard. *The Secret Life of Bill Clinton: The Unreported Stories* (Washington, DC: Regnery, 1997).

Karl Feldmeyer, "Wenn Wahlkämpfer an Europa denken. Das Hin und Her der Unionsparteien soll den wechselnden Stimmungen Rechnung tragen," *FAZ* (5 November 1993), 14.

Karl Feldmeyer, "Folgen der Friedensdividende," *FAZ* (11 May 1995).

Final Communique. Ministerial Meeting of the North Atlantic Council held at NATO Headquarters, Press Release M-NAC-2 (97) 155 (Brussels: NATO, 16 December 1997).

Stephen J. Flanagan, "NATO and Central and Eastern Europe: From Liaison to Security Partnership," *The Washington Quarterly* 15.2 (Spring 1992), 141-152.

Rainer Follmann, "Nach Maastricht: Mehr Fragen als Antworten?" *Orientierungen zur Wirtschafts- und Gesellschaftspolitik* 51 (März 1992), 10-13.

Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security between NATO and the Russian Federation (Paris, 27 May 1997).

Klaus-Dieter Frankenberger, "Bürgernähe gegen Europa-Verdruss," *FAZ* (23 December 1993), 10.

Lawrence Freedman, "Great Powers, Vital Interests and Nuclear Weapons," *Survival* 36.4 (Winter 1994/1995), 35-52.

Thomas L. Friedman, "Clinton Keeping Foreign Policy on a Back Burner," *NYT* (8 February 1993).

Thomas L. Friedman, "Any war in Bosnia would carry a domestic price," *NYT* (2 May 1993).

Thomas L. Friedman, "Clinton's Folly," *NYT* (31 July 1997).

Stefan Fröhlich, "Die Osterweiterung der NATO erfordert die organisatorische Neugestaltung des Bündnisses," *KAS-Auslandsinformationen* 6 (1997).

Dan Froomkin, "Welfare's Changing Face," *WP* (23 July 1998).

Francis Fukuyama, "The End of History," *The National Interest* (Summer 1989), 1-9.

Johan Galtung, "Die NATO-Osterweiterung oder der Beginn des zweiten Kalten Krieges," *Blätter für deutsche und internationale Politik* 43.2 (1998), 197-207.

Adam Garfinkle, "NATO Enlargement: What's the Rush," *The National Interest* 46 (Winter 1996), 102-111.

Gary L. Geipel (ed.). *Germany in a new era* (Indianapolis: Hudson Institute, 1993).

Leslie H. Gelb, "Tomorrow's Germany," *NYT* (22 December 1991).

"Germany is a Challenge for Post-Soviet Europe," *NYT* (27 December 1991), A10.

Bruce Goldberger, "Why Europe should not fear the Germans," *German Politics* 2.2 (August 1993), 288-310.

James M. Goldgeier. *Not Whether but When. The U.S. Decision to Enlarge NATO* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 1999).

David C. Gompert, "NATO Enlargement: Putting the Cost in Perspective," *Strategic Forum* 129 (October 1997), 1-5.

James E. Goodby. *Europe Undivided. The New Logic of Peace in U.S.-Russian Relations* (Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace, 1998).

Andrew J. Goodpaster. *An Evolving U.S. Nuclear Posture, Second Report of the Steering Committee, Project on Eliminating Weapons of Mass Destruction* (Washington, DC: The Henry L. Stimson Center, December 1995).

Michael R. Gordon, "President orders end to enforcing Bosnian embargo," *NYT* (11 November 1994).

Philip H. Gordon, "Berlin's Difficulties. The Normalization of German Foreign Policy," *Orbis* 38.2 (Spring 1994), 225-243.

Philip H. Gordon (ed.). *France, Germany and the Western Alliance* (Boulder: Westview, 1995).

Al Gore, "Remarks at Berlin conference," *U.S. Department of State Dispatch* 5 (12 September 1994), 597-98.

John M. Goshko, "Reduced U.S. role outlined but soon altered," *WP* (26 May 1993).

George W. Grayson. *Strange Bedfellows. NATO marches East* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1999).

Steven Greenhouse, "Clinton to tell Yeltsin that NATO is not anti-Russian," *NYT* (14 March 1995).

Joseph M. Grieco. *Cooperation among Nations. Europe, America and Non-Tariff Barriers to Trade* (Ithaca/New York: Cornell University, 1990).

"Grosse Mehrheit im Bundestag für Ost-Erweiterung der NATO," *FAZ* (27 March 1998).

Valerie Guerin-Sendelbach. *Frankreich und das vereinigte Deutschland. Interessen und Perzeptionen im Spannungsfeld* (Opladen: Leske und Buderich, 1999).

Richard N. Haass. *Intervention. The Use of American Military Force in the Post-Cold War World* (Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1994).

Richard N. Haass, "Paradigm Lost," *FA* 74.1 (January/February 1995), 43-58.

Christian Hacke. *Die Außenpolitik der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Weltmacht wider Willen* (Frankfurt am Main: Ullstein, 1997).

Erwin Häckel, "Die nuklearpolitische Interessenlage Deutschlands," *IP* 10 (1996), 3-8.

Daniel S. Hamilton. *Beyond Bonn. America & the Berlin Republic* (Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1994).

Nigel Hamilton. *Bill Clinton. An American Journey. Great Expectations* (New York: Random House, 2003).

Wolfram F. Hanrieder. *Germany, America, Europe: 40 years of German foreign policy* (New Haven: Yale University, 1989).

John F. Harris. *The Survivor. Bill Clinton in the White House (*New York: Random House, 2005).

Chris Hedges, "The Balkan Peace: The Outlook; Bosnia's Checkerboard Partition; Instability more likely," *NYT* (20 March 1996).

Andrej Heinke. *Wechselnde Konstellationen. Die deutsch-amerikanischen Außen- und Sicherheitsbeziehungen in der ersten Amtszeit von US-Präsident Bill Clinton* (Baden-Baden: Nomos, 2003).

Arthur Heinrich, "Danke, Amerika! Dayton und die Deutschen," *Blätter für deutsche und internationale Politik* 41.1 (1996), 35-44.

Francis Heller / John R. Gillingham (eds.). *NATO. The Founding of the Atlantic Alliance and the Integration of Europe* (New York: St. Martin's, 1992).

Gunther Hellmann, "Jenseits von ,Normalisierung' und 'Militarisierung.' Zur Standortdebatte über die neue deutsche Außenpolitik," *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte* 1-2 (1997), 24-33.

Ryan C. Hendrickson. *The Constitution, Congress, and War Powers* (Vanderbilt: Vanderbilt University, 2002).

Thomas H. Hendriksen. *Clinton's Foreign Policy in Somalia, Bosnia, Haiti and North Korea* (Stanford: Stanford University, 1996).

