

Final Report for NATO Fellowship

March 1998

**Mary N Hampton
University of Utah**

I have completed the work for my 1997-1998 NATO Research Fellowship. Because of the fellowship, I was able to finish critical secondary research and conduct many useful discussions in Germany with relevant academics and with current and past German foreign policy and security elites. My project, "The German Conception of Security: an Examination of Competing Views", has resulted in three major research papers, one which is already published, and two that are accepted for publication or under contract. I will return to these research papers below.

Aside from NATO's generous assistance, the Konrad Adenauer Stiftung in Sankt Augustin and the Hessische Stiftung fuer Friedens und Konflikt Forschung (HSFK), Frankfurt, were especially helpful in allowing me to carry out my research. I had offices in both institutes. The libraries in both were very useful. The HSFK has a fine collection of security journals, including the most important ones in English and German. It also has a good collection of the German party publications, which were most helpful to my work. However, most important to my project was the interaction I had with analysts and scholars at the two institutions. I am very grateful to Dr. Harald Mueller, the Director of the HSFK, for his generous assistance, and to other analysts at the institute who read my work and discussed it with me, and who helped me obtain interview partners critical to my work. Among those that assisted me most and to whom I am grateful were Drs. Bruno Schoch, Matthias Dembinski, Kinka Gerka, and Berthold Meyer.

Central to the completion of my research were the resources and especially the people at the Konrad Adenauer Stiftung. I had an office at the institute from April 1, 1997 through July 31, 1997. I am most grateful for the help I got from Dr. Peter Weilemann and from the institute's excellent security experts, Dr. Karl-Heinz Kamp and Dr. Martin Hoch. Because of their assistance, I met with over 20 CDU, FDP, SPD, and Green members of Parliament, and with current and former senior officials from NATO and the German Foreign and Defense Departments. Dr. Roland Freudenstein, the Adenauer Stiftung's representative in Warsaw, was also of tremendous assistance. Also, the analysts who work in the Adenauer Stiftung library there were extremely gracious in helping me assemble press clippings on my topic.

At NATO headquarters, Dr. Michael Ruehle was indispensable. I met with him during a research trip to NATO in July of 1997. He also helped arrange other meetings for me. Through the contacts I made while in Brussels and in combination with those from the Adenauer Stiftung, I was invited to and did attend a NATO Roundtable held in Washington, D.C. during November of 1997. The conference was most useful for my research, and helped me establish more valuable contacts.

Finally, I was able to utilize the resources in the library and meet with a number of excellent analysts during a trip in April of 1997 to the Ebenhausen Stiftung outside Munich. Aside from that trip, I visited the International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS) in London during July of 1997. While there, I met with Dr. Phil Gordon, a noted NATO expert.

A list of the people with whom I spoke while in Germany, London, Brussels, and at the Washington NATO Roundtable include, and to whom I am most grateful:

Dr. Oliver Thraenert, Roland Freudenstein, Karl-Heinz Kamp, Dr. Peter Weilemann, Dr. Martin Hoch, Mrs. Nancy McEldowny, Rolf Huettel, Dr. Klaus Scharioth, Dr. Christof Weil, Dr. Hans-Joachim Daerr, Karl Lamers, Andreas Schockenhoff, Ruprecht Polenz, Michael Stuebgen, Dr. Friedbert Pflueger, Andreas Krautscheid, Hans-Joachim Falenski, Guenter Verheugen, Karsten Voigt, Dr. Hermann Scheer, Gernot Erler, Freimut Duve, Egon Bahr, Marcus Meckel, Helmut Hugler for Frau Angelika, Ludger Volmer, Graf von Einsiedel, Max Schmidt, Dr. Hans Ruehle, General Franz-Joseph Schulze, General Helge Hansen, General Rainer Schuwirth, Dr. Marek Prawda, Phil Gordon, Nick Williams, Michael Ruehle, Charles Skinner, Peter Stratemann, Andrew Denison, Dr. Holger Mey, Michael Innacker.

As mentioned in the first paragraph, I have produced three major research papers as a result of my NATO Research Fellowship. In all three studies, I examine German political elite beliefs regarding German security interests and the role that NATO plays in meeting those needs. Continued German support for NATO is critical, and it is clear that German support for NATO is today mostly unquestioned in the mainstream. Further, German membership in NATO is less controversial in domestic politics than perhaps at any time in postwar history. However, why Germans supports NATO and how they perceive NATO in the post cold war era are issues that need to be fully addressed. I examine in a number of contexts the various German elite perspectives on NATO according to party, organizational, regional, and generational differentiation. I also address perspectives of the German intellectual and journalistic elite circles. I focus my inquiries on two clusters of issues now important to NATO: the importance of democratization through NATO, and secondly, the emerging guidelines for post cold war NATO identity.

I also examine German perspectives and attitudes within the larger theoretical context of assessing current American international relations theories and their explanatory power. For example, many realists argue, and I concur, that Germany will continue to support NATO because NATO serves specific German security interests. However, where my analyses diverge from realism is with my argument that NATO was never a traditional alliance, but rather always reflected the liberal internationalist ordering principles pursued early on by U.S. policy makers in the immediate postwar period. It was within the context of this security order that Germany developed its postwar identity.

