

Dec. 12, 1989

Secretary Baker

Current
Policy
No. 1233

A New Europe, A New Atlanticism: Architecture for a New Era



United States Department of State
Bureau of Public Affairs
Washington, D.C.

Following is the prepared address by Secretary Baker to the Berlin Press Club at the Steigenberger Hotel in Berlin, December 12, 1989.

It is a great honor for an American to speak at this time in this city. For me and for millions of my fellow citizens, Berlin is the crucible of half a century of history.

- Here we have seen clearly what elsewhere hid in shadows.
- Here the ambiguous disclosed its true nature.
- Here we made the choices and took the stands that shaped today's world.

In 1945, pictures of a bombed-out Berlin brought home to us the terrible cost of war.

In 1948, the Soviet Union stalked out of the Four Power Control Commission and blockaded Berlin—the clear declaration of cold war.

In 1953, Berliners staged the first popular revolt against Soviet tyranny in Eastern Europe.

In 1961, the Berlin Wall closed

the last escape hatch from the prison camp of nations which Eastern Europe had become.

In 1971, the Quadripartite Agreement on Berlin epitomized the terrible dilemma of detente—the proposition that cooperation between East and West assumed the continued division of this continent.

Then in 1989, the most important event—certainly the most dramatic—of the postwar era occurred right here in Berlin.

On November 9, the wall became a gateway. Berliners celebrated history's largest, happiest family reunion. And all of us who watched these scenes felt, once again: We are all Berliners.

Once more, images from Berlin flashed around the world, images that again heralded a new reality. This new reality has its roots in those older Berlin scenes—the scenes of West Berlin's dramatic

postwar reconstruction; the scenes of Allied aircraft supplying a blockaded city; the scenes of American and Soviet tanks facing off at Checkpoint Charlie.

By standing together, in Berlin as elsewhere, Western nations created the essential preconditions for overcoming the division of this city, of this nation, and of this continent.

As these recent events have unfolded, the Soviet Union has shown a remarkable degree of realism. And President Gorbachev deserves credit for being the first Soviet leader to have the courage and foresight to permit the lifting of repression in Eastern Europe.

But the real impulse for change comes from an altogether different source: the peoples of Poland, of Hungary, of Czechoslovakia, of Bulgaria, and of East Germany. They have freed themselves.

From the Baltic to the Adriatic, an irresistible movement has gathered force—a movement of, by, and for the people. In their peaceful urgent multitude, the

peoples of Eastern Europe have held up a mirror to the West and have reflected the enduring power of our own best values. In the words of Thomas Jefferson, the first American Secretary of State:

"Nothing is more certainly written in the book of fate than that these people are to be free." The changes amount to nothing less than a peaceful revolution.

Now, as President Bush stated last week, "the task before us is to consolidate the fruits of this peaceful revolution and provide the architecture for continued peaceful change."

The first step is for free men and women to create free governments. The path may appear difficult, even confusing, but we must travel it with understanding. For true stability requires governments with legitimacy, governments that are based on the consent of the governed.

The peoples of Eastern Europe are trying to build such governments. Our view, as President Bush has told President Gorbachev, is that the political and economic reforms in the East can enhance both long-term stability in Europe and the prospects for *perestroika*. A legitimate and stable European order will help, not threaten, legitimate Soviet interests. An illegitimate order will provide no order at all.

Free men and free governments are the building blocks of a Europe whole and free. But hopes for a Europe whole and free are tinged with concern by some that a Europe undivided may not necessarily be a Europe peaceful and prosperous. Many of the guideposts that brought us securely through four sometimes tense and threatening decades are now coming down. Some of the divisive issues that once brought conflict to Europe are reemerging.

As Europe changes, the instruments for Western cooperation must adapt. Working together, we must design and gradually put into place a new architecture for a new era.