Roman Herzog, "Die Grundkoordinaten deutscher Außenpolitik," *IP* 4 (1995), 3-11.

Helmut Hesse, "Maastricht und die Europäische Währungsunion – eine nüchterne Diskussionsübersicht," *Staatswissenschaften und Staatspraxis* 3 (1992), 307-318.

Stephan Hessler/Ulrich Menzel. *Regionalisierung der Weltwirtschaft und Veränderungen von Weltmarktanteilen 1968-1988* (Bonn: Stiftung Entwicklung und Frieden, 1992).

Wolfgang Heydrich/Joachim Krause/Uwe Nerlich/Jürgen Nötzold/Reinhard Rummel (eds.). *Sicherheitspolitik Deutschlands: Neue Konstellationen, Risiken, Instrumente* (Baden-Baden: Nomos, 1992).

Klaus Hildebrand. *Von Erhard zur Großen Koalition 1963-1969* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1984).

Jim Hoagland, "Europe – A Great Idea, Up to a Point," *WP* (25 April 1991), A15.

Stanley Hoffmann. *Contemporary Theory in International Relations* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1962).

Michael Hogan. *The Marshall Plan. America, Britian and the Reconstruction of Western Europe, 1947-1952* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1987).

John Hohenberg. *The Bill Clinton Story: Winning the Presidency* (Syracuse: Syracuse University, 1994).

Richard Holbrooke, "America, a European Power," *FA* 74.2 (March/April 1995), 38-51.

Richard Holbrooke. *To End a War* (New York: The Modern Library, 1999).

Rudolf Hrbek (ed.). *Der Vertrag von Maastricht in der wissenschaftlichen Kontroverse* (Baden-Baden: Nomos, 1993).

Robert E. Hunter, "Enlargement: Part of a Strategy for Projecting Stability into Central Europe," *NATO Review* 43.3 (May 1995), 3-8.

Samuel P. Huntington, "America's Changing Strategic Interests," *Survival* 33.1 (January/February 1991), 3-17.

Samuel P. Huntington. *The Third Wave. Democratization in the late Twentieth Century* (Oklahoma: Oklahoma University, 1991).

Samuel P. Huntington, "The Clash of Civilizations?" *FA* 72.3 (Summer 1993), 22-49.

William G. Hyland, "The Case for Pragmatism," *FA* 71.1 (1991/1992), 38-52.

William G. Hyland. *Clinton's World. Remaking American Foreign Policy* (Westport: Praeger, 1999).

Fred C. Ikle, "How to Ruin NATO," *NYT* (11 January 1995).

Friedrich Jäger. *Bosniaken, Kroaten, Serben: ein Leitfaden ihrer Geschichte* (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 2001).

Cord Jakobeit, Ute Sacksofsky and Peter Wenzel (eds.). *The United States and German-American Relations through German Eyes* (New York: Nova Science, 1996).

Douglas Jehl, "25,000 U.S. troops to aid UN force if it quits Bosnia," *NYT* (9 December 1994).

Reimut Jochimsen, "Die Europäische Wirtschafts- und Währungsunion. Chancen und Risiken," *EA* 13/14 (1993), 377-388.

Josef Joffe, "Putting Germany Back Together. The Fabulous Bush and Baker Boys," *FA* 75.1 (January/February 1996), 158-164.

Tony Judt, "New Germany, Old NATO," *New York Review of Books* (29 May 1997).

Detlef Junker (ed.). *Die USA und Deutschland im Zeitalter des Kalten Krieges 1945-1990. Ein Handbuch* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlag-Anstalt, 2001).

Alain Juppé, "Respenser l'Europe," *Le Monde* (18. November 1994).

Karl Kaiser, "Die ständige Mitgliedschaft im Sicherheitsrat. Ein berechtigtes Ziel der neuen deutschen Außenpolitik," *EA* 19 (1993), 541-552.

Karl Kaiser/Hanns W. Maull (eds.). *Die Zukunft der europäischen Integration. Folgerungen für die deutsche Politik. Symposium des Forschungsinstituts der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Auswärtige Politik am 2. Juli 1993. Arbeitspapiere zur Internationalen Politik 78* (Bonn: Union, 1993).

Karl Kaiser/Hanns W. Maull (eds.). *Deutschlands neue Außenpolitik. Band 2: Herausforderungen* (München: Oldenbourg, 1995).

Karl Kaiser/Joachim Krause (eds.). *Deutschlands neue Außenpolitik. Band 3: Interessen und Strategien* (München: Oldenbourg, 1996).

Karl Kaiser/Hanns W. Maull. *Deutschlands neue Außenpolitik. Band 1: Grundlagen, 3rd edition* (München: Oldenbourg, 1997).

Karl-Heinz Kamp, "The Folly of Rapid NATO Expansion," *Foreign Policy* 98 (Spring 1995), 116-129.

Tim Kane, "Global U.S. Troop Deployment, 1950-2003," *Heritage Foundation Center for Data Analysis Report* CDA04-11 (Washington, DC, 27 October 2004).

Erhard Kantzenbach / Bruno Molitor / Otto G. Mayer (eds.). *Hamburger Jahrbuch für Wirtschafts- und Gesellschaftspolitik* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1992).

Charles W. Kegley, Jr. / Gregory A. Raymond (eds.). *A Multipolar Peace? Great-Power Politics in the 21st Century* (New York: St. Martin's, 1994).

Alexander Kelle, "The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Regime after the NPT Extension Conference – The Tasks Ahead," *The International Spectator* 30.4 (1995), 31-51.

Alexander Kelle. *Das Chemiewaffen-Übereinkommen und seine Umsetzung – einführende Darstellung und Stand der Diskussion* (Frankfurt: Peace Research Institute, December 1996).

Robert O. Keohane/ Joseph S. Nye. *Power and Independence. World Politics in Transition* (Boston: Little Brown, 1977).

Peter Graf Kielmansegg, "Legitimität bleibt für die Europäische Union auf absehbare Zeit ein knappes Gut," *FAZ* (17 February 1995), 13.

Julie Kim. *Economic Sanctions and the Former Yugoslavia: Current Status and Policy Considerations through 1996* (Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, 16 December 1996).

Klaus Kinkel. *Rede des Bundesaußenministers vor den Vereinten Nationen: 47. Generalversammlung in New York am 23. September 1992* (Bonn: Bulletin des Presse- und Informationsamt der Bundesregierung, 25. September 1992), 949-953.

Klaus Kinkel. *Rede des Bundesministers des Auswärtigen anlässlich der Unterzeichnung des internationalen Übereinkommens zur Ächtung chemischer Waffen in Paris am 13. Januar 1993* (Bonn: Bulletin des Presse- und Informationsamtes der Bundesregierung, 15. January 1993), 33-34.

Klaus Kinkel, "Verantwortung, Realismus, Zukunftssicherung. Deutsche Außenpolitik in einer sich neu ordnenden Welt," *FAZ* (19 March 1993), 8.