Central to that my study of German elite attitudes toward NATO is an examination of the German security identity that has evolved over the last half century. Since its entry into NATO in 1954, Germany has upheld, benefited from, and internalized the NATO norms of democracy, self determination, sovereignty and equality of status promoted among members. German policy makers drew lessons from history through which the evolution of democratic norms could evolve. The NATO relationship was important in cementing these lessons after 1949, and in promoting democratization in Germany. As NATO reorganizes and contemplates eastward extension, the role of shared norms inside NATO will be critical. For example, how important is it to Germans that only democracies enter NATO? The answers to such questions are critical if one is to speak of NATO, as do the constructionists in international relations theory, as a "Wertegemeinschaft", or community of commonly held democratic values.

Obviously, German policy makers and elites can and do hold views that are consistent with both realism and constructivism. My analyses of German attitudes toward NATO flesh out those views in light of their practical and theoretical significance.

In sum, in each of the three papers produced for my project, I conclude that NATO has remained the cornerstone of German of security in the post unification period. These

are important findings given the debate today in international relations theory concerning post cold war security issues. For example, realist expectations that a major redefinition of German security interests will occur given the redistribution of national power capabilities that occurred with the collapse of bipolarity are to date unfounded. The strengthening of the German elite and public commitment to NATO do not bear out such realist assessments. The continued resistance to NATO of the PDS and among much of the rank and file membership of the SPD and Greens notwithstanding, the German consensus regarding NATO as the cornerstone of German security has remained intact and in many ways strengthened. Below are abstracts of the three papers that I completed and that have been or are being published.

Abstracts:

The first paper, **"'Borne Ceaselessly Into the Past?' Poland, Germany and NATO Enlargement"**, appeared in the January 1998 issue of German Comments. This piece was the result of many discussions with CDU, SPD, and Green members of Parliament, as well as with Polish representatives in Bonn and with Dr. Roland Freudenstein in Warsaw. The paper is also the product of intensive secondary research carried out mostly at the Konrad Adenauer Stiftung in Sankt Augustin. I delivered an address to members and invited guests of the Adenauer Stiftung on the paper topic in July of 1997, and received very useful comments.

The article seeks to explain one strand of current German elite thinking concerning NATO and German security by focusing on the critical and evolving Polish-German relationship. I argue that while intra-alliance politics, especially U.S. policy, predisposed many German politicians to accept enlargement, German political elites have been heavily influenced to support NATO enlargement as a result of their sensitivity to Polish interests. Through the impact of a cluster of historical lessons regarding the German past, and through the persuasive efforts of Polish elites, many German policymakers took it upon themselves to become the advocates of Polish entry into NATO. For example, the interests of the Poles and other East European elites in seeking entry into NATO actually persuaded members of the Green Party leadership to support an alliance policy they may otherwise have rejected.

The second paper, **"NATO, Germany, and the United States: Creating Positive Identity in Trans-Atlantia"**, is also the product of my research in Germany. The study has been accepted for publication in the Autumn 1998 issue of the first rate security journal, Security Studies. The paper, based on interviews and much secondary research, examines the continued post unification loyalty to NATO of German elites and the German public. My findings and argument contrast greatly with the predictions and explications of many realists in international relations theory who argue that NATO, and Germany's loyalty to it, will erode in the wake of the cold war system's collapse. Realists define national interest in terms of the distribution of power capabilities among states. Because power has been redistributed on the European continent in the wake of the cold war, realist expectations are that security interests and threat perceptions among European states will change accordingly, and that NATO will fall victim to those reassessed interests.

In fact, despite the real and relative increase in German power capability, rather than witnessing an erosion of German loyalty to or interest in the continued vitality of NATO, the opposite is occurring. There is a stronger elite and public consensus supporting NATO today than was true a decade ago. Further, support for NATO has grown in the last few years among former East Germans, who were highly critical of the organization immediately after German unification. I explain this phenomenon by focusing on the evolution of what I call positive identity formation between the U.S. and Germany over the

last fifty years through the NATO relationship. The article confirms the arguments of those who argue that NATO has always represented more than a traditional security alliance, and is more characteristic of a trans-national security community of democracies.

The third paper is entitled "**German Security at the Crossroads: All Signs Point to NATO**". While in Germany, I and Dr. Christian Soe decided to co-edit a book on Germany in the post unification period. Our book, **Between Bonn and Berlin: German Politics in Transition**, is under contract at Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, and is projected to appear in 1998. My article will be a chapter in the book. Again, I completed most of the research for this paper during my stay in Germany, using interviews and secondary research.

I argue in this chapter that despite continued disagreement among the Greens and within the SPD's rank and file, German elite consensus on maintaining NATO as the core of German security policy is currently strong. While German elites continue to support the creation of a European security identity through the WEU and EU, they have thus far remained resistant to French overtures to separate this emerging identity from NATO. In fact, I argue that while the European quest continues for a security identity and the construction of an organization within which to house that identity, the consequences of the short term German preference to reinvigorate NATO has actually caused inertia in the joint European enterprise. The results of the coming national German elections in September of 1998 will be important for testing my argument.

Conclusions:

In sum, I was able to accomplish the objectives I set for myself with my NATO Research Research Fellowship. My research trip to Germany was critical for completing the multifaceted project. I will now work to extend the project by focusing on the German-French relationship, and compare it to the relationship between Germany and the U.S. regarding the evolution of positive identity. My intention is turn the study into a single authored book.

I am extremely grateful to NATO for honoring me with the Research Fellowship, and I believe the fruits of the project have been many. Aside from the research papers that have resulted from my receiving the fellowship, I have benefited as well from the many excellent new contacts and friendships I have developed in Germany.