Perpetuating U.S. Preeminence

The 1990 Deals to "Bribe the Soviets Out" and Move NATO In

Mary Elise Sarotte

Dramatic changes in 1989—most notably, the fall of the Berlin Wall on November 9—shocked much of the world. Yet the post–Cold War order that emerged afterward included a great deal of continuity, particularly with regard to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Although the transatlantic alliance's primary mission had been to counter the Soviet threat, NATO endured the demise of that threat and the end of the Cold War with relatively few alterations. The means by which this happened are of more than historical interest, given that NATO's endurance enabled its subsequent enlargement. If world leaders had struck alternative bargains at the end of the Cold War—namely, agreements subordinating or replacing NATO, or foreclosing NATO's future movement eastward—then such enlargement would have become much more difficult, if not impossible.[1]

As a combination of newly available and previously released multilingual evidence reveals, such potential alternative bargains emerged in 1990.[2] First,

Mary Elise Sarotte, a historian, is Professor of International Relations at the University of Southern California. She is the author, most recently, of 1989: The Struggle to Create Post–Cold War Europe.

The author is grateful to the following institutions for funding: the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation; the Bosch Public Policy Fellowship Program; the German Academic Exchange Service or DAAD; the Institute for Advanced Study; the Mershon Center of the Ohio State University; the National Endowment for the Humanities; St. John's College, University of Cambridge; and the University of Southern California. She thanks the participants of both the H-Diplo online discussion of her book of February 2010 and the Princeton Center for International Security Workshop of March 4–6, 2010, convened by Daniel Deudney and G. John Ikenberry, for discussing many of these ideas with her. For comments on and help with the manuscript, she is grateful to Robert English, Jeffrey Legro, Norman Naimark, Odd Arne Westad, and the journal's anonymous reviewers.

1. The enlargement of NATO in 1990 was not the first time the alliance had expanded; it had already added members, such as Spain and West Germany, in the period between its formation in 1949 and the caesura of 1989. For more information on the history of NATO, see Wallace J. Thies, *Why NATO Endures* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009).
2. The newest sources used in this article are (1) the papers of the former West and East German foreign ministries, which first became available to scholars in late 2009 and are abbreviated here as GU; (2) documents on British policy overseas, published in October 2009 by the British Foreign and Commonwealth Office, in Patrick Salmon, Keith Hamilton, and Stephen Robert Twigge, eds., *Britain and German Unification 1989–90,* Documents on British Policy Overseas, Series 3, Vol. 7 (London: Routledge, 2009), abbreviated here as FCO-DBPO; and (3) French sources in the Archives Nationales, which became available to the author in the summer of 2009 as a result of a successful petition for access. This article uses these materials from 2009 in combination with (1) archival sources that opened in the last few years and (2) those that have been available since the end of the Cold War, listed here with the acronyms used in the notes to identify them: BP, or the papers of James A. Baker III, Mudd Library, Princeton University; BPL, or Bush Presidential Library, College

International Security, Vol. 35, No. 1 (Summer 2010), pp. 110–137

Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev began calling for a new post–Cold War pan-European security structure. He hoped for an organization that, while yet ill-defined, would stretch from the shores of the Atlantic to his country. The U.S. ambassador in Moscow, Jack Matlock, reported in May 1990 that Gorbachev wanted to create such a security structure quickly by putting a united Germany into both NATO and the Warsaw Pact. Moscow's logic was that if "Germany can participate without difficulty in the G-7 [Group of Seven], the EC [European Community]-12, the NATO-16 and the CSCE [Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe]-35, why couldn't it also accept participation in all or part of the Warsaw Pact political framework—an Eastern E-7, so to speak"?[3] Gorbachev also speculated with the Polish president, Wojciech Jaruzelski, on whether the Warsaw Pact should increase its presence in East Germany until such a pan-European structure came about. Jaruzelski thought that, because not only U.S. but also British and French troops were stationed in West Germany, Polish and Czechoslovakian troops should move into East Germany to join the Soviet forces already there.[4] Second, the U.S. National Security Council (NSC) worried in 1990 that Gorbachev might call a snap peace conference of the 110 nations that had been in a state of war with Nazi Germany in 1945. Many of the former belligerents would have been eager to attend, given the possibility of gaining reparations from wealthy West Germany.[5] The issue of "postwar" security structures would then have been on the table, and the consequences for NATO of such a meeting would have been unpredictable. The French, for example, had already expressed interest in new visions for the future of European security. In contrast to what they saw as an American, British, and West German plan to "confirm and revitalize

---

Station, Texas; DESE, or published West German Chancellery documents, in Hanns Jürgen Küsters and Daniel Hoffman, eds., *Dokumente zur Deutschlandpolitik: Deutsche Einheit, Sonderedition aus den Akten des Bundeskanzleramtes 1989/90* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 1998); FOIA, or U.S. Freedom of Information Act, documents requested under, institutional source identified with each citation; KASPA, or the Konrad-Adenauer Stiftung press archive, St. Augustin; and МГ [MG], *Михаил Горбачев и германский вопрос* [Mikhail Gorbachev and the German question] (Moscow: Весь Мир, 2006). Documents also come from the briefing book distributed at the Mershon Center conference "U.S.-Soviet Military Relationships at the End of the Cold War, 1988–91," October 15–17, 1999, Mershon Center, Ohio State University. Unless otherwise identified, translations from foreign-language sources are the author's. These sources, and the alternative bargains, are discussed in more detail in Mary Elise Sarotte, *1989: The Struggle to Create Post–Cold War Europe* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2009).

3. Ambassador Jack Matlock, cable from Amembassy Moscow to Secstate Washdc, May 1, 1990, released by the State Department via FOIA.

4. "Из беседы М.С. Горбачева с В. Ярузельским, 13.04.1990" [From the conversation between Gorbachev and Jaruzelski, April 13, 1990], МГ, p. 394.

5. On the peace conference idea, see Philip Zelikow and Condoleezza Rice, *Germany Unified and Europe Transformed: A Study in Statecraft* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1995), pp. 154–155.

the Atlantic alliance" at the end of the Cold War, French President François Mitterrand and his advisers were interested in a third and, in their eyes, "better" alternative: an expanded role for a "suitably reinforced" CSCE.[6] Secretary of State James Baker found this variant worrying; as he advised President George H.W. Bush, the "real risk to NATO is CSCE."[7] Fourth, it was conceivable that West Germans might, if pressed by the Soviet Union, be willing to trade NATO membership for unification with East Germany; the alliance was not a beloved one. In the 1980s, more than 1 million West Germans had protested against NATO's missile emplacements in their backyard; Chancellor Helmut Schmidt's government fell partly because it had made agreements leading to such emplacements; and a popular rock song telling Americans and Russians to go fight on the uninhabited surface of the moon instead of in divided Germany spent eighty weeks at the top of the charts.[8] Fifth, a number of the Eastern European dissidents who had contributed to the dramatic changes of 1989 were now political rulers. Many came from pacifist backgrounds and rejected both the Warsaw Pact and NATO, indeed all military alliances. To cite just one example, the new Czechoslovakian leader, Václav Havel, shocked Washington during his first visit there in February 1990 when he called for all foreign troops to leave Europe.[9]

These alternatives shared one critical aspect: they promised to diminish the United States' preeminence in European security, an outcome that President Bush wanted to avoid. Writing personally to Mitterrand in April 1990, he stated, "I hope that you agree that the North Atlantic Alliance is an essential component of Europe's future." Moreover, "I do not foresee that the CSCE can replace NATO as the guarantor of Western security and stability. Indeed, it is

6. Hubert Védrine and Vice-Amiral d'Escadre Lanxade, Présidence de la République, "A/s: une proposition de défense européenne, Paris, le 10 avril 1990," in 5 AG 4, EG 170, Archives Nationales, France. Mitterrand put a handwritten and underlined note on top: "Nôte à garde FM." The relationship between the United States and France in this period was complex, not consistently adversarial as is often assumed, and the French would eventually accept NATO's continued dominance. For more on the relationship between the United States and France in this period, see Frédéric Bozo, *Mitterrand, the End of the Cold War, and German Unification* (New York: Berghahn, 2009); and Frédéric Bozo, "'Winners' and 'Losers': France, the United States, and the End of the Cold War," *Diplomatic History,* Vol. 33, No. 5 (November 2009), pp. 927–956.
7. "Notes from Jim Cicconi [notetaker] re: 7/3/90 pre-NATO Summit briefing at Kennebunkport," folder 3, box 109, 8c monthly files, BP.
8. Sarotte, *1989*, chap. 1; Henry Ashby Turner Jr., *Germany from Partition to Reunification* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1992), pp. 174–175; and Lawrence S. Wittner, *The Struggle against the Bomb,* Vol. 3: *Toward Nuclear Abolition: A History of the World Disarmament Movement, 1971 to the Present* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2003), particularly pp. 134–147.
9. Vojtech Mastny and Malcolm Byrne, eds., *A Cardboard Castle? An Inside History of the Warsaw Pact, 1955–1991* (New York: Central European University Press, 2005), p. 71.

difficult to visualize how a European collective security arrangement including Eastern Europe, and perhaps even the Soviet Union, would have the capability to deter threats to Western Europe." Bush asserted, "NATO is the only plausible justification in my country for the American military presence in Europe. If NATO is allowed to wither because it has no meaningful political place in the new Europe, the basis for a long-term U.S. military commitment can die with it."[10] In the words of Mitterrand's top foreign policy aide, Hubert Védrine, the transatlantic alliance's future was "the only issue" that truly concerned Bush at the end of the Cold War.[11] To ensure that NATO would maintain its dominant status during a time of dramatic upheaval, its supporters would need to act quickly and decisively.