Klaus Kinkel, "Priceless Alliance," *WP* (4 November 1997).

Stephen Kinzer, "Europe, Backing Germans, accepts Yugoslav breakup," *NYT* (16 January 1992).

Stephen Kinzer, "NATO Favors U.S. Plan for Ties with the East, but Timing is vague," *NYT* (22 October 1993).

Henry Kissinger, "Be realistic about Russia," *WP* (25 January 1994).

Henry Kissinger, "Die atlantische Gemeinschaft neu begründen," *IP* 1 (1995), 20-26.

Henry Kissinger, "Helsinki Fiasco," *WP* (30 March 1997).

I.P. Khosla, "Another NPT: The Chemical Weapons Convention," *Strategic Analysis* 19.12 (March 1997), 1613-1626.

James Kitfield, "Kohl's answer," *The National Journal* 28.49 (7 December 1996), 2637.

Joe Klein. *The Natural. The Misunderstood Presidency of Bill Clinton* (New York: Random House, 2002).

Philip Klinkner (ed.). *Midterm: Elections of 1994 in Context* (Boulder: Westview, 1996).

"Klose fordert von der SPD neue Beschlüsse zu Kampfeinsätzen," *FAZ* (1 July 1993).

Stephen A. Kocs. *Autonomy or Power? The Franco-German Relationship and Europe's Strategic Choices, 1955-1995* (Westport: Praeger, 1995).

Helmut Kohl. *Erklärung der Bundesregierung: NATO-Gipfel vom 10./11. Januar in Brüssel* (Bonn: Deutscher Bundestag, 12. Wahlperiode, 202. Sitzung, 13. January 1994).

"Helmut Kohl, digging in; At the White House a familiar face at the dinner table," *WP* (10 February 1995).

Helmut Kohl. *Ich wollte Deutschlands Einheit* (Berlin: Propyläen 1996).

Hemut Kohl. *Speech by Chancellor Helmut Kohl at the ceremony at Tempelhof airport to commemorate the Berlin Airlift on the occassion of the visit of President Clinton* (Berlin: Auswärtiges Amt, 14 May 1998).

Helmut Kohl. *Erinnerungen 1990-1994* (München: Droemer, 2007).

Stefan Kornelius, "Die NATO verordnet sich eine lange Denkpause," *SZ* (8 January 1994).

Kevin R. Kosar. *Shutdown of the Federal Government: Causes, Effects, and Process* (Washington, DC: The Library of Congress, 20 September 2004).

Andrei Kozyrev, "The Lagging Partnership," *FA* 73.3 (May/June 1994), 59-71.

Andrei Kozyrev, "Russia and NATO: A Partnership for a United and Peaceful Europe," *NATO Review* 42.4 (August 1994), 3-6.

Michael Kramer, "The Case for Expanding NATO," *Time* (22 May 1995), 35.

Steven Philip Kramer, "The French Question," *The Washington Quarterly* 14.4 (1991 Autumn), 83-96.

Michael Kranish, "Clinton sets '99 for expansion," *The Boston Globe* (23 October 1996).

Joachim Krause (ed.). *Kernwaffenverbreitung und internationaler Systemwandel. Neue Risiken und Gestaltungsmöglichkeiten* (Baden-Baden: Nomos, 1994).

"Kritik deutscher Rechts- und Wirtschaftswissenschaftler an Maastricht," *Handelsblatt* (26 June 1992).

Eduard J. M. Kroker / Bruno Dechamps (eds.). *Die Deutschen auf der Suche nach ihrer Identität?* (Frankfurt am Main: Königsteiner Forum, 1993).

Bernd W. Kubbig. *Aufrüstung vor Rüstungskontrolle. Amerikanische Raketenabwehr während der Clinton-Administration* (Frankfurt: Peace Research Institute, January 1996).

Bernd W. Kubbig/Harald Müller/Annette Schaper. *Die strategische Rüstungskontrolle zwischen USA und Rußland: Erfolge – Probleme – Perspektiven* (Frankfurt: Peace Research Institute 1996).

Bernd W. Kubbig/Matthias Dembinski/Alexander Kelle. *Unilateralism as Sole Foreign-Policy Strategy? American Policy toward the UN, NATO, and the OPCW in the Clinton Era* (Frankfurt: Peace Research Institute, November 2000).

Richard L. Kugler. *U.S. National Military Strategy and Force Posture for the Post-Communist Era* (Santa Monica: Rand, 1992).

Richard L. Kugler. *The Future of NATO and U.S. Policy in Europe* (Santa Monica: RAND, 1992).

Richard L. Kugler, "Costs of NATO enlargement. Moderate and Affordable," *Strategic Forum* 128 (October 1997), 1-6.

Charles A. Kupchan, "Strategic Visions," *World Policy Journal* 11.3 (Fall 1994), 112-122.

Charles A. Kupchan (ed.). *Atlantic Security. Contending Visions* (New York: Council on Foreign Relations, 1998).

Anthony Lake. *From Containment to Enlargement* (Washington, DC: Johns Hopkins University, 21 September 1993).

Karl Lamers / Wolfgang Schäuble. *Überlegungen zur europäischen Politik* (Bonn: CDU/CSU Fraktion, 1 September 1994).

John R. Lampe. *Yugoslavia as history: twice there was a country* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2000).

J.J. Lee & Walter Korter (eds.). *Europe in Transition* (Austin: University of Texas, 1991).

Peter B. Levy. *Encyclopaedia of the Clinton Presidency* (Westport: Greenwood, 2002).

Michael Libal. *Limits of persuasion: Germany and the Yugoslav Crisis, 1991-1992* (Westport: Praeger, 1997).

Robert J. Lieber. *Eagle Adrift. American Foreign Policy at the End of the Century* (Washington, DC: Georgetown University, 1997).

Anatol Lieven, "A New Iron Curtain," *The Atlantic Monthly* 277.1 (January 1996), 20-21.

Anatol Lieven, "Baltic Iceberg dead ahead: NATO beware," *The World Today* 52.7 (July 1996), 175-179.

Beate Lindemann (ed.). *Amerika in uns. Deutsch-amerikanische Erfahrungen und Visionen* (Mainz: Hase und Köhler, 1995).

London Declaration on a Transformed North Atlantic Alliance (Brussels: NATO, 1990).

Wilfried Loth, "Die doppelte Eindämmung. Überlegungen zur Genesis des Kalten Krieges 1945-1947," *Historische Zeitschrift* 238 (1984), 611-631.

Trent Lott, "The Senate's Role in NATO Enlargement," *WP* (21 March 1997).

Gerhard Lozek (ed.). *Die ethnischen Konflikte auf dem Balkan in historischer Sicht* (Berlin: Helle Panke, 2000).