This new architecture must have a place for old foundations and structures that remain valuable—like NATO [North Atlantic Treaty Organization]—while recognizing that they can also serve new collective purposes. The new architecture must continue the construction of institutions—like the EC [European Community]—that can help draw together the West while also serving as an open door to the East. And the new architecture must build up frameworks—like the CSCE [Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe] process—that can overcome the division of Europe and bridge the Atlantic Ocean.

This new structure must also accomplish two special purposes.

First, as a part of overcoming the division of Europe, there must be an opportunity to overcome, through peace and freedom, the division of Berlin and of Germany. The United States and NATO have stood for unification for 40 years, and we will not waver from that goal.

Second, the architecture should reflect that America's security—politically, militarily, and economically—remains linked to Europe's security. The United States and Canada share Europe's neighborhood.

As President Bush stated in May: "The United States is and will remain a European power." And as he added last week: "The U.S. will

maintain significant military forces in Europe as long as our Allies desire our presence as part of a common security effort." This is our commitment to a common future, a recognition of a need for an active U.S. role in Europe, a need even acknowledged by President Gorbachev.

The charge for us all, then, is to work together toward *the New Europe and the New Atlanticism*.

New Missions for NATO

In May of this year, President Bush suggested to his NATO colleagues that it was time to begin considering new missions for NATO.

For over 40 years, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization has secured peace in Europe through both deterrence and dialogue with the East. Today, NATO is working in Vienna to build a new security structure for Europe, one in which the military component is reduced and the political is enhanced. This is NATO's first new mission.

A conventional forces agreement is the keystone of this new security structure. In May, NATO adopted President Bush's suggestion to seek such an agreement on an accelerated timetable. President Gorbachev has responded to this opportunity positively. And we have moved significantly closer to concluding an agreement limiting conventional armaments from the Atlantic to the Urals. In Malta, President Bush proposed a summit meeting to sign such an agreement in 1990.

Today, I further propose that the ministers of the 23 NATO and Warsaw Pact nations take advantage of our February meeting in Ottawa, where we will launch the "open skies" negotiations, to review the status and give a further push to the Vienna talks on conventional Forces.

As we construct a new security architecture that maintains the common defense, the nonmilitary

component of European security will grow. Arms control agreements, confidence-building measures, and other political consultative arrangements will become more important. In such a world, the role of NATO will evolve. NATO will become the forum where Western nations cooperate to negotiate, implement, verify, and extend agreements between East and West.

In this context, the implementation and verification monitoring of a conventional forces agreement will present a major challenge for enduring security. NATO must make an important contribution.

I, therefore, invite allied governments to consider establishing a NATO arms control verification staff. Verification will remain a national responsibility. But such a new staff would be able to assist member governments in monitoring compliance with arms control and confidence building measures in Europe. A NATO organization of this sort could be valuable in assisting all allies and coordinating the implementation of inspections. It could provide a clearinghouse for information contributed by national governments, perhaps joining with collective European efforts through the Western European Union.

As the East-West confrontation recedes, and as the prospects for East-West cooperation advance, other challenges for European and Atlantic security will arise. They point to NATO's second new mission. Regional conflicts—along with the proliferation of missiles and nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons—present growing dangers. Intensified NATO consultations on these issues can play an important role in forming common Western approaches to these various threats.

Third, NATO should also begin

considering further initiatives the West might take, through the CSCE process in particular, to build economic and political ties with the East, to promote respect for human rights, to help build democratic institutions, and to fashion, consistent with Western security interests, a more open environment for East-West trade and investment.

Finally, NATO may have its greatest and most lasting effect on the pattern of change by demonstrating to the nations of the East a fundamentally different approach to security. NATO's four decades offer a vision of cooperation, not coercion; of open borders, not iron curtains. The reconciliation of ancient enemies, which has taken place under the umbrella of NATO's collective security, offers the nations of Eastern Europe an appealing model of international relations.