The available evidence shows that they did. Bush and West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl understood that NATO guaranteed a leading role for the United States in European security. In the interest of maintaining that status quo, they took action to shield NATO from both potential competitors, in the form of new European security structures, and from restrictions on its future activities. Kohl's cooperation in this effort was fortunate for Bush, because a different West German leader might have considered other alternatives more seriously. But Kohl believed in NATO, and he believed that he could overcome West Germans' ambivalence toward the alliance if he could achieve German unification as part of a grand bargain.[12] Put another way, the reactions of both Washington and Bonn to the events of 1989 revealed the accuracy of a popular saying about NATO's mission—namely, to keep the Russians out, but also to keep the Americans in, and the Germans down. By 1990 the alliance had clearly succeeded; the Russians were "out," the Americans wanted to stay "in," and the Germans wanted to stay "down."

The way in which Washington and Bonn succeeded in achieving their strategic goals is the focus of this article. Given the vast literature on the end of the Cold War, it is impossible to revisit all of the major narratives and debates here.[13] Rather, this article focuses on those assumptions most in need of

10. "From White House to Elysee Palace," telegram from Bush to Mitterrand, April 17, 1990, in 5 AG 4, EG 170, Archives Nationales, France; the file includes both the English original, from which these quotations are taken, and a French translation.
11. Hubert Védrine, *Les mondes de François Mitterrand* (Paris: Fayard, 1996), p. 443; and Hubert Védrine, email correspondence with author, June 18, 2009.
12. For more on Kohl's motivation, see Sarotte, *1989*, chaps. 4–5.
13. The twentieth anniversary of the fall of the Berlin Wall in 2009 yielded a stack of new works; among the notable new English-language titles that appeared were Archie Brown, *The Rise and Fall of Communism* (New York: HarperCollins, 2009); Jeffrey A. Engel, ed., *The Fall of the Berlin Wall: The Revolutionary Legacy of 1989* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009); Stephen Kotkin with a contribution by Jan T. Gross, *Uncivil Society: 1989 and the Implosion of the Communist Establishment*

(New York: Modern Library, 2009); Michael Meyer, *The Year That Changed the World: The Untold Story behind the Fall of the Berlin Wall* (New York: Scribner, 2009); Constantine Pleshakov, *There Is No Freedom without Bread! 1989 and the Civil War That Brought Down Communism* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2009); David Priestland, *The Red Flag: A History of Communism* (New York: Grove, 2009); and Victor Sebestyen, *Revolution 1989: The Fall of the Soviet Empire* (New York: Pantheon, 2009). The appearance of these anniversary books also produced a number of useful review essays: in English, see Timothy Garton Ash, "1989!" *New York Review of Books,* November 5, 2009; John Lloyd, "And the Wall Came Tumbling Down . . ." *Financial Times,* November 6, 2009; and Philip Zelikow, "The Suicide of the East? 1989 and the Fall of Communism," *Foreign Affairs,* Vol. 88, No. 6 (November/December 2009), pp. 130–140. Many of the works published before the fall of 2009 remain essential reading nonetheless: Stephen G. Brooks and William C. Wohlforth, "Power, Globalization, and the End of the Cold War: Reevaluating a Landmark Case for Ideas," *International Security,* Vol. 25, No. 3 (Winter 2000/01), pp. 5–53; Stephen G. Brooks and William C. Wohlforth, "From Old Thinking to New Thinking in Qualitative Research," *International Security,* Vol. 26, No. 4 (Spring 2002), pp. 93–111; Archie Brown, *Seven Years That Changed the World: Perestroika in Perspective* (New York: Oxford, 2007); Daniel Deudney and G. John Ikenberry, "Soviet Reform and the End of the Cold War: Explaining Large-Scale Historical Change," *Review of International Studies,* Vol. 17, No. 3 (July 1991), pp. 225–250; Daniel Deudney and G. John Ikenberry, "The International Sources of Soviet Change," *International Security,* Vol. 16, No. 3 (Winter 1991/92), pp. 74–118; Robert D. English, *Russia and the Idea of the West: Gorbachev, Intellectuals, and the End of the Cold War* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000); Robert D. English, "Power, Ideas, and New Evidence on the Cold War's End: A Reply to Brooks and Wohlforth," *International Security,* Vol. 26, No. 4 (Spring 2002), pp. 70–92; John Lewis Gaddis, *The Cold War: A New History* (New York: Penguin, 2006); Timothy Garton Ash, *In Europe's Name: Germany and the Divided Continent* (New York: Vintage, 1993); Richard K. Herrmann and Richard Ned Lebow, eds., *Ending the Cold War: Interpretations, Causations, and the Study of International Relations* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004); Hans-Hermann Hertle, *Der Fall der Mauer: Die unbeabsichtigte Selbstauflösung des SED-Staates* (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1996); Konrad H. Jarausch, *The Rush to German Unity* (New York: Oxford, 1994); Mark Kramer, "Ideology and the Cold War," *Review of International Studies,* Vol. 25, No. 4 (October 1999), pp. 539–576; Mark Kramer, "The Myth of the No-NATO-Enlargement Pledge to Russia," *Washington Quarterly,* Vol. 32, No. 2 (Spring 2009), pp. 39–61 (note that the journal subsequently published an online correction box informing readers that the citations to the BP in "The Myth of the No-NATO-Enlargement Pledge to Russia" came from Sarotte. See http://www.twq.com/09april/index.cfm?id=336); Melvyn P. Leffler, *For the Soul of Mankind: The United States, the Soviet Union, and the Cold War* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2007); Charles S. Maier, *Dissolution: The Crisis of Communism and the End of East Germany* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1997); James Mann, *The Rebellion of Ronald Reagan: A History of the End of the Cold War* (New York: Viking, 2009); Olav Njølstad, ed., *The Last Decade of the Cold War: From Conflict Escalation to Conflict Transformation* (London: Frank Cass, 2004); Gerhard Ritter, *Der Preis der deutschen Einheit: Die Wiedervereinigung und die Krise des Sozialstaats* (Munich: Beck, 2006); Donald Oberdorfer, *The Turn: From the Cold War to a New Era* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1991); Andreas Rödder, *Deutschland Einig Vaterland* (Munich: Beck, 2009); Angela E. Stent, *Russia and Germany Reborn: Unification, the Soviet Collapse, and the New Europe* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1999); Stephen F. Szabo, *The Diplomacy of German Unification* (New York: St. Martin's, 1992); Odd Arne Westad, ed., *Reviewing the Cold War: Approaches, Interpretations, Theory* (London: Routledge, 2000); and Odd Arne Westad, *The Global Cold War: Third World Interventions and the Making of Our Times* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005). The unification of Germany, in particular, was the subject of a 3,000-page study: *Geschichte der deutschen Einheit* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1998), hereafter GDE. Last but not least, many participants in events have produced informative accounts. To cite just a few American examples, see Robert L. Hutchings, *American Diplomacy and the End of the Cold War: An Insider's Account of U.S. Policy in Europe, 1989–1992* (Washington, D.C.: Woodrow Wilson Center Press, 1997); Jack F. Matlock Jr., *Superpower Illusions: How Myths and False Ideologies Led America Astray—And How to Return to Reality* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2010); and Zelikow and Rice, *Germany Unified and Europe Transformed*.

reassessment: first, that in 1990, consideration of NATO's future beyond its 1989 border was either nonexistent or limited solely to eastern Germany; second, that U.S. policymakers negotiated all of the key bargains with the Soviet Union, most importantly at the Washington summit of May–June 1990; and, third, that, as Daniel Deudney and G. John Ikenberry have argued, "[T]he diplomatic conversation at the end of the Cold War concerned architectures that would *integrate* the Soviets (and Russians) into pan-European and pan-Atlantic institutions."[14]

The article's three main sections challenge these assumptions by showing (1) that as early as February 1990, leading Western policymakers were speculating about NATO's future, not just in eastern Germany but also in Eastern Europe; (2) that, in the endgame of the Cold War, it was not just U.S. but also West German negotiators who would play decisive roles; and (3) that their main goal was not the integration described by Deudney, Ikenberry, and others in their depictions of the United States as a liberal Leviathan. Rather, their goal was best articulated by Robert Gates, the deputy national security adviser in 1990. He summarized Bonn and Washington's strategy as follows: "to bribe the Soviets out" using the wealth of the West. Gates was thinking about divided Germany in particular, but his analysis has broader applicability to the means by which the United States perpetuated its preeminence in European security after the Cold War.[15]

Considering NATO's Future

Experts have argued that, at the end of the Cold War, consideration of NATO's future beyond its 1989 border was either nonexistent or limited solely to eastern Germany. As Ronald Asmus, a Department of State official in Bill Clinton's administration, wrote in 2002, "[N]o one in either Washington or Moscow was thinking about further NATO expansion in the spring and fall of 1990."[16] Mark Kramer stated in 2009 that "NATO's role vis-à-vis the rest of the Warsaw Pact countries . . . never came up during the negotiations on German reunification."[17] Deudney and Ikenberry maintained in 2010 that "NATO expansion

14. Daniel Deudney and G. John Ikenberry, "The Unraveling of the Cold War Settlement," *Survival*, Vol. 51, No. 6 (December 2009–January 2010), p. 50 (emphasis in the original).
15. Robert M. Gates, *From the Shadows: The Ultimate Insider's Story of Five Presidents and How They Won the Cold War* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1996), p. 492.
16. Ronald D. Asmus, *Opening NATO's Door: How the Alliance Remade Itself for a New Era* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002), p. 6.
17. Kramer, "The Myth of the No-NATO-Enlargement Pledge to Russia," p. 41. In coming to this view, Kramer and others conceive of the 2+4 talks between the two Germanies and the four occupying powers as the most important negotiating forum. This understanding of the 2+4 venue

was simply outside the realm of the thinkable at the time."[18] Gilles Andréani wrote in 2010 that "[t]he fact is that in 1990 NATO enlargement was not conceivable as an issue."[19]

Newly available sources challenge the view that no one was engaged in thinking about NATO enlargement and that the subject never came up. It is important to avoid overstating what these sources say; the new evidence does not reveal a secret 1990 plot to ensure that NATO reached the Baltics. It does, however, demonstrate that key Western political leaders had indeed begun to think—in both approving and disapproving terms—about the alliance's future role in Eastern Europe, not just eastern Germany, by February 1990.