Richard Lugar. *NATO: Out of Area or Out of Business. A Call for U.S. Leadership to Revive and Redefine the Alliance* (Washington, DC: Overseas Writers Club, 24 June 1993).

Madrid Declaration on Euro-Atlantic Security and Cooperation. Issued by the Heads of State and Government, Press Release M-1 (97)81 (Madrid: Meeting of the North Atlantic Council, 8 July 1997).

Michael Mandelbaum, "Preserving the New Peace: The Case Against NATO Expansion," *FA* 74.3 (May/June 1993), 9-13.

Michael Mandelbaum, "Lessons of the Next Nuclear War," *FA* 74.2 (March/April 1995), 22-37.

Michael Mandelbaum, "Foreign Policy as Social Work," *FA* 75.1 (January/February 1996), 16-32.

Michael Mandelbaum. *The Dawn of Peace in Europe* (New York: The Twentieth Century Fund, 1996).

Michael Mandelbaum. *NATO Expansion: A Bridge to the Nineteenth Century* (Washington, DC: Center for Political and Strategic Studies, 1997).

"Manifest von 60 Ökonomen gegen Maastricht," *FAZ* (11 June 1992).

David Maraniss. *First in his Class. A Biography of Bill Clinton* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1995).

Ruth Marcus, "'I agree with Helmut': Clinton finds a friend abroad in food-loving Chancellor Kohl," *WP* (12 July 1994).

Andrei S. Markovits, "Germany and Germans: A View from the United States," *Germany Politics and Society* 13.3 (Fall 1995), 155-164.

David Marsh, "Partners dance to different tunes: As political uncertainty becomes more widespread across Europe, Maastricht looks less relevant," *FT* (18 June 1994), 8.

Jurek Martin, "Clinton's pledge on NATO's expansion," *FT* (23 October 1996).

Hanns W. Maull, "Zivilmacht Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Vierzehn Thesen für eine neue deutsche Außenpolitik," *EA* 10 (1992), 269-278.

Hanns W. Maull /Philip H. Gordon. *German Foreign Policy and the German 'National Interest': German and American Perspectives* (Washington, DC: Johns Hopkins University, January 1993).

Charles William Maynes, "Ethnische Veränderungen im 'Schmelztiegel' Amerika. Auswirkungen auf die amerikanische Außenpolitik," *IP* 5 (1996), 45-48.

Walter Russell Mead, "An American Grand Strategy," *World Policy Journal* 10.1 (Spring 1993), 1-37.

John J. Mearsheimer, "Back to the Future. Instability in Europe after the Cold War," *International Security* 15.1 (Summer 1990): 5-56.

Franz-Josef Meiers. *From Start I to Start II. Arms Control under Uncertainty* (Geneva: Program for Strategic and International Security Studies, 1994).

Franz-Josef Meiers, "Germany: The Reluctant Power," *Survival* 37.3 (Fall 1995), 82-103.

Dirk Metz. *Die Schlacht um das Olympic Hotel am 3/4. Oktober 1993 in Mogadischu/Somalia. Die Niederlage von US und UN-Streitkräften in einem asymmetrischen Konflikt* (Berlin: Dr. Köster, 2004).

Berthold Meyer. *NATO Enlargement: Path to Unity or to a New Division of Europe* (Frankfurt: Peace Research Institute, June 1995).

Michael Mihalka, "Squaring the Circle: NATO's Offer to the East," *RFE/RL Research Report* 12 (25 March 1994), 1-9.

Linda B. Miller, "The Clinton Years: Reinventing U.S. Foreign Policy?" *International Affair*s 70 (October 1994), 621-634.

Alexander Moens/ Christopher Anstis (eds.). *Disconcerted Europe. The Search for a New Security Architecture* (Boulder: Westview, 1994).

Hans J. Morgenthau. *Politics among Nations. The Struggle for Power and Peace*, 5th edition (New York: Alfred A Knopf, 1973).

Dick Morris. *Behind the Oval Office. Getting Reelected against all odds* (Los Angeles: St. Martin's, 1999).

Harald Müller, "Nuklearschmuggel: Tödliches Risiko," *IP* 2 (1995), 23-30.

Harald Müller, "Viewpoint: Neither Hype nor Complacency: WMD Proliferation after the Cold War," *The Nonproliferation Review* 4.2 (Winter 1997), 62-71.

Joshua Muravchik. *The Imperative of American leadership. A Challenge to Neo-Isolationism* (Washington, DC: AEI, 1996).

"Nach dem Scheitern des Vance-Owen-Friedensplans. Der Westen findet sich offenbar mit der Teilung Bosniens ab," *SZ* (19 June 1993).

Alexander Nacht, "U.S. Foreign Policy Strategies," *The Washington Quarterly* 18.3 (Summer 1995), 195-210.

NATO. *Decisions Taken at the Meeting of the North Atlantic Council on 9th August 1993, Press Release* (Brussels: North Atlantic Council, 9 August 1993).

"NATO ministers back 'partnerships idea'," *The Washington Times* (22 October 1993).

NATO Expansion Act of 1994 – 103D Congress, 2D Session, H.R.4210 (Washington, DC, 1994).

NATO. *Study on NATO Enlargement* (Brussels: NATO, September 1995).

NATO. *Final Communiqué. Issued at the Ministerial Meeting of the North Atlantic Council. Press Communiqué, M-NAC-2, (96) 165* (Brussels: NATO, 10 December 1996).

Klaus Naumann (ed.). *NVA. Anspruch und Wirklichkeit nach ausgewählten Dokumenten* (Berlin/Bonn/Herford: Mittler, 1993).

Klaus Naumann. *Die Bundeswehr in einer Welt im Umbruch* (Berlin: Siedler, 1994).

Pauline Neville-Jones, "Dayton, IFOR and Alliance Relations in Bosnia," *Survival* 38.4 (Winter 1996/1997), 45-65.

New Transatlantic Agenda (Washington, DC: Delegation of the European Commission to the United States, 3 December 1995).

Gottfried Niedhart (ed.). *Nationale Interessen und internationale Ordnung im 20. Jahrhundert* (Mannheim: Palatium, 1997).

Joseph S. Nye, Jr., "What New World Order?" *FA* 71.2 (Spring 1992), 83-96.

William E. Odom, "NATO's Expansion. Why the Critics are Wrong," *The National Interest* 39 (Spring 1995), 38-49.

"Officials seek to clarify position on NATO expansion," *FBIS Trends* (29 September 1993).

Tanya Ogilvie-White, "Is there a theory of nuclear proliferation? An analysis of the contemporary debate," *The Nonproliferation Review* 4.1 (Fall 1996), 43-60.

Gary B. Ostrower. *The United Nations and the United States* (New York: Twayne, 1998).

David B. Ottaway, "Bosnian Serb reply to peace plan," *WP* (21 July 1994).