Whatever security relationships the governments of Eastern Europe choose, NATO will continue to provide Western governments the optimal instrument to coordinate their efforts at defense and arms control and to build a durable European order of peace. The interests of Eastern Europe and, indeed, the interests of the Soviet Union will be served by the maintenance of a vigorous North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

The Role of the European Community

The future development of the European Community will play a central role in shaping the new Europe.

The example of Western cooperation through the European Community has already had a

dramatic effect on Eastern attitudes toward economic liberty. The success of this great European experiment, perhaps more than any other factor, has caused Eastern Europeans to recognize that people as well as nations cooperate more productively when they are free to choose. The ballot box and the free market are the fundamental instruments of choice.

But the European experiment has succeeded not just because it has appealed to the enlightened self-interest of European producers and consumers. This experiment has succeeded because the vision of its founders encompassed and yet transcended the material. This experiment has succeeded because it also held out the higher goal of political as well as economic barriers overcome, of a Europe united.

This was the goal of Monnet and Schumann. This was the goal supported by the United States of Marshall and Acheson. This was the goal contained in the Treaty of Rome and more recently in the European Single Act. The United States supports this goal today with the same energy it did 40 years ago.

Naturally the United States seeks a European Community open to cooperation with others. We believe Americans will profit from access to a single European market, just as Europeans have long profited from their access to a single American market. However, it is vital to us all that both these markets remain open—indeed, that both become even more open.

As Europe moves toward its goal of a common internal market, and as its institutions for political and security cooperation evolve, the link between the United States and the European Community will become even more important. We want our transatlantic cooperation to keep pace with European integration and institutional reform.

To this end, we propose that the United States and the European Community work together to achieve, whether in treaty or some other form, a significantly strengthened set of institutional and consultative links. Working from shared ideals and common values, we face a set of mutual challenges—in economics, foreign policy, the environment, science, and a host of other fields. So it makes sense for us to seek to fashion our responses together as a matter of common course.

We suggest that our discussions about this idea proceed in parallel with Europe's efforts to achieve by 1992 a common internal market so that plans for U.S.-EC interaction would evolve with changes in the Community.

The United States also encourages the European Community to continue and expand cooperation with the nations of the East. The promotion of political and economic reforms in the East is a natural vocation for the European Community. That is why we were exceptionally pleased with the agreement at the Paris economic summit that the European Commission should assume a special role in the Group of 24 effort to promote reform in Poland and Hungary.

The United States has worked closely with the European Community in mobilizing economic and financial support for Hungary and Poland. Indeed, the United States has authorized almost \$1 billion of assistance to these two nations. This week, we look to the Group of 24 meeting to move as close as possible toward achieving the \$1 billion stabilization fund Poland requested to support its

major move toward currency convertibility and macroeconomic reform.

That should be just the start of our common labor. Poland and Hungary have 40 years of economic stagnation to overcome, and this will take time and our steady support. As Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, and the German Democratic Republic undertake political and economic reforms comparable to those already under way in Poland and Hungary, we believe the activities of the Group of 24, centered around the EC, should be expanded to support peaceful change in these countries as well.

As the nations of Eastern Europe achieve more open political and economic systems, they may seek new relationships with the European Community, with the Council of Europe, and with other institutions serving both Europe and the broader international community. In fact, such ties could be fundamental to our strategy of rebuilding the economies of Eastern Europe through private capital and initiative: Private investors in Eastern Europe will want to know that they can sell their products in Western markets.

I am confident that creative new arrangements can be devised to encourage and sustain the process of political and economic reforms in the countries of Eastern Europe, while at the same time preserving the integrity and the vitality of existing institutions. We need to offer the nations of the East hope, opportunities that can be seized as they take steps toward democracy and economic liberty. Perhaps the recent work on an agreement between the EC and the six nations of the European Free Trade Association will set a pattern for improved ties with others.

We see no conflict between the process of European integration and

an expansion of cooperation between the European Community and its neighbors to the East and West. Indeed, we believe that the attraction of the European Community for the countries of the East depends most on its continued vitality. And the vitality of the economic community depends in turn on its continued commitment to the goal of a united Europe envisaged by its founders—free, democratic, and closely linked to its North American partners.