EARLY SPECULATION IN 1990

On February 2, 1990, West German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher visited Secretary of State Baker and subsequently President Bush in Washington, to discuss among other topics the consequences of the opening of the Berlin Wall and what they might mean for NATO. Genscher and Baker announced the results at a press conference that same evening, a Friday. Genscher said they had agreed that "there was no interest to extend NATO to the east." The foreign minister had already made public comments to this effect, so he was confirming that Baker was of a similar opinion.[20]

After the intervening weekend and his return to Bonn from Washington, Genscher clarified his thinking in a conversation on February 6 with the visiting British foreign minister, Douglas Hurd. Genscher told his English guest that the West needed to state clearly that "NATO does not intend to expand its

---

overstates its importance. The 2+4 was not the decisionmaking forum on the most significant matters, such as the future of NATO. Bilateral talks between national leaders and their foreign ministers decided the crucial issues; the 2+4 sessions subsequently worked on the details. In particular, U.S. leaders from the president down worked actively to prevent efforts to expand the scope of the 2+4 to include discussion of NATO, and were successful in doing so. See "Fernschreiben, Aus: London diplo, Nr 844 vom 18.04.1990, An: Bonn AA, Betr.: Britisch-Amerikanischer Bermuda-Gipfel am 13.04.1990," and "Fernschreiben, Aus: London diplo, Nr 898 vom 27.04.1990, An: Bonn AA, Betr.: '2+4' Gespräche, Hier: Sicherheitspolitischen Fragen," both in ZA198.440E, GU; the comments of Zoellick in "Fernschreiben, Aus: Washington, Nr. 1313 vom 30.03.1990, An: Bonn AA, Betr.: USA-Reise des Koordinators fuer die deutsch-amerikanische Zusammenarbeit vom 28. bis 31.03.1990," in ZA140.729E, GU; Bush's letter to Mitterrand, "From White House to Elysee Palace"; and the communications of Baker and Bush in the service of this goal, quoted in Sarotte, *1989,* pp. 125–126, 261 n. 32.

18. Deudney and Ikenberry, "The Unraveling of the Cold War Settlement," p. 50.

19. Gilles Andréani, "Answering Medvedev," *Survival,* Vol. 52, No. 1 (February–March 2010), pp. 236–244 at p. 241.

20. Quoted in Al Kamen, "West German Meets Privately with Baker," *Washington Post,* February 3, 1990. See also "JAB notes from 2/2/90 press briefing following 2½ hr meeting w/FRG FM Genscher, WDC," folder 14, box 108, 8c monthly files, series 8, BP; Hans-Dietrich Genscher, *Erinnerungen* (Berlin: Siedler, 1995), pp. 716–719; and Zelikow and Rice, *Germany Unified and Europe Transformed,* pp. 174–177.

territory to the East. Such a statement must refer not just to East Germany but rather be of a general nature. For example, the Soviet Union needs the security of knowing that Hungary, if it has a change of government, will not become part of the Western Alliance."[21] Thus, Genscher was already thinking of NATO's potential future in Eastern Europe; not as something that he wanted to promote, but rather as something that Moscow would want ruled out. Genscher speculated that if the Warsaw Pact were to erode, it "would be easier for the Soviet Union" to use the CSCE "as a safety net."[22] Genscher's goal appears to have been to establish a realistic negotiating stance with regard to Moscow, which he would be visiting in four days with Kohl.

Hurd responded that he shared this view and thought that it should be discussed within the alliance itself, both with military and political leaders. Replying that such discussions could begin "now," Genscher mentioned that the discussions should consider "developments in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and East Germany." He also stated that "we do not want to extend NATO territory, but we do not want to leave NATO. In our opinion, both alliances [NATO and the Warsaw Pact] must become part of the common European security structure."[23] Also on February 6, journalists traveling with Baker (who by now was en route to the Soviet Union) pressed for clarification of Genscher's comments and received the following reply: "[I]t is a way of maintaining the NATO structure and not having NATO forces further East."[24] In Moscow, from February 7 to February 9, Baker reiterated to Gorbachev that the alliance would not move "one inch eastward" if he agreed to allow a unified Germany to go into NATO.[25]

Genscher discussed the question of NATO's future yet again that weekend in Moscow, after journeying there with Kohl on Saturday, February 10. Like

---

21. "Ministerbüro, Bonn, den 07.02.1990, Vermerk, Betr.: Gespräch BM mit britischem AM Hurd am 06. Februar 1990," in ZA 178.927E, GU.
22. Ibid.
23. Ibid. See also Mary E. Sarotte, "Diplomatie in der Grauzone," *Süddeutsche Zeitung,* November 7–8, 2009, http://www.sueddeutsche.de/politik/362/493707/text/; and Mary Elise Sarotte, "Enlarging NATO, Expanding Confusion," *New York Times,* November 29, 2009. In addition, Genscher's papers show that Thatcher shared his worry about the consequences of changes to established Cold War borders, both of states and alliances. As Thatcher said during a conversation on November 29, 1989, "[C]hanging the territorial status quo in Europe would mean opening Pandora's Box" and said that she was "thinking of Yugoslavia," among other places. See "London, den 30.11.1989, Auswärtiges Amt, Betr.: Besuch BM Genscher in London am 29./30.11.1989, Hier: Vermerk über das Gespräch mit PM Thatcher am 29.11.1989–17.10 bis 18.05 Uhr," ZA178.931E, GU.
24. "U.S. Department of State, Office of the Assistant Secretary/Spokesman, Background Briefing by Senior Administration Official," February 6, 1990, AV20.634E, GU.
25. See Mary Elise Sarotte, "Not One Inch Eastward? Bush, Baker, Kohl, Genscher, Gorbachev, and the Origin of Russian Resentment toward NATO Enlargement in February 1990," *Diplomatic History,* Vol. 34, No. 1 (January 2010), pp. 119–140.

Baker, Genscher and Kohl stated during separate meetings that NATO would not expand eastward. Genscher told his counterpart, Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze, that "for us, it stands firm: NATO will not expand itself to the East"; Kohl told Gorbachev that "naturally" NATO's territory could not expand.[26]

The issue of NATO and Eastern Europe moved from behind closed doors to the pages of newspapers on February 20, 1990, when prominent Hungarian politician Gyula Horn speculated about some kind of future integration of Hungary into NATO. His comments were controversial, and critics discounted them as an election ploy.[27] Nonetheless, in Washington a member of the U.S. State Department's Policy Planning staff, Harvey Sicherman, was given the job of writing a speculative report on future security structures in the Germanies and Eastern Europe. Baker and his top aides, Dennis Ross and Robert Zoellick, received copies of this report, dated March 12, 1990; Baker found the document so worthwhile that he kept it among his private collection when he left office.

In his report, Sicherman concluded that some Central and East Europeans—the peoples who had suffered the most from living between Germany and the Soviet Union—were already realizing that cooperation with NATO was "the best way out of the German-Russian security dilemma and, with the Czech exception, the Hungarians and the Poles already see it." Sicherman found that the United States could offer "these nations great opportunities" but that Washington needed to ensure that "1) taking on the burden of 'organizing' this region is really a vital interest [and] 2) we have the means to do so. My answer tentatively is that we alone do not have the means but that NATO and the EC surely do."[28]

Both Ross and Zoellick later recounted that they began speculating about a potential role for NATO in Eastern Europe in early 1990, in part prompted by this March memo. In 2009 Baker recollected doing so by the second half of 1990. Although Brent Scowcroft, the U.S. national security adviser, stated that he did not remember this speculation, one of his subordinates, Philip Zelikow, recalled the idea being mooted in a speculative way.[29]

---

26. Ibid., for Kohl comments. See Genscher comments in "Drahterlass, 11.02.1990, Dr. Kastrup, Az.: D2-110-8 111400, Betr.: Gespräch BM mit AM Schewardnadse am 10.02.1990 im Kreml (16.00 bis 18.30 Uhr)," and the immediately following "Fortsetzung," in ZA178.928E, GU.
27. Horn, quoted in Kramer, "The Myth of the No-NATO-Enlargement Pledge to Russia," p. 42; Kramer views the comment as an election ploy.
28. Memorandum from Harvey Sicherman to S/P—Dennis Ross, and C—Robert Zoellick, 12 March 1990, in folder 14, box 176, series 12, BP.
29. Interviews by the author: Baker, Houston, 2009; Ross, Washington, D.C., 2008; Scowcroft, Washington, D.C., 2008; Zelikow, via telephone, 2008; and Zoellick, Brussels, 2008.