Jutta Paczulla, "The long, difficult road to Dayton. Peace efforts in Bosnia-Herzegovina," *International Journal* 60.1 (Winter 2004/2005), 255-272.

"Paris und Bonn wollen den Kern einer europäischen Armee schaffen," *FAZ* (17 October 1991), 1.

Christopher Parkes, "U.S. cool to Kinkel's Atlantic trade plan," *FT* (20 April 1995), 3.

Partnership for Peace – Invitation and Partnership for Peace: Framework Document (Brussels: North Atlantic Council, 10-11 January 1994).

Jane Perlez, "Blunt Reason for Enlarging NATO: Curbs on Germany," *NYT* (7 December 1997).

John Pomfret, "Yugoslavia orders end of ties to Bosnian Serbs. Milosevic assails leaders for rejection of peace plan," *WP* (5 August 1994).

Elizabeth Pond. *Beyond the Wall. Germany's Road to Reunification* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 1993).

Barry Poser /Andrew L. Ross, "Competing Visions for U.S. Grand Strategy," *International Security* 21.3 (Winter 1996/97), 5-53.

William C. Potter, "Viewpoint. Nuclear Insecurity in the post-Soviet States," *The Nonproliferation Review* 1.3 (Spring/Summer 1994), 61.

August Pradetto (ed.). *Ostmitteleuropa, Rußland und die Osterweiterung der NATO. Perzeptionen und Strategien im Spannungsfeld nationaler und europäischer Sicherheit* (Opladen: Westdeutscher, 1997).

August Pradetto /Fouzieh Melanie Alamir (eds.). *Die Debatte über die Kosten der NATO-Osterweiterung* (Baden-Baden: Nomos, 1998).

Press Briefing by Chief of Staff Leon Panetta, Chairman of National Economic Council Dr. Laura Tyson, OMB Director Alice Rivlin, Secretary of Treasury Bob Rubin (Washington, DC: The White House, Office of the Press Secretary, 13 June 1995).

Press Release, Summit of the French-German Defense and Security Council on 22 May 1992 in La Rochelle (Washington, DC: The Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany, 26 May 1992).

Alexei K. Pushkov, "Don't isolate us. A Russian View of NATO Expansion," *The National Interest* 47 (Spring 1997), 58-62.

Sabrina P. Ramet. *Balkan Babel. The Disintegration of Yugoslavia from the Death of Tito to the War in Kosovo* (Boulder: Westview, 1999).

Robert W. Rauchhaus (ed.). *Explaining NATO Enlargement* (London: Frank Cass, 2001).

"Rechter SPD-Flügel: Bisherige Position nicht zu halten – für Kampfeinsätze der Bundeswehr. Voigt für Abschied von provinzieller außenpolitischer Kultur," *SZ (*4 February 1993).

Republican Contract with America (Washington, DC, 27 September 1994).

John E. Rielly (ed.). *American Public Opinion and U.S. Foreign Policy 1991* (Chicago: Chicago Press Corporation, 1991).

John E. Rielly (ed.). *American Public Opinion and U.S. Foreign Policy 1995* (Chicago: Chicago Press Corporation, 1995).

John E. Rielly, "Pragmatischer Internationalismus. Öffentliche Meinung und Außenpolitik in den USA," *IP* 3 (1995), 47-54.

A.M. Rosenthal, "On my mind: The Clinton Doctrine," *NYT* (6 October 1992).

Barry Rubin/Judith Colp Rubin. *Hating America. A History* (Oxford: Oxford University, 2004).

Alvin Z. Rubinstein, Albina Shayevich, Boris Zlotnikov (eds.). *The Clinton Foreign Policy Reader: Presidential Speeches with Commentary* (London: M.E. Sharpe, 2000).

Peter Rudolf, "The Future of the United States as a European Power: The Case of NATO Enlargement," *European Security* 5.2 (Summer 1996), 180-183.

Volker Rühe, "Shaping Euro-Atlantic Policies: A Grand Strategy for a New Era," *Survival* 35.2 (Summer 1993), 129-137.

Volker Rühe, "Adapting the Alliance in the Face of Great Challenges," *NATO Review* 6.41 (December 1993), 3-5.

Volker Rühe. *Rede von Bundesverteidigungsminister Volker Rühe über Europa und Amerika, gehalten auf der Münchner Konferenz für Sicherheitspolitik am 4. Februar 1995* (Bonn: Bundesministerium der Verteidigung, 4 February 1995).

Lothar Rühl, "Deutschlands Interesse an der NATO-Osterweiterung," *IP* 11 (1996), 49-54.

Reinhardt Rummel (ed.). *Planning a Common Foreign and Security Policy in the European Community* (Baden-Baden: Nomos, 1992).

"Russia moves East, like NATO," *Russian Press Digest* (26 March 1997).

Rudolf Scharping, "Deutsche Außenpolitik muß berechenbar sein," *IP* 8 (1995), 38-44.

James Schlesinger, "Quest for a Post-Cold War Foreign Policy," *FA* 72.1 (1992/1993), 17-28.

Bernd Schmidbauer, "Illegaler Nuklearhandel und Nuklearterrorismus," *IP* 2 (1995), 19-22.

Hans-Joachim Schmidt. *NATO and Arms Control: Alliance Enlargement and the CFE Treaty* (Frankfurt am Main: Peace Research Institute, July 1996).

Gregor Schöllgen. *Angst vor der Macht. Die Deutschen und ihre Außenpolitik* (Berlin/Frankfurt am Main: Ullstein, 1993).

Jörg Schönbohm. *Zwei Armeen und ein Vaterland* (Berlin: Siedler, 1992).

"Schrempp beklagt Europamüdigkeit," *FAZ* (3 November1995), 20.

Gesine Schwan. *Antikommunismus und Antiamerikanismus in Deutschland. Kontinuität und Wandel nach 1945* (Baden-Baden: Nomos, 1999).

Hans-Peter Schwarz. *Die gezähmten Deutschen: von der Machtbesessenheit zur Machtvergessenheit* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlagsgesellschaft, 1985).

Klaus Dieter Schwarz. *Weltmacht USA. Zum Verhältnis von Macht und Strategie nach dem Kalten Krieg* (Baden-Baden: Nomos, 1999).

Gebhard Schweigler, "Driftet die atlantische Gemeinschaft auseinander?" *IP* 6 (1995), 53-60.

Sherle R. Schwenninger, "The Case against NATO Enlargement: Clinton's Fateful Gamble," *The Nation* (20 October 1997).

Simon Serfaty, "America and Europe Beyond Bosnia," *The Washington Quarterly* 19.3 (Summer 1996).

Avi Shlaim. *The United States and the Berlin Blockade, 1948-1949* (Berkeley: University of California, 1983).

Jeffrey Simon (ed.). *NATO: The Challenge of Change* (Washington, DC: National Defense University, 1993).