The Helsinki Process —The New Role of CSCE

The institution that brings all the nations of the East and West together in Europe, the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, is in fact an ongoing process launched over 14 years ago in Helsinki. There have been different perceptions as to the functions of this CSCE process. Some saw the Helsinki Final Act of 1975 as a ratification of the *status quo*, the equivalent of a peace treaty concluding World War II, and thus the legitimization of Europe's permanent division. Others, however, saw this process as a device by which these divisions could be overcome.

The dynamic concept of the CSCE process has prevailed. In 1975, the governments of Eastern Europe may not have taken seriously their commitments to respect a wide range of fundamental human rights. Their populations did. The standards of conduct set by the Helsinki Final Act are increasingly being met through international pressure and

domestic ferment. Last month, here in Berlin, we witnessed one of the proudest achievements of the CSCE process as the G.D.R. [East Germany] fulfilled its commitment to allow its people to travel freely.

Now it's time for the CSCE process to advance further. We can look toward filling each of its three baskets with new substance.

First, we can give the security basket further content through the 35-nation negotiations on confidence-building measures currently underway in Vienna. The agreements under consideration there should help prevent force, or the threat of force, from being used again in an effort to intimidate any European nation. Apart from reducing further the risk of war, new confidence-building measures can create greater openness. They can institutionalize a predictable pattern of military interaction, a pattern that is difficult to reverse and that builds a new basis for trust.

Second, the relatively under-developed economic basket can assume new responsibilities. President Bush suggested to President Gorbachev at Malta that we could breathe new life into this CSCE forum by focusing it on the conceptual and practical questions involved in the transition from stalled, planned economies to free, competitive markets. When our nations meet in Bonn in May of next year to discuss economic cooperation, I suggest we concentrate on this issue.

Third, the CSCE process has made its most distinctive mark in the field of human rights. One fundamental right, however, has not yet been fully institutionalized. This is the right for people to choose, through regular, free, open, multiparty elections, those who will govern them.

This is the ultimate human right, the right that secures all others. Without free elections, no rights can be long guaranteed. With free elections, no rights can be long denied.

On May 31, in Mainz, President Bush announced a major new Helsinki initiative to help end the division of Europe. He called for free elections and political pluralism in all the countries of Europe. Now this is coming to pass.

In June, the United States and the United Kingdom cosponsored a free elections initiative at the CSCE human rights meeting in Paris. This proposal called on all 35 CSCE participating states to allow periodic, genuine, and contested elections based on universal and equal suffrage, by secret ballot, and with international observers. Individuals would be allowed to establish and maintain their own political parties in order to ensure fully democratic procedures.

Free elections should now become the highest priority in the CSCE process. In 1945, Joseph Stalin promised free elections and self-determination for the peoples of Eastern Europe. The fact that those elections were not free, and that those peoples were not allowed to determine their destiny, was a fundamental cause of the cold war.

Now this Stalinist legacy is being removed by people determined to reclaim their birthright to freedom. They should not be denied. They will not be denied.

As all or nearly all the CSCE states move toward fully functioning representative govern-

ments, I suggest we consider another step: We could involve parliamentarians more directly in CSCE processes, not only as observers as at present but perhaps through their own meetings. To sustain the movement toward democracy, we need to reinforce the institutions of democracy.

Germany and Berlin In a New Europe

A new Europe, whole and free, must include arrangements that satisfy the aspirations of the German people and meet the legitimate concerns of Germany's neighbors. Before the *Bundestag* on November 28, Chancellor Kohl laid out an approach designed to achieve German aspirations in peace and freedom. At last week's NATO Summit, President Bush reaffirmed America's longstanding support for the goal of German unification. He enunciated four principles that guide our policy, and I am pleased to note these ideas were incorporated into the statement issued last week by the leaders of the European Community nations at Strasbourg.