In April 1990, as cited above, Bush had told Mitterrand that it was "difficult to visualize how a European collective security arrangement including Eastern Europe, and perhaps even the Soviet Union" could defend Western Europe, and proposed maintenance of NATO as the answer. In July 1990, Baker and Zoellick would expand on that topic by briefing Bush on the potential need to provide structure for the Soviet Union and East European states after their own institutions collapsed.[30] And in September 1990, Zoellick and his British colleagues would refuse to finalize the so-called 2+4 accord on the unification of Germany (on which Zoellick was the lead U.S. negotiator) until it was confirmed in an "agreed minute" that non-German NATO troops retained the option of moving eastward over the alliance's 1989 border. Although he did not explicitly discuss Eastern Europe, Zoellick later stated he was thinking of Poland at the time.[31]

"A QUESTION OF CASH"

The question of the future of NATO caused internal disagreements in both Washington and Bonn. In early February 1990, Baker, Kohl, and Genscher were willing to tell Gorbachev and Shevardnadze that NATO would not move eastward beyond its 1989 border.[32] Indeed, such statements helped to inspire Gorbachev to agree, on February 10, to internal German unification, in the form of economic and monetary union. (Planning for monetary union began immediately thereafter, and the union was enacted on July 1, 1990, well before political unification.)

In the lead-up to the U.S.–West German summit at Camp David on February 24–25, 1990, however, both the NSC and the West German defense ministry pushed back against this early February view, questioning how eastern Germany would be defended after unity.[33] Mitterrand, assessing from a distance how U.S.–West German thinking was developing, decided that Genscher's views were becoming increasingly out-of-step with those of Bush and Kohl. The West German chancellor chose not to bring Genscher to Camp David.[34]

---

30. "Notes from Jim Cicconi [notetaker] re: 7/3/90 pre-NATO Summit briefing at Kennebunkport."
31. See Sarotte, *1989*, particularly pp. 174–175, 192.
32. Genscher's papers suggest that he held on to this opinion longer than Kohl or Baker or Bush; see ZA140.728E and ZA178.928E, GU, most notably, "Washington, den 5. April 1990, Vermerk, Betr.: Besuch BM in Washington vom 04. bis 06.04.1990, hier: Gespräch mit dem Auswärtigen Ausschuß des Senats am 04.04.1990 um 16.00 Uhr."
33. Sarotte, "Not One Inch Eastward?"
34. "Communication aux ambassadeurs des trois puissances, 28 mars 1990," in 5 AG 4, CDM 36, dossier 2, Archives Nationales, France. On Kohl's failure to bring Genscher to Camp David, see Sarotte, *1989*, pp. 126–127.

Gorbachev and Kohl had essentially already reached a gentleman's agreement on February 10: Kohl told Gorbachev that NATO would not expand eastward, and the Soviet leader agreed to internal German economic and monetary union, a process that had already begun. If the Western leaders wanted more flexibility regarding NATO's future, they would have to find a way to placate Gorbachev. Kohl believed that the Soviets would want compensation: "It will come down in the end to a question of cash," he told Bush at Camp David. The president replied that West Germany had "deep pockets."[35]

Given the deteriorating economic conditions in the Soviet Union, its leadership would likely be susceptible to such inducement. In the spring of 1990, Matlock found that Gorbachev was starting to look "less like a man in control and more [like] an embattled leader." The "signs of crisis," he wrote, "are legion: Sharply rising crime rates, proliferating anti-regime demonstrations, burgeoning separatist movements, deteriorating economic performance . . . and a slow, uncertain transfer of power from party to state and from the center to the periphery."[36] In addition, a crisis caused by a Lithuanian push for independence from the Soviet Union would soon begin troubling Gorbachev as well.

Thus, Moscow could not address its domestic problems without the help of foreign aid and credit. In light of the softening U.S. economy, however, Bush neither wanted to be generous nor felt that he could justify giving aid to a country that was still ostensibly the United States' greatest enemy. Therefore, Gorbachev would have to turn to West Germany for help. The question was whether Bonn could provide such assistance in a manner that allowed Gorbachev to save face as he accepted a unified Germany in NATO.[37] To paraphrase Gates, Bonn and Washington decided to work closely together and to offer Gorbachev various monetary and political "bribes," paid by Bonn.

In short, the available evidence shows that speculation by Western leaders

35. "Gespräch des Bundeskanzlers Kohl mit Präsident Bush, Camp David, 24. Feb. 1990," Dok. 192, DESE, pp. 868–869. See also George H.W. Bush and Brent Scowcroft, *A World Transformed* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1998), p. 253; GDE, Vol. 4, p. 269; and Zelikow and Rice, *Germany Unified and Europe Transformed*, p. 215. In retrospect, Bush's comment was ironic, given that Kohl's political career would end under a cloud of suspicion about a domestic political corruption scandal. See Heribert Schwan and Rolf Steiniger, *Helmut Kohl: Virtuose der Macht* (Mannheim: Artemis und Winkler, 2010), chaps. 34–36.

36. "Moscow Embassy Cable," May 11, 1990, released by the State Department via FOIA and reproduced in the Mershon Conference briefing book.

37. As one U.S. analyst insultingly put it, aid could not look like "an Ethiopian relief program." Quoted anonymously in Stent, *Russia and Germany Reborn*, p. 126. French analysts independently came to the same conclusion, using the same phrase ("sauver la face"). See "Jacques Attali avec Horst Teltschik, 15 mars 1990," in 5 AG 4, CDM 33, Archives Nationales, France. Teltschik told Attali at this meeting that Bush had spoken bluntly to Kohl about NATO's prerogatives in Europe and his unwillingness to accept restrictions: the American had told the West German, "no nukes, no troops."

about the future of NATO, including in Eastern Europe, had emerged by February 1990. Such speculation was controversial, both in public and behind closed doors, and the August 1990 invasion of Kuwait by Saddam Hussein pushed it well down the Bush administration's priority list in any event. At the same time, the evidence shows that it was part of the strategizing of 1990, and that convincing Gorbachev to accept NATO's movement beyond its 1989 borders was a high priority.

Bonn and Washington's Coordinated Strategy

English-language scholarly histories of the Cold War often emphasize the superpowers and their interaction.[38] Yet the evidence suggests that, in the endgame, the West Germans played a decisive role. Together with the Americans, they devised and offered Gorbachev a number of deals in the late spring and summer of 1990. The five key moments in this process were the following: (1) in the spring of 1990, Bonn ensured that German commercial banks would make large loans to Moscow; (2) around the same time, Bonn and Washington worked together to make changes to increase NATO's acceptability to Moscow, even as Gorbachev suggested that perhaps the Soviet Union should join it; (3) in May–June 1990, Washington enlisted the so-called Helsinki principle at a summit, but it did not settle matters definitively; (4) in June, Bonn offered to cover the costs of Soviet troops in East Germany; and (5) in July, NATO publicized its changes at a key moment. Given the desperate condition of the Soviet Union, it is fair to ask what leverage Moscow could exert in reply to these offers. In fact, Moscow maintained not only legal rights emanating from Germany's unconditional surrender at the end of World War II but also sizable occupation forces—about 380,000 troops—in East Germany. Hence, little could happen without Soviet agreement.

LOANING MONEY TO MOSCOW IN MAY 1990

Kohl felt certain that the Soviets were more worried about securing financial help for reform at home and lucrative future economic relations with West Germany than any other foreign policy issue.[39] Therefore, if Kohl could reassure both Gorbachev and enough of the Soviet leader's advisers and foes that West Germany would be a reliable source of financial support, then the chancellor would empower Gorbachev. The Soviet leader could then give permis-

38. See, for example, Gaddis, *The Cold War;* and Leffler, *For the Soul of Mankind.*
39. Kohl explained as much to Hurd. See "Gespräch des Bundeskanzlers Kohl mit Außenminister Hurd, Bonn, 15. Mai 1990," Dok. 278, DESE, pp. 1119–1120.

sion for a united Germany to enter NATO without cumbersome restrictions. Not coincidentally, this belief also put Kohl in the driver's seat, because the Bush administration and European leaders other than the West German chancellor repeatedly refused to give Gorbachev significant financial or economic aid. Hurd summed up West European thinking at the time: "[O]ne doesn't help his friends by throwing a great deal of money down a hole."[40] Such views only increased Bonn's significance.

Kohl's intuition about Soviet priorities was correct. In May 1990, Gorbachev's chief foreign policy aide, Anatoly Chernyaev, confidentially advised his boss that it was probably no longer possible to prevent NATO from moving eastward as part of German unification. Chernyaev thought that, to a certain extent, it did not even matter. The balance of forces that mattered was in the nuclear realm, and that would not change even if eastern Germany joined NATO, because neither it nor West Germany had any nuclear weapons of their own.[41] The real problem—which Shevardnadze would emphasize in the 2+4 talks between the two Germanies and their four occupying powers (i.e., Britain, France, the United States, and the Soviet Union)—was not the balance of power but the balance of opinion. Reaching the point where Gorbachev and his closest advisers felt comfortable that they could make a decision to allow NATO to move eastward beyond its 1989 border and still survive in office was the main issue.

In the spring and summer of 1990, the Soviets and the West Germans began bilateral talks. Moscow sought 20–25 billion West German Deutschmarks (DM) in credit.[42] Shevardnadze informed Kohl's foreign policy adviser, Horst Teltschik, that the Soviet Union had lost the ability to secure loans on the international credit market, a problem Teltschik confirmed with Hilmar Kopper of Deutsche Bank and Wolfgang Röller of Dresdner Bank.[43] Kohl was convinced, however, that giving loans to Moscow would help to support Gorbachev. Kohl succeeded in convincing Kopper and Röller of this belief, and as a result, the two banks informed Moscow it could, with the backing of the West German government, borrow up to DM 5 billion from them.[44] Gorbachev reacted "eu-

40. Hurd, quoted in Szabo, *The Diplomacy of German Unification*, p. 93.
41. "Из докладной записки А.С. Черняева М.С. Горбачеву" [From the report by Chernyaev to Gorbachev], May 4, 1990, МГ, pp. 424–425.
42. GDE, vol. 2, pp. 418–420; Szabo, *The Diplomacy of German Unification*, p. 93; and Zelikow and Rice, *Germany Unified and Europe Transformed*, pp. 258–259.
43. DESE, p. 165.
44. "Schreiben des Bundeskanzlers Kohl an Präsident Gorbatschow, Bonn, 22. Mai 1990," Dok. 284, DESE, pp. 1136–1137.

phorically" upon hearing this news.[45] The Soviet leader would later call this credit a "chess move" made at the right moment.[46]

There was a domestic political subtext to these events. Kohl had decided that the next West German election (which, under the country's electoral law, had to take place before January 13, 1991) should be held in early December 1990.[47] The chancellor hoped that this election could be the first all-German one since the 1930s, because he had strong support in the East and he wanted that region to unify with the West and become part of the electorate in time for the voting. To accomplish this goal, unification would need to occur in a short period of time (i.e., sufficiently in advance of December 1990). It seems that, to diminish Soviet anger at the rapid pace of events that he was contemplating, Kohl used his leverage with his friends in the banking sector to secure loans for Gorbachev.