Jeffrey Simon (ed.). *NATO Enlargement: Opinions and Options* (Washington, DC: National Defense University, 1995).

Neil Skene / Robert W. Merry (eds.). *1993 Congressional Quarterly Almanac* (Washington, DC: CQ, 1994).

Stanley R. Sloan. *A Strategic Partnership between Germany and the United States: American Expectations* (Sankt Augustin: Konrad Adenauer Stiftung, Dezember 1995).

Jeffrey Smith, "Clinton decides to retain Bush nuclear arms policy," *NYT* (22 September 1994), A1.

Martin A. Smith. *Building a bigger Europe: EU and NATO enlargement in comparative perspective* (Burlington: Ashgate, 2000).

W. R. Smyser. *Germany and America. New Identities, Fateful Rift?* (Boulder: Westview, 1993).

Gerald B. Solomon. *The NATO Enlargement Debate, 1990-1997. Blessings of Liberty* (Westport: Praeger, 1998).

Theo Sommer, "Why we can be trusted," *Newsweek* (9 July1990), 38.

Immo Stabreit, "Yugoslav Breakup: Don't blame Germany," *WP* (29 June 1993).

Statement by the North Atlantic Council (Brussels, 14 March 1997).

Stephen John Stedman, "The New Interventionists," *FA* 72.1 (1992/1993), 1-16.

Rolf Steiniger et. al (ed.). *Die doppelte Eindämmung, europäische Sicherheit und deutsche Frage in den Fünfzigern* (München: Hase & Koehler, 1993).

George Stephanopoulos. *All too human. A Political Education* (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1999).

Strobe Talbott, "Why NATO Should Grow," *New York Review of Books* (August 10, 1995), 27-30.

Strobe Talbott, "Democracy and the National Interest," *FA* 75.6 (November/December 1996), 47-63.

Text of Joint Action Program Released by the Office of the Spokesman (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of State, 22 May 1993).

The Alliance's New Strategic Concept (Brussels: NATO, July 1990).

"The Future of the Balkans. An interview with David Owen," *FA* 72.2 (March/April 1993), 1-9.

"The German Question. Ask it openly, answer it frankly," *The Economist* (12 October 1991), 18.

"The President's News Conference with Visegrad Leaders in Prague, January 12, 1994," *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States. Book I, January 1 to July 31, 1994*. William J. Clinton (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1995), 40.

"The President's News Conference with Chancellor Helmut Kohl of Germany in Milwaukee," *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States Book 1 – January 1 to June 30, 1996*. William J. Clinton (Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office, 1997), 805-812.

The Senate Resolution on NATO Expansion (Washington, DC, April 1998).

The White House Domestic Policy Council, The President's Health Security Plan (Washington, DC: Times Books, 1993).

 "The 1992 Campaign. Excerpts from Interview with Clinton on Goals for Presidency," *NYT* (28 June 1992).

Siegfried Thielbeer, "Klare Worte an die baltischen Republiken," *FAZ* (20 June 1995), 8.

Helmut Thielen (ed.). *Der Krieg der Köpfe. Vom Golfkrieg zur neuen Weltordnung* (Bad Honnef: Horlemann, 1991).

Hans Tietmeyer. *Die Europäische Wirtschafts- und Währungsunion. Eine deutsche Sicht* (Stuttgart: Gustav Fischer, 1992).

Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms (Washington, DC: NTI Research Library, 31 July 1991).

Gregory F. Treverton. *America, Germany, and the future of Europe* (Princeton: Princeton University, 1992).

Ann Tusa /John Tusa. *The Berlin Airlift* (New York: Atheneum, 1988).

Patrick E. Tyler, "Pentagon Drops Goal of Blocking New Superpowers," *NYT* (24 May 1992), 1/4.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. *Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1994* (Washington, DC: Bureau of the Census, 1994).

U.S. Congressional Record (Washington, DC, 31 January 1994).

U.S. Department of Defense. *Report to the Congress on the military requirements and costs of NATO enlargement* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Defense, February 1998).

U.S. Department of Defense. *Military Personnel Historical Reports: Active Duty Military Personnel by Regional Area and by Country* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Defense, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, Statistical Information Analysis Division, 19 October 2004).

U.S. Department of Health & Human Services. *The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996* (Washington, DC, 22 August 1996).

U.S. Department of State. *Report to the Congress on the Enlargement of the North Atlantic Treaty organization: Rationale, Benefits, Costs and Implications* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of State, 24 February 1997).

U.S. House Committee on Foreign Affairs. *Hearings on Emergency Aid.* 80th Congress, 1st Session, (Washington, DC, 1947).

U.S. House Committee on Foreign Affairs. *Hearings on United States Foreign Policy for a Post-War Recovery Program.* 80th Congress, 1st Session (Washington, DC, 1947).

U.S. Senate. *Hearings on United States Assistance to European Economic Recovery*, 80th Congress, 2nd Session (Washington, DC, 1947).

U.S. Senate. *The Ethnic Cleansing of Bosnia-Hercegovina. A Staff report to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate* (Washington, DC: U.S. Senate, 15 August 1992).

"U.S. will not push Muslims to accept Bosnia Peace Plan," *NYT* (4 February 1993).

André Uzulis, "Sparpläne für Bundeswehr: Union und FDP sehen Bündnisfähigkeit gefährdet," *Welt am Sonntag* (15 June 1997).

Martin van Heuven. *The integration of Germany and its role in Europe* (Santa Monica: RAND, 1995).

John Van Oudenaren, "Die neue transatlantische Agenda," *IP* 5 (1996), 49-52.

Daniel Vernet, "Europäisches Deutschland oder deutsches Europa?: Deutsche Interessenpolitik in Europa," *IP* 52 (February 1997), 15-22.

Karsten Voigt, "Das deutsche Interesse am Multilateralismus," *Außenpolitik* 47.2 (1996), 107-116.

Mario von Baratta. *Fischer Weltalmanach 1993* (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 1992).

Wolfgang Wagner et al. (eds). *Die Internationale Politik 1991-1992. Jahrbücher des Forschungsinstituts der deutschen Gesellschaft für Auswärtige Politik* (München: Oldenbourg, 1994).

William Wallace, "Deutschland als europäische Führungsmacht," *IP* 50 (May 1995), 23-28.

George Washington, "Farewell Address to the People of the United States" *The Independent Chronicle* (26 September 1796).

Werner Weidenfeld. *Maastricht in der Analyse. Materialien zur Europäischen Union (Strategien und Optionen)* (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann Stiftung, 1994).

Werner Weidenfeld. *Neue Wege transatlantischer Partnerschaft. Tätigkeitsbericht des Koordinators für die deutsch-amerikanische zwischengesellschaftliche, kultur- und informationspolitische Zusammenarbeit 1994/1995* (Bonn: Auswärtiges Amt, Januar 1996).