- One, self-determination must be pursued without prejudice to its outcome. We should not at this time endorse nor exclude any particular vision of unity.
- Two, unification should occur in the context of Germany's continued commitment to NATO and an increasingly integrated European Community and with due regard for the legal role and responsibilities of the Allied powers.
- Three, in the interests of general European stability, moves toward unification must be peaceful, gradual, and part of a step-by-step process.
- Four, on the question of borders, we should reiterate our support for the principles of the Helsinki Final Act.

President Bush concluded that “an end to the unnatural division of Europe, and of Germany, must proceed in accordance with and be based upon the values that are becoming universal ideals, as all the countries of Europe become part of a commonwealth of free nations.”

As an American, I am proud of the role my nation has played and will continue to play standing with you. Yet this very positive course will not be easy, nor can it be rushed. It must be peaceful. It must be democratic. It must respect the legitimate concerns of all the participants in the new Europe.

As Berlin has stood at the center of a divided Europe, so it may stand at the center of a Europe whole and free—no longer the embattled bastion of freedom but instead a beacon of hope for a better life.

A New Europe, A New Atlanticism

My friends, the changes we see underway today in the East are a source of great hope. But a new era brings different concerns for all of us. Some are as old as Europe itself. Others are themselves the new products of change.

Were the West to abandon the patterns of cooperation that we have built up over four decades, these concerns could grow into problems. But the institutions we have created—NATO, the European Community, and the CSCE process—are alive. Rooted in democratic values, they fit well with

the people power that is shaping history’s new course.

More important, these institutions are also flexible and capable of adapting to rapidly changing circumstances. As we adapt, as we update and expand our cooperation with each other and with the nations of the East, we will create a New Europe on the basis of a new Atlanticism.

NATO will remain North America’s primary link with Europe. As arms control and political arrangements increasingly supplement the still vital military component of European security, NATO will take on new roles.

The European Community is already an economic pillar of the transatlantic relationship. It will also take on, perhaps in concert with other European institutions, increasingly important political roles. Indeed, it has already done so, as evidenced by the Community’s coordination of a Western effort to support reform in Eastern Europe. And as it continues to do so, the link between the United States and the European Community should become stronger, the issues we discuss more diversified, and our common endeavors more important.

At the same time, the substantive overlap between NATO and European institutions will grow. This overlap must lead to synergy, not friction. Better communication among European and transatlantic institutions will become more urgent.

The CSCE process could become the most important forum of East-West cooperation. Its mandate will grow as this cooperation takes root.

As these changes proceed, as they overcome the division of Europe, so too will the divisions of Germany and Berlin be overcome in peace and freedom.

This fall, a powerful cry went up from the huge demonstrations in Leipzig, Dresden, and Berlin: “We are the people!” the crowds chanted at the party that ruled in their name. On the other side of the globe, Lech Walesa was addressing the U.S. Congress, thanking America for supporting Polish liberty. He began with words written 200 years ago, the words that open the U.S. Constitution: “We the people.”

Between 1789 and 1989, between the expressions “We the people” and “We are the people,” runs one of history’s deepest currents. What the American Founding Fathers knew, the people of East Germany and Eastern Europe now also know—that freedom is a blessing but not a gift; that the work of freedom is never done, and it is never done alone. Between the America of “We the people” and the Europe of “We are the people,” there can be no division. On this basis, a new Atlanticism will flourish, and a new Europe will be born. ■

Published by the United States Department of State • Bureau of Public Affairs • Office of Public Communication • Editorial Division
Washington, D.C. • December 1989
Editor: Jim Pinkelman • This material is in the public domain and may be reprinted without permission; citation of this source is appreciated.

PA/OAP, Rm. 5815A
United States Department of State
Washington, D.C. 20520-6810

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE \$300

Address Correction Requested

**BULK RATE
POSTAGE & FEES PAID
U.S. Department of State
Permit No. G-130**