STARTING TO REFORM NATO

If money was one "bribe," reform of NATO was another. The goal was to make NATO seem less threatening outwardly but to maintain its essential characteristics. The evidence shows that Bonn and Washington made key decisions about reform bilaterally, then vetted them with a few other national leaders, and finally channeled them through the alliance's bureaucracy for rubber-stamping.

Bush suggested organizing a NATO summit in the summer of 1990, to publicize the results of their efforts.[48] Kohl thought that such a summit should not take place until after Gorbachev survived the upcoming Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) of July 2–14, 1990, which promised to be contentious.[49] The Bush administration disagreed, believing that revamping NATO's public image would help Gorbachev to defend himself at the Congress. Washington won; the NATO summit was scheduled for July 5–6, during the CPSU Congress. In addition, Bush invited Gorbachev to Washington, D.C., for a summit in the lead-up to the Congress, at the end of

45. Horst Teltschik, *329 Tage: Innenansichten der Einigung* (Berlin: Siedler, 1991), p. 249. See also "Schreiben des Bundeskanzlers Kohl an Präsident Gorbatschow, Bonn, 12. Juni 1990," Dok. 309, DESE, p. 1207; "Schreiben des Präsidenten Gorbatschow an Bundeskanzler Kohl, 14. Juni 1990," Dok. 315, DESE, pp. 1224–1225; and DESE, p. 170.
46. Quoted in Garton Ash, *In Europe's Name,* p. 352.
47. For more on the subject of the all-German election of 1990, see Sarotte, *1989,* pp. 160, 200–201.
48. "Vorlage des Ministerialdirektors Teltschik an Bundeskanzler Kohl, Bonn, 3. Mai 1990," Dok. 265, DESE, pp. 1076–1078. See also "Telegram, from USMission USNATO, to Secstate Washdc, 17 April 1990," released by the State Department via FOIA.
49. "Gespräch des Bundeskanzlers Kohl mit Außenminister Baker, Bonn, 4. Mai 1990," Dok. 266, DESE, pp. 1079–1084.

May and start of June 1990. As Robert Hutchings, a member of the NSC at the time, remembers, "Gorbachev needed a successful summit, and we meant to give him one."[50]

In preparation for both summits, Kohl, accompanied by a large delegation, visited Washington in the middle of May 1990. Hutchings recalled a real sense of camaraderie between the Americans and the West Germans.[51] Kohl was becoming a particularly welcome and frequent visitor to the United States; at one point in the spring of 1990, he appeared twice in three weeks. Nevertheless, he and Bush still had their differences, mostly over how much economic assistance the United States would provide to the Soviet Union. The White House remained unwilling to give Moscow loans, or even most-favored-nation trading status, while the Baltic crisis remained ongoing. Bush was coming under criticism domestically for doing too little for Lithuania; George Will, for example, remarked that Bush's timid response proved that "Bushism is Reaganism minus the passion for freedom."[52]

Bush and Kohl did agree on a major issue: that the trickiest problem would be the removal of Soviet troops from East Germany without parallel requests for the removal of NATO troops from West Germany. They concluded that the Helsinki Final Act of 1975, which stated that signatories had the right to choose their own alliances and should respect the rights of others to do so, would be useful in this context. The Soviet Union was a signatory to this act. Therefore, if a united Germany chose to be in NATO, then Western troops would remain there. Reminding Gorbachev of the Helsinki principle would thus be very useful.[53]

Meanwhile, as the Americans and the West Germans made plans together in Washington in May, Baker and his team were back in Moscow. There, the secretary of state found a Soviet leader trying to fend off opponents on both his right and his left. The unhappy Gorbachev pushed Baker to compromise on the subject of the transatlantic alliance. The Soviet leader repeatedly questioned the need for a united Germany to be in NATO. He accused Washington of playing games and not taking his concerns or ideas about pan-European se-

50. Hutchings, *American Diplomacy and the End of the Cold War,* pp. 132–133.
51. Hutchings, interview by author, Princeton, N.J., 2008; Teltschik, telephone interview by author, 2008; and Hutchings, *American Diplomacy and the End of the Cold War,* pp. 130–133.
52. Quoted in Timothy Naftali, *George H.W. Bush* (New York: Times Books, 2007), p. 92. See also Zelikow and Rice, *Germany Unified and Europe Transformed,* pp. 259, 272; and the press clippings criticizing the Bush administration for not supporting Lithuania more strongly in folder 14, box 176, 12b chapter files, series 12, BP.
53. "Delegationsgespräch des Bundeskanzlers Kohl mit Präsident Bush, Washington, 17. Mai 1990," Dok. 281, DESE, pp. 1126–1132. See also "Schreiben des Bundeskanzlers Kohl an Staatspräsident Mitterrand, Bonn, 23. Mai 1990," Dok. 286, DESE, pp. 1143–1145.

curity seriously. Baker reassured Gorbachev that there was no such game playing.[54] He called Gorbachev's idea of a pan-European security institution "an excellent dream, but only a dream"; NATO was a reality, and a Germany solidly implanted in it would be in the interest of the Soviet Union.[55]

Gorbachev was unconvinced. Showing that he, too, could speculate about a future for NATO beyond eastern Germany, the Soviet leader raised the issue of whether the Soviet Union should join the transatlantic alliance as well. "I will propose to the President [Bush], and will say publicly, that we want to enter NATO," Gorbachev stated. He emphasized that the idea was not a hypothetical question, "not some absurdity," but rather a serious consideration. In reply, Baker avoided Gorbachev's suggestion by bringing up the Helsinki principle. Under it, Baker emphasized, the Germans would be allowed to choose their own alliance. Determined to press the matter, Gorbachev repeated that "our membership in NATO is not such a wild fantasy"; the United States and the Soviet Union had once been allies, so why not again?[56] Baker remained unmoved.[57]

THE WASHINGTON SUMMIT, MAY–JUNE 1990

Aware of Gorbachev's mind-set, the Bush administration had limited expectations for the Washington summit. It would try to hearten the Soviet leader by agreeing that a united Germany would renounce "ABC" (atomic, biological, and chemical) weapons, and that Soviet troops could remain there for a transition period. But no massive financial aid, Gorbachev's main goal, would follow. The internal briefing papers for the summit concluded that, as a result, expectations should be kept low.[58] Bush himself told Kohl that he did not ex-

---

54. "Gorby Kremlin 5/18/90," Handwritten notes, folder 1, box 109, 8c monthly files, series 8, BP; and "Из беседы М.С. Горбачева с Дж. Бейкером" [From the conversation between Gorbachev and Baker], May 18, 1990, МГ, pp. 437–445.
55. To make NATO more palatable, Baker told Gorbachev that the United States was willing to offer "nine assurances," including a future limitation on the size of the Bundeswehr; a prohibition against nuclear weapons in a future Germany; talks on tactical nuclear armaments; a transitional period for the withdrawal of Soviet troops; changes to NATO itself; and, finally, guarantees that the economic interests of the Soviet Union would be respected during the unification process. See "Из беседы М.С. Горбачева с Дж. Бейкером" [From the conversation between Gorbachev and Baker], May 18, 1990, pp. 437–445. Gorbachev sought more than just assurances, however—what he really wanted was financial support from the United States and cooperation on new security structures, but Washington would not agree to either request.
56. "Gorby Kremlin 5/18/90"; and "Из беседы М.С. Горбачева с Дж. Бейкером" [From the conversation between Gorbachev and Baker].
57. Ibid.
58. In particular, the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) preparatory paper concluded that the president should "not anticipate major movement on Germany at the summit." See "Theme Paper: German Unification," May 23, 1990, released by the State Department via FOIA; "Primary Objectives for the Summit," by the Director of Central Intelligence, National Intelligence Council, NIC

pect much. Rather, Bush's goal was simple: for Gorbachev to "come out feeling he has had a good summit, even though there are no major breakthroughs."[59]

Bush's assessment was accurate. The Washington summit failed to produce an agreement on what would happen to Germany and NATO. It could, however, boast a significant U.S. accomplishment: Gorbachev, in response to a direct question from Bush, allowed that nations could choose which military alliances they would join, thus confirming his respect for the Helsinki principle.[60] The subsequent claim that this meeting was "the most important U.S.-Soviet summit ever held," however, is not supported by the evidence now available. Although accords were signed on chemical weapons, nuclear testing, and trade, there "was nothing to announce on Germany."[61] Matlock reported that the summit had hardly even registered in Moscow. It could "not compete with concerns over food supplies and the election of [Boris] Yeltsin to the . . . presidency" of the new Russian republic. Most people had written it off as part of a "Gorbachev political campaign to gain support at home."[62]

PAYING THE OCCUPIERS IN JUNE 1990

In the meantime, Kohl's team continued work devising a new "bribe," namely, agreement by the West Germans to cover many of the costs of the Soviet troops in East Germany. Soviet forces stationed there had come as victorious occupiers, but at the end of the Cold War they were demoralized, housed in deteriorating barracks, and badly fed. A particularly worrisome development was that they were selling army property and weaponry for personal gain. East Germans living near Soviet bases complained that the troops seemed desperate, hungry, and potentially dangerous. Already in December 1989, Shevardnadze had confided to Genscher that "the situation in East Germany is running the risk of becoming unstable." Despite being Soviet for-

---

00562/90, May 24, 1990, released by the CIA via FOIA; and "The President's Meetings with Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev, May 30–June 3, 1990, Washington D.C., book 1, scope paper, Secretary Baker's Memorandum to the President," in the Mershon Conference briefing book.