Werner Weidenfeld. *America and Europe: Is the break inevitable?* (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann Stiftung, 1996).

Werner Weidenfeld. *Außenpolitik für die deutsche Einheit. Die Entscheidungsjahre 1989/90 (*Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1998).

Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger's speech to the National Press Club in Washington (28 November 1984).

Weißbuch 1994. Weißbuch zur Sicherheit der Bundesrepublik Deutschland und zur Lage der Zukunft der Bundeswehr (Bonn: Bundesministerium der Verteidigung, 1994).

Ulrich Weisser. *NATO ohne Feindbild: Konturen einer europäischen Sicherheitspolitik* (Bonn/Berlin: Bouvier, 1992).

Ulrich Weisser. *Sicherheit für ganz Europa. Die Atlantische Allianz in der Bewährung* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1999).

Siegrid Westphal / Joachim Arendt (eds.). *Uncle Sam und die Deutschen. 50 Jahre deutsch-amerikanische Partnerschaft in Politik, Wirtschaft und Alltagsleben* (München: Bonn Aktuell, 1995).

Immanuel Wexler. *The Marshall Plan Revisited. The European Recovery Program in Economic Perspective* (Westport: Greenwood, 1983).

Craig R. Whitney, "Move on Bosnia by U.S. alarms allies in NATO," *NYT* (12 November 1994).

Craig R. Whitney, "Balkan Accord: The Overview; Balkan Foes sign peace pact, dividing an unpacified Bosnia," *NYT* (15 December 1995).

Klaus Wiegrefe. *Das Zerwürfnis. Helmut Schmidt, Jimmy Carter und die Krise der deutsch-amerikanischen Beziehungen* (Berlin: Propyläen, 2005).

Leo Wieland, "Das Deutschlandbild in Amerika," *FAZ* (13 February 1997), 1.

Daniel Williams, "Clinton's National Security Adviser Outlines U.S. 'Strategy of Enlargement'," *WP* (22 September 1993).

Daniel Williams, "U.S. revises approach to sanctions on Serbia; Administration tries long-shot bid for peace," *WP* (15 February 1995).

Daniel Williams/Thomas W. Lippman, "U.S. is allowing Iran to arm Bosnia Muslims," *WP* (14 April 1995).

Boguslaw W. Winid, "NATO Enlargement in US Congress in 1993-1996," *Polish Quarterly of International Affairs* 6 (1997), 61-86.

Rainer Winkler, "Deutschlands geopolitische Lage im sich wandelnden Europa," *Welt Trends* 6 (März 1995), 98-111.

Paul D. Wolfowitz, "Clinton's First Year," *FA* 73.1 (January/February 1994), 28-43.

Bob Woodward. *The Agenda. Inside the Clinton White House* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1994).

Bob Woodward. *The Choice. How Clinton won* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996).

Susan L. Woodward. *Balkan Tragedy. Chaos and Dissolution after the Cold War* (Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution, 1995).

X, "The Sources of Soviet Conduct," *FA* (July 1947).

Boris Yeltsin. *Remarks by Russian President Yeltsin at the Signing Ceremony of the NATO-Russia Founding Act* (Paris, 27 May 1997).

Philip Zelikow /Condoleeza Rice. *Germany unified and Europe transformed: a study in statecraft* (Cambridge: Harvard University, 1995).

Warren Zimmermann. *Origins of a Catastrophe. Yugoslavia and its destroyers – America's last Ambassador tells what happened and why* (New York: Random House, 1996).

Zusammenfassung

Das Thema dieser Dissertation sind die außen- und sicherheitspolitischen Beziehungen zwischen den Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika und Deutschland während der ersten Amtszeit von U.S.-Präsident Bill Clinton (1993-1997). Die Arbeit beschreibt die Kontinuitätslinien und Veränderungen im bilateralen Verhältnis beider Staaten in dieser Zeit. Im Mittelpunkt der Analyse steht der Umgang deutscher und amerikanischer Außenpolitik mit der veränderten Sicherheitslage in Europa nach Ende des Kalten Krieges unter besonderer Berücksichtigung dreier Fallstudien: die Weiterverbreitung von Massenvernichtungswaffen aus dem Arsenal der ehemaligen Sowjetunion, der Krieg auf dem Balkan sowie die Osterweiterung der NATO.

Die Studie kommt zu dem Ergebnis, dass trotz der Zäsur der Jahre 1989/90 die strategische Partnerschaft zwischen Deutschland und den Vereinigten Staaten in außen- und sicherheitspolitischen Fragestellungen von Bedeutung für die internationale Gemeinschaft blieb. Diese Konstante hatte in der neuen Ära nach der Wiedervereinigung Deutschlands und dem Zusammenbruch der Sowjetunion weiterhin Relevanz, wenngleich in einem veränderten europäischen Umfeld.

Durch den Fall der Mauer und den Vertrag über die abschließende Regelung in Bezug auf Deutschland (den so genannten „Zwei plus Vier-Vertrag") vom 12. September 1990 erlangte Deutschland nach mehr als vierzig Jahren seine volle Souveränität zurück und gewann damit erheblichen Handlungsspielraum in außenpolitischen Fragen. Der Wegfall der innerdeutschen Grenze und die Auflösung des Warschauer Paktes verbesserte die Sicherheitslage der Berliner Republik dramatisch; Deutschland war auf einmal „von Freunden umzingelt" (Volker Rühe). Diese Entwicklungen waren Ausgangspunkt für eine stärkere europäische Integration, die sich in einer Wirtschafts- und Währungsunion sowie der Schaffung einer gemeinsamen Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik (Vertrag von Maastricht) manifestierte.

Auch in Washington führte das Ende des Kommunismus auf dem europäischen Kontinent zu einer Überprüfung der bisherigen Leitlinien amerikanischer Außenpolitik. An die Stelle der Eindämmungsdoktrin des Kalten Krieges setzte die Clinton-Administration zunächst ihre Erweiterungsstrategie, die auf eine Ausbreitung westlicher Werte in der Welt zielte. Es gelang ihr jedoch nicht, die amerikanische Öffentlichkeit von diesem neuen Ansatz zu überzeugen, weil nach dem Ende des jahrzehntelangen bipolaren Kräftemessens mit der Sowjetunion das Interesse der Bürger an Außenpolitik schwand. Vorübergehend hofften Regierung, Eliten und Öffentlichkeit gleichermaßen, Amerika könne sich nun vordringlich um innenpolitische und wirtschaftliche Fragen kümmern. Doch neue Krisen in Europa vereitelten diese Aussicht.

Es wurde alsbald klar, dass Amerika sich auch weiterhin nicht aus seiner Rolle als europäische Macht würde zurückziehen können. Im Gegenteil, sein Engagement und seine Führungsstärke waren mehr gefragt denn je. Umso wichtiger war für die Vereinigten Staaten in dieser Situation Deutschland als vertrauenswürdiger Partner, der auch nach der Wiedervereinigung keine Sonderwege suchte, sondern weiter auf dem Pfad einer multilateralen, auf Vermittlung angelegten Außenpolitik blieb.