59. Memcon, "Telephone Call from Chancellor Helmut Kohl of West Germany," May 30, 1990, the White House, released via FOIA 1999-0393-F, BPL; and "Telefongespräch des Bundeskanzlers Kohl mit Präsident Bush, Washington, 30. Mai 1990, 13:30–13:45," Dok. 293, DESE, pp. 1161–1162.

60. "Из второй беседы М.С. Горбачева с Дж. Бушем" [From the second conversation between Gorbachev and Bush], May 31, 1990, МГ, pp. 466–476; Baker's notes from the summit, in folder 1, box 109, 8c monthly files, series 8; Scowcroft, interview by author, Washington, D.C., 2008; and Gates, *From the Shadows,* p. 493. See also Michael R. Beschloss and Strobe Talbott, *At the Highest Levels: The Inside Story of the Cold War* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1993), pp. 219–221; and Zelikow and Rice, *Germany Unified and Europe Transformed,* p. 278.

61. The "most important" interpretation is in Hutchings, *American Diplomacy and the End of the Cold War,* pp. 132–133; "nothing to announce" is from Zelikow and Rice, *Germany Unified and Europe Transformed,* pp. 280–281.

62. "Telegram, From Ambembassy Moscow, to Secstate Washdc, June 12, 1990," released by the State Department via FOIA.

eign minister, Shevardnadze "did not know what orders Soviet soldiers there [i.e., East Germany] might receive." Given that "the soldiers had their wives and children with them, even a minor incident could become an explosion." Genscher asked if there was evidence of "aggressive behavior on the part of Germans in East Germany toward members and dependents of the Soviet Army" that might trigger such an explosion, and Shevardnadze replied that there was.[63]

This had been the situation in December 1989; in the spring of 1990, the specter of the July 1 beginning of German economic and monetary union threatened to exacerbate the situation further. If Soviet soldiers became penniless with the introduction of a hard currency, the consequences could include violence. There were even rumors that Soviet troops withdrawing from Czechoslovakia and Hungary might decide to head to East Germany rather than to the Soviet Union (because they faced such terrible conditions back home) and create further problems.[64] In light of all of these issues, Moscow sought help from Bonn, and Bonn agreed to provide it.

On June 25, 1990, West Germany committed to pay DM 1.25 billion in "stationing costs" for Soviet troops in the second half of 1990. The irony of this decision was heavy. West Germany would pay to continue to be occupied by the Soviet Union after the collapse of the Berlin Wall. In addition, Soviet soldiers and their dependents would be allowed to exchange their so-called field bank savings (which were becoming worthless) into Deutschmarks at a very favorable rate. Similarly favorable terms would apply to future trade between unified Germany and the Soviet Union. It was also agreed that property confiscated during the initial wartime occupation of Germany—that is, before the 1949 foundings of West and then East Germany—would not be subject to legal action in a united Germany. This pronouncement would largely shield the Soviet Union from legal challenges dating back to the war.[65]

PUBLICIZING NATO REFORM IN JULY 1990

West German bankers and government leaders had thus committed a substantial amount of funding to Moscow. The matching "bribe"—a NATO relaunch—was still being assembled. On June 8, 1990, Bush and Kohl discussed this relaunch, as well as other issues, when Kohl returned to

63. "Bonn, den 06. Dezember 1989, Vermerk, Betr.: Gespräch BM mit GS Gorbatschow am 05.12.1989 in Moskau (16.00 bis 17.30 Uhr)," and "Gedächtnisaufzeichnung über das Gespräch zwischen Bundesminister Genscher (BM) und dem sowjetischen Aussenminister Schewardnadse (SAM) auf der Fahrt zum Flughafen am 5.12.1989," both in ZA178.931E, GU.
64. "Fernschreiben des Staatssekretärs Bertele an den Chef des Bundeskanzleramtes, Berlin (Ost), 25. Mai 1990," Dok. 287, DESE, pp. 1146–1147.
65. GDE, Vol. 2, pp. 420–422. For more on the issue of legal claims, see A. James McAdams, *Judging the Past in Unified Germany* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

Washington. In a session only they attended, Bush, Baker, Scowcroft, and Kohl began planning the July NATO summit in detail. Although NATO was de jure an institution and alliance of many nations, de facto it was the close confidantes of U.S. and West German leaders—that is, Scowcroft, Teltschik, and their subordinates—who decided on the July 1990 press release. They did so through an exchange of draft communiqués in late June. Bush specified that only NATO Secretary-General Manfred Wörner, along with the British, French, and Italian leaders Margaret Thatcher, Mitterrand, and Giulio Andreotti, might be consulted.[66] The idea was to produce a press release that would help Gorbachev to prevail over his opponents at the CPSU Congress in the short term and convince the Soviet leader to accept a united Germany without significant restrictions on NATO in the longer term.[67]

Scowcroft and his subordinates wrote an initial draft press release, to which Teltschik and his team responded with a number of criticisms. The White House wanted to link changes to the complete withdrawal of Soviet troops, some indefinite number of years off, which the West Germans did not like. Nor did the U.S. draft contain language to placate the CSCE, which was essentially losing out on any chance of becoming the leading European security institutions. It also did not offer to limit the size of German conventional forces. The draft talked only about potential outreach to individual members of the Warsaw Pact in the future, not directly with the pact as a whole, as Gorbachev wanted.[68] Scowcroft agreed with some of these criticisms but insisted that NATO and the Warsaw Pact were no longer equals, so talking to individual members made more sense than talking to the pact as a whole. Zelikow later suggested that dealing with individual countries was a way of opening NATO's door to East European states and creating opportunities for the future.[69]

Teltschik understood the U.S. objection to dealing with the dying Warsaw Pact, but he still wanted some kind of joint declaration, because Moscow had

66. "Fernschreiben des Präsidenten Bush an Bundeskanzler Kohl, 21. Juni 1990," Dok. 321, pp. 1234–1237, and "Entwurf," Dok. 312A, pp. 1237–1241, both in DESE. See also Raymond L. Garthoff, *The Great Transition: American-Soviet Relations and the End of the Cold War* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 1994), p. 433.

67. In a conversation with Mitterrand, Kohl expressed his view that Germany in NATO was primarily a domestic political problem for Gorbachev. See "Gespräche des Bundeskanzlers Kohl mit Staatspräsident Mitterrand, Assmannshausen und auf dem Rhein, 22. Juni 1990," Dok. 324, DESE, pp. 1247–1249.

68. DESE contains a number of documents related to this topic. See, in particular, "Vorlage des Oberstleutnants i.G. Ludwigs und des vortragenden Legationsrats Westdickenberg an Ministerialdirektor Teltschik, Bonn, 25. Juni 1990," Dok. 326, pp. 1256–1261; and "Schreiben des Ministerialdirektors Teltschik an Sicherheitsberater Scowcroft, Bonn, 28. Juni 1990," Dok. 330, p. 1276, and its attachment, "Entwurf NATO Gipfelerklärung," Dok. 330A, pp. 1276–1280, all in DESE.

69. Zelikow, telephone interview by author, 2008.

hinted that this was strongly desired. The Bush administration also rejected a possible early withdrawal of nuclear artillery, arguing that it should happen only after all Soviet troops in central Europe had gone home.[70] Finally, Scowcroft thought that it was too soon for Germany to make concessions on its overall troop numbers; that discussion should be saved for later, in the Conventional Forces in Europe (CFE) talks.[71]

On July 3, 1990, just after the CPSU Congress opened, Bush assembled senior members of the NSC and the State Department (along with a few selected others) for a final briefing before the NATO summit. Baker explained how the White House had prevented the draft press release from going through NATO channels. It was at this meeting that Baker and Zoellick briefed the president on the need to edge out the CSCE in Eastern Europe. As mentioned above, Baker felt that the CSCE, or to be more precise, French visions of building a new security structure based on it, represented a risk to NATO's dominance. He told the assembled group that "this is why we need to lead re[garding] what [the] role of CSCE should be." Bush asked, "[D]o the French really want to see us out of there?" Baker replied that the French did not exactly want the Americans to disappear. Rather, they would just prefer if they could become "mercenaries," available for hire only when needed. Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney commented that it had become time for a "rethink" of what NATO's future "out-of-area" operations might be. The meeting's participants also discussed the need to provide some kind of security, and perhaps even structure, for the Soviet Union and its former allies once their international institutions, such as the Warsaw Pact, collapsed around them.[72]

At the NATO summit in London afterward, the United States and West Germany succeeded in getting their press release through the alliance bureaucracy with hardly any changes. The West Germans got their joint declaration with the Warsaw Pact, but invitations to visit and establish permanent diplomatic missions were extended to individual pact member states, not the organization as a whole. The document also called for the CFE talks to go into "continuous session." A long section paying lip service to the importance of the CSCE appeared as well.[73] These and other provisions originated either

70. "Gesprächsunterlagen des Bundeskanzlers Kohl für das Gipfeltreffen der Staats- und Regierungschefs der Mitgliedstaaten der NATO, London, 5./6. Juli 1990," Doks. 344, 344A-I, DESE, pp. 1309–1323.
71. "Schreiben des Sicherheitsberaters Scowcroft an Ministerialdirektor Teltschik, 30. Juni 1990," Dok. 355, DESE, pp. 1285–1286.
72. "Notes from Jim Cicconi [notetaker] re: 7/3/90 pre-NATO Summit briefing at Kennebunkport." Because the notes are handwritten, some words are abbreviated or omitted, as indicated above.
73. A copy of the final communiqué is available in various languages and locations; the one cited here is in folder 3, box 109, 8c monthly files, series 8, BP.

in the first U.S. draft or in subsequent West German edited versions; clearly, where the United States and West Germany led, NATO followed.

Meanwhile, in Russia there was considerably less agreement at the CPSU Congress. Gorbachev came in for bitter, vulgar, and unrelenting attacks from opponents who wanted to oust him. Once the NATO summit was under way, however, the news from London helped the Soviet leader. Shevardnadze would later thank Baker for getting the press release approved during the CPSU Congress, saying it had contributed to Gorbachev's survival as leader. Always a glass-half-full optimist, Gorbachev emerged from the Congress feeling confident, despite the vicious attacks that he had endured and his loss of favor even among former liberal-intellectual supporters.[74] Although he did not know it at the time, the results of the Congress did not ensure his future for long, as his power would continue to erode, hitting bottom with the coup in 1991.

Sealing the Deal

Washington and Bonn had come a long way, but they still had not attained their most pressing goal: getting the Soviets out and moving NATO in, or, put more formally, securing Gorbachev's promise that the Soviets would remove themselves from a united Germany, and that the unified country would then become part of NATO. Kohl sought an invitation to go to Russia so that he could make the final sale in person; Gorbachev invited him for July 15, 1990, immediately after the CPSU Congress ended. A British assessment of Kohl's chances written on July 12 was pessimistic. London "did not expect a breakthrough in Soviet policy on German membership of NATO."[75] Contrary to expectations, however, Kohl succeeded in sealing the deal. He did so in two key sessions: first, a formal meeting in Moscow; and second, a visit to Gorbachev's favorite vacation spot, the village of Archys in the Caucasus mountains.

MEETING IN MOSCOW

Just before leaving for Moscow, Kohl received word that Gorbachev had already spent the May bank loans and would need more funding; that would be

74. "Vorlage Ministerialdirektors Teltschik an Bundeskanzler Kohl, Bonn, 4. Juli 1990, Betr.: Innere Lage in der Sowjetunion nach Beginn des 28. KPdSU-Parteitages," Dok. 340, DESE, pp. 1297–1299. See also Ritter, *Der Preis der deutschen Einheit*, p. 46; and Stent, *Russia and Germany Reborn*, pp. 123–134.

75. Sir C. Mallaby (Bonn) to Mr Hurd, July 12, 1990, 7.21 P.M., Kohl's Visit to Moscow, Document 215 in FCO-DBPO. For a British summary of what was decided in Russia, see Document 218, FCO-DBPO.

to Kohl's advantage.[76] On July 15, the chancellor and his aide Teltschik spent two hours alone with Gorbachev and Chernyaev before the rest of their delegations joined them. Kohl called for a plan for Soviet troop withdrawal and an agreement that a united Germany could enter NATO. In return, he would be willing to talk about future limits on the size of the armed forces of a unified Germany and about economic relations between West Germany and the Soviet Union.

Gorbachev responded that Soviet military leaders were already howling that he was selling the Soviet victory in World War II for Deutschmarks. Still, he was willing to deal in specifics. He asked that a united Germany never acquire or develop ABC weapons. Kohl replied that he was already on the record as agreeing with this request. Then Gorbachev slipped in what sounded like the long hoped-for concession in a way that downplayed it. Without explicitly saying that Germany could join NATO, he simply proceeded to the details. He announced that "NATO's structures" could not extend to what was then East Germany, and that Soviet troops would remain there for a transitional period.

Kohl tried to clarify whether Gorbachev meant that full NATO jurisdiction could spread to eastern German regions after Soviet troops left. Gorbachev answered indirectly, saying, "[T]he united Germany will be a member of NATO." But even though Germany might belong to NATO de jure, "de facto it must look like the territory of the GDR [i.e., East Germany] does not come under NATO jurisdiction as long as Soviet troops are there." The two leaders agreed that the Soviet forces could stay three to four years.[77] When Gorbachev's and Kohl's delegations joined them shortly thereafter, Kohl gave his interpretation of what had just happened. He told the assembled group that "at the end of the year, according to everything that we know now, and plan to do, Germany will reunify."[78]

AGREEMENT IN ARCHYS

After a press conference, the West German and Soviet delegations flew for a brief visit to Gorbachev's former hometown of Stavropol. Nazi Germany had occupied the city, and, as a gesture of reconciliation, Kohl went with Gorbachev (who had experienced the occupation there as a child) to a war me-

76. Helmut Kohl, *Erinnerungen 1990–1994* (Munich: Droemer, 2007), p. 164; and Teltschik, *329 Tage*, pp. 318–319.
77. The description above of the July 15 talk comes both from the German and the Russian transcripts. See "Gespräch des Bundeskanzlers Kohl mit Präsident Gorbatschow, 15. Juli 1990," Dok. 350, DESE, pp. 1340–1348; and "Из беседы Горбачева с Г. Колем один на один" [From the conversation between Gorbachev and Kohl one-on-one], July 15, 1990, МГ, pp. 495–503.
78. "Delegationsgespräch des Bundeskanzlers Kohl mit Präsident Gorbatschow, Moskau, 15. Juli 1990," Dok. 352, DESE, p. 1354.

morial to lay a wreath. The senior members of both delegations then left for Archys and more talks the next day, July 16.

The biggest unsolved question concerned the Soviet troops. How much, and what kind of, additional credits and payments would the Soviet Union receive for its withdrawal from East Germany? Could NATO go in fully following the Soviet departure? To the frustration of the West Germans, when they thought they had an agreement, suddenly a new statement would seem to contradict it. Kohl was certain that he and Gorbachev had agreed on a three-to-four year withdrawal period the day before, but in Archys the Soviet leader began speculating about five to seven years. Kohl pushed back, saying that they had already agreed on three to four years, and Gorbachev relented.[79]

The Soviets suggested that they needed funding to cover many areas of the troops' withdrawal, resettlement, and retraining back home, as well as the loss of defense ministry property. Kohl believed that his subordinates could negotiate the final amount; he wanted to focus on figuring out the status of East German territory after the Soviet troops' withdrawal and, by extension, what NATO could do there. At first, Gorbachev declared flatly that "NATO's military structures" could not extend eastward, without saying specifically what that included. Genscher noted that a united Germany would have the right to select its own alliance and that it would choose to join NATO. Gorbachev agreed, but gradually it became apparent that he did not want this agreement explicitly codified, preferring as little as possible about the future of NATO in writing. It seems likely that he wanted to make sure that his domestic enemies did not have written evidence of his concessions, or perhaps he wanted to keep open some possibility for changes later. Whatever the reason, Gorbachev's hesitancy would have far-reaching consequences, as his successors would search in vain for any written guarantees emerging from these negotiations.

After questioning by Genscher, Gorbachev modified his position to say that NATO's structures could not extend into East Germany as long as Soviet troops were stationed there. Shevardnadze, however, interjected that, even after the Soviet troop withdrawal, no NATO structures and especially no nuclear weapons should be present in the former East German territory.

The final breakthrough came when Gorbachev suggested a compromise: both sides could live with a bilateral agreement that left the limits of NATO's

79. Both the West Germans and the Russians produced long transcripts from this meeting, but they are not always identical. I have only cited material here that appeared in both transcripts: "Gespräch des Bundeskanzlers Kohl mit Präsident Gorbatschow im erweiterten Kreis, Archys/Bezirk Stawropol, 16. Juli 1990," Dok. 353, DESE, pp. 1355–1367; and "Из беседы М.С. Горбачева с Г. Колем" [From the conversation between Gorbachev and Kohl], July 16, 1990, МГ, pp. 507–524. Additional useful sources on the significance of these meetings are cited below.

future role vague but guaranteed that no steps would be taken to "diminish the security of the Soviet Union." He added that NATO's nuclear weapons must be banned from eastern Germany and that only German NATO troops could go in after the Soviet withdrawal.[80] Kohl and Genscher concurred and indicated that they would agree to a future ceiling of 370,000 troops in the Bundeswehr; this figure would eventually be codified in an annex to the CFE treaty.[81]

According to the available documents, neither Kohl nor Genscher explicitly discussed the issue of NATO and Eastern Europe with Gorbachev. Genscher had believed that restrictions on NATO movement farther eastward would be a condition of Soviet agreement to German unity, but he was mistaken. The absence of this issue from the record could suggest ignorance of the issues involved, but it likely shows the negotiating savvy of the West Germans. If Gorbachev was not going to make an issue of NATO's future beyond eastern Germany, either through lack of concern or by focusing on other, more immediate priorities, then it was not the role of the West Germans to point out that there might be future Soviet concerns there; that task belonged to Gorbachev.

Instead, Kohl had conceded to limits on NATO's future in just two respects: there would be neither nuclear weapons nor foreign (i.e., non-German) troops stationed on former East German territory. Otherwise, there were no restrictions.[82] Kohl held a press conference as soon as possible, and television stations rushed to broadcast the story.[83] Halfway across the globe, the Bush administration was thrilled. The press conference was the first that any Americans had heard of Kohl's success; the White House would have to wait for details until Kohl was back in Bonn with secure communications.