Die dauerhafte Bedeutung der deutsch-amerikanischen Beziehungen, die nach wie vor auf gemeinsamen Werten und Interessen gründeten, zeigte sich zunächst beim Umgang mit dem Problem der Weiterverbreitung von Massenvernichtungswaffen. Die Vereinigten Staaten und Deutschland übernahmen die Führung im Rahmen der internationalen Nichtverbreitungsregime, was zu einer unbefristeten Verlängerung des Atomwaffensperrvertrages und der Verabschiedung

eines nuklearen Teststoppvertrages führte. Beide Seiten setzten sich überdies für die Stabilisierung und Verringerung des Arsenals der ehemaligen Sowjetunion mit Hilfe von finanziellen Zuwendungen oder bilateralen Abrüstungsverträgen ein.

Im deutlichen Gegensatz zu dieser Erfolgsgeschichte deutsch-amerikanischer Kooperation stand die Unfähigkeit der Vereinigten Staaten und Europas, angesichts der Balkankrise zu einer gemeinsamen Position zu finden. Zahlreiche gescheiterte Vermittlungsversuche in den ersten drei Jahren des Konflikts waren die Folge. Es war offensichtlich, dass die EU trotz erster Fortschritte bei der Entwicklung einer gemeinsamen Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik noch weit davon entfernt war, aus eigener Kraft eine Lösung für einen ethnischen Konflikt in ihrer unmittelbaren Nachbarschaft zu finden. Erst, als die Vereinigten Staaten die Führungsverantwortung übernahmen und sich sowohl militärisch als auch politisch engagierten, konnte das Friedensabkommen von Dayton auf den Weg gebracht werden.

Für die deutsch-amerikanischen Beziehungen im Bereich der Sicherheitspolitik brachte der Krieg auf dem Balkan die Gewissheit, dass die Vereinigten Staaten als stabilisierende Kraft auf dem europäischen Kontinent weiterhin unersetzbar blieben. Gleichzeitig stärkte das Daytoner Friedensabkommen die Stellung der NATO, da unter ihrem Dach eine multilaterale Friedenstruppe zur Überwachung des Waffenstillstandsabkommens (IFOR) geschaffen wurde. Dem westlichen Militärbündnis, das nach 1989 zeitweilig Orientierung und Existenzzweck verloren zu haben schien, bescherte dieses Mandat eine Renaissance als zentrales Forum, in dem die Vereinigten Staaten und Europa ihre sicherheitspolitischen Herausforderungen gemeinsam angingen.

Die Frage nach der Zukunft der NATO spielte ebenfalls eine wichtige Rolle in der Debatte um die Osterweiterung des Bündnisses. Die Aufnahme ehemaliger Warschau Pakt-Staaten in die NATO wurde nach intensiven bilateralen Beratungen von Deutschland und den Vereinigten Staaten aufgrund von moralischen, sicherheitspolitischen und geopolitischen Argumenten vorangetrieben. Die deutsch-amerikanische Zusammenarbeit leistete einen wertvollen Beitrag in dieser Sache: weil sie innerhalb des Bündnisses Überzeugungsarbeit leistete, aber vor allem in ihrem Bestreben, in einem transparenten Prozess um die Zustimmung Russlands für diese Initiative zu werben. Auf dem gesamten Weg zur Erweiterung der NATO – mit den Meilensteinen „Partnership for Peace", NATO-Erweiterungsstudie, NATO-Russland-Gründungsakte und NATO-Gipfel in Madrid 1997, – waren die Regierungen in Bonn und Washington die treibenden Kräfte zur Verwirklichung dieses Projekts. Nur der strategischen Partnerschaft zwischen Deutschland und den Vereinigten Staaten war es schließlich zu verdanken, dass durch die Aufnahme Polens, Ungarns und Tschechiens in die NATO das Sicherheitsvakuum in Osteuropa geschlossen werden konnte.

Struktur der Dissertation:

Kapitel 1 stellt verschiedene theoretische Ansätze dar, die für die Debatte über den Kurs amerikanischer Außenpolitik nach Ende des Kalten Krieges von Bedeutung waren. Besondere Aufmerksamkeit gilt dabei den außenpolitischen Denkschulen sowie den Kontinuitäten und Veränderungen in der amerikanischen Militär- und Verteidigungsstrategie.

Kapitel 2 skizziert die außen- und sicherheitspolitische Orientierung Deutschlands nach dem Fall der Berliner Mauer. Im Mittelpunkt der Betrachtung steht dabei die Rolle der Bonner Republik als Förderer der europäischen Integration und als nunmehr souveräner Staat in der internationalen Gemeinschaft.

Kapitel 3 beschäftigt sich mit dem Aufstieg und der ersten Amtszeit des amerikanischen Präsidenten Bill Clinton (1993-1997). Die innen- und außenpolitischen Initiativen der Clinton-Administration sowie die ihnen zugrunde liegenden politischen Beweggründe werden ausführlich dargestellt.

Kapitel 4 beschreibt die Entwicklung des deutsch-amerikanischen Verhältnisses im behandelten Zeitraum. Von zentralem Interesse ist dabei die Kongruenz von Werten und Interessen sowie die Entwicklung der öffentlichen Meinung über den Partner auf beiden Seiten des Atlantiks.

Kapitel 5 widmet sich dem Problem der potentiellen Weiterverbreitung von Massenvernichtungswaffen aus dem Arsenal der ehemaligen Sowjetunion in den 1990er Jahren. Es analysiert die deutsch-amerikanischen Bemühungen, diese Bestände zu sichern und zu reduzieren und beschreibt, wie multilaterale Instrumente erfolgreich eingesetzt wurden (Atomwaffensperrvertrag und nuklearer Teststoppvertrag), um dieses Ziel zu erreichen.

Kapitel 6 wendet sich dem Krieg in Bosnien-Herzegowina zu und beschreibt – unter Berücksichtigung der lange durchaus unterschiedlichen Rollen Deutschlands und der USA – die Ursprünge des Konflikts, die fehlgeschlagenen Vermittlungsversuche der internationalen Gemeinschaft sowie die Befriedung des Balkans durch das Abkommen von Dayton.

Kapitel 7 rekapituliert die Argumente, die für und gegen eine Erweiterung der NATO sprachen und zeichnet den Prozess nach, der schließlich zur Aufnahme ehemaliger Warschauer Pakt-Staaten in die Allianz führte. Her liegt der Akzent auf der Darstellung der engen deutsch-amerikanischen Zusammenarbeit an diesem Projekt sowie auf dem Umgang des Westens mit der russischen Opposition gegen diese Initiative.