Gorbachev's subordinates and opponents watching at home in the Soviet Union were horrified. The leading Soviet Germanist, Valentin Falin, spoke for many when he complained that he and indeed all institutions of the Soviet Union and Warsaw Pact had been kept in the dark. Gorbachev had been in a mood to wave his magic wand once again in Archys, Falin concluded, and wondered aloud whether the Soviet leader had agreed with Kohl because he was a masochist.[84] Falin was not opposed to allowing unification on terms the Germans wanted, but felt strongly that "we should 'sell' it at a higher price."[85]

---

80. Ibid., and Kohl, *Erinnerungen 1990–1994,* pp. 175–176.
81. Richard A. Falkenrath, *Shaping Europe's Military Order: The Origins and Consequences of the CFE Treaty* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1995), pp. 74–75, 172.
82. Kohl, *Erinnerungen 1990–1994,* pp. 180–183.
83. See, for example, the television coverage of "Im Brennpunkt," video, July 17, 1990, KASPA.
84. Falin, quoted in Stent, *Russia and Germany Reborn,* p. 135. See also Valentin Falin, *Konflikte im Kreml: Zur Vorgeschichte der deutschen Einheit und Auflösung der Sowjetunion* (Munich: Blessing Verlag, 1997).
85. The author thanks Norman Naimark for this Falin quotation, which comes from Stanford Uni-

Another adviser thought that Gorbachev, again bypassing party policymaking channels, was behaving like an emperor.[86]

Germany could now unify rapidly (and would do so by October 3, 1990) and enter NATO. Kohl would have his all-German election in December 1990, which he would win decisively. There was still much to be done—the Soviet–West German deal had top-level blessing but still had to be finalized in detail; everything needed ratification—but the essentials were now in place.[87] The main outstanding issue was the final "price," which Kohl and Gorbachev fixed in two phone calls on September 7 and 10, 1990. Political scientist Hannes Adomeit has rightly referred to these calls as two of "the most expensive telephone conversations" in history.[88] Kohl had thought that the amount could be fixed by subordinates, but West German finance and treasury experts balked at the sums Gorbachev demanded. For his part, Gorbachev complained that he felt like he "had fallen into a trap" and was trying desperately to salvage what he could at a late date by negotiating for more cash. Overriding his worried ministers and staff, Kohl offered the Soviet leader DM 3 billion of interest-free credit plus DM 12 billion for the construction of housing for Soviet troops returning home. Gorbachev wanted more, but accepted Kohl's offer on September 10.[89]

Gorbachev's acceptance meant that the signing of the 2+4 accord could take place on September 12 in Moscow. With their signatures, the four powers formally agreed to relinquish their occupation rights. The terms of the deal improved for NATO in the final days. Although Kohl and Gorbachev had said that foreign troops could not be stationed in eastern Germany, it was at this point that Zoellick and the British insisted on a written assurance that they had the right to deploy there nonetheless. In the final rush, Moscow signed an "agreed minute" that allowed for non-German NATO troops to cross the 1989 border after all.

Conclusion

This article has marshaled evidence, both new and previously released, to support three claims. First, the revolutionary events of 1989 led top-ranking

---

versity, Hoover Institution Archives, Gorbachev Foundation Collection, Falin Collection, box 1, p. 29.

86. Valery Boldin, *Ten Years That Shook the World: The Gorbachev Era as Witnessed by His Chief of Staff* (New York: HarperCollins, 1994).

87. For details of the final agreements, see DESE, p. 1540 n. 8.

88. Hannes Adomeit, *Imperial Overstretch: Germany in Soviet Policy from Stalin to Gorbachev* (Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, 1998), pp. 539–551 at p. 551.

89. For more detailed analysis of these phone calls, see Sarotte, *1989*, pp. 191–193.

Western leaders to consider significant questions about the future of European security and NATO broadly speaking, in Eastern Europe as well as in a newly united Germany. Indeed, it could hardly have been otherwise; a leader with any strategic sense was forced in 1989–90 to speculate on a number of new futures. And given that NATO ensured a leading U.S. role in transatlantic security, shielding that status quo in an era of dramatic change became the United States' highest priority. Speculation on how to achieve this goal included discussion of NATO's potential role in Eastern Europe, although such discussion was controversial and preliminary—and, as mentioned, the subsequent invasion of Kuwait by Saddam Hussein in August 1990 pushed it down the Bush administration's list of priorities.

Second, U.S. and West German policymakers worked together to achieve the goal of shielding NATO from alternative visions for the future. The final deal ensuring NATO's continued dominance was sealed not in June in Washington, but in July in Archys, between the Soviets and the West Germans (with the price tag confirmed in subsequent phone calls). Bush's comment that Kohl had "deep pockets" was thereby proved to be correct and prescient; not only had Bonn agreed with Washington's preferred strategy—"to bribe the Soviets out"—Bonn had even paid for it. In other words, it was Bonn's economic might that brought about the final conclusion, because West Germany had the combination of the ability and the willingness to pay the Soviet Union when Washington did not. The Bush administration's success in 1990 lay in recognizing that West Germany was working in the interest of the United States, and continuing to trust its ally to do so, not in shaping all events itself.

Third, this article challenges the argument that U.S. foreign policy at the end of the Cold War was generous and inclusionary. Zelikow and Condoleezza Rice concluded their study of U.S. foreign policy in 1989–91 by saying that "leaders who saw their chance acted with skill, speed, and regard for the dignity of the Soviet Union."[90] And, as cited in the introduction, Deudney and Ikenberry argued that the main goal was to "*integrate* the Soviets (and Russians) into pan-European and pan-Atlantic institutions."

This article suggests a different understanding of the animus behind U.S. foreign policy at the end of the Cold War, public statements notwithstanding. Obviously, large policy issues—such as how to respond to the changes in Europe in 1989—have many facets, but the evidence presented here does not show that integration of the Soviets into new or existing institutions was dominant in 1990. Rather, the goal was to get the Soviets out. Bush made clear dur-

90. Zelikow and Rice, *Germany Unified and Europe Transformed*, p. 370.

ing the February Camp David summit how he felt about the idea of the West compromising over NATO: "To hell with that! We prevailed, they didn't. We can't let the Soviets clutch victory from the jaws of defeat."[91] Baker consistently advised the president that there was little reason to help the Soviet Union solve its own problems; as he wrote in a summary of U.S.-Soviet relations in early 1989, the Russians "have to make hard choices. *We do Gorbachev no favors when we make it easier to avoid choices*." Cheney told CNN that Gorbachev would "ultimately fail."[92]

These views were largely accurate, but they did not exude concern for the dignity and integration of the Soviet Union. The Bush administration succeeded in achieving its goals, but Gorbachev's 1990 requests to the West to include the Soviet Union in new security structures or even NATO fell on deaf ears. His appeals for funding from Washington were unsuccessful as well. Put another way, at the end of the Cold War, the Soviet Union was denied entry into leading Western clubs, originating resentments that have lasted for decades.[93]

Instead, the strategy of Washington and Bonn in 1990 was to speed up the pace as much as possible, and to present the world with one fait accompli after another, in an effort to get the Soviets out and ensure NATO's continued dominance. This policy was skillfully executed and very successful in the short term, admirers of a muscular U.S. foreign policy will see no reason to criticize it. It was not possible, however, to bribe the Soviets, later Russians, permanently out of Europe. Indeed, Asmus argued in 2010 that the Russian-Georgian war of 2008 was a result of the problems inherent in the Western post–Cold War strategy. This war, he found, underscored "the need for rethinking and overhauling the Western strategy toward Russia and our European security architecture" in the future.[94]

At the final signing ceremony of the 2+4 accord in Moscow on September 12, 1990, Genscher had solemnly promised Gorbachev that the Soviet people

---

91. Bush and Scowcroft, *A World Transformed*, p. 253.
92. Baker and Cheney, quoted in Sarotte, *1989*, p. 23 (emphasis in the original Baker document).
93. For analysis of the consequences of this denial in not only Russia but also China, see Deborah Welch Larson and Alexei Shevchenko, "Status Seekers: Chinese and Russian Responses to U.S. Primacy," *International Security*, Vol. 34, No. 4 (Spring 2010), pp. 63–95. For the contemporary case in favor of integrating Russia into international institutions, particularly economic ones, see Jeffrey Mankoff, "The Russian Economic Crisis," Council on Foreign Relations Special Report, April 2010, www.cfr.org/russian_economy_CSR.
94. Ronald D. Asmus, *A Little War That Shook the World: Georgia, Russia, and the Future of the West* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), p. 13. Also writing in 2010, Russian Sergei Karaganov was more succinct, speaking of an "unfinished Cold War." See Karaganov, "Russia's Choice," *Survival*, Vol. 52, No. 1 (February–March 2010), pp. 5–10 at p. 9.

would never be disappointed by what they had done.[95] Later Russian leaders, most notably Vladimir Putin—who had been horrified to witness the events of 1989 first hand as an intelligence operative in the East German city of Dresden, and broke a furnace by shoving so many sensitive documents into it for burning—recalled such statements as hollow promises.[96] Gorbachev had stressed to both Kohl and Genscher in July 1990 that he would agree to let NATO move eastward if the West promised in return to take no steps that would "diminish the security of the Soviet Union." Putin felt that the West had not lived up to this or other assurances that it had given Moscow. Understanding the history of 1990 is therefore not only a useful starting place for theorizing about international institutions but also for illuminating today's tense relationship with Russia.

95. "Из беседы М.С. Горбачева с Г-Д. Геншером" [From the conversation between Gorbachev and Genscher], September 12, 1990, МГ, pp. 570–573.
96. Vladimir Putin, with Nataliya Gevorkyan, Natalya Timakova, and Andrei Kolesnikov, *First Person: An Astonishingly Frank Self-Portrait by Russia's President Putin,* trans. Catherine A. Fitzpatrick (New York: PublicAffairs, 2000), pp. 69–76.