GERMAN FOREIGN AND SECURITY POLICY: SUSTAINING CIVILIAN AND MULTILATERAL ORIENTATION

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

MURAT GÜL

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

JANUARY 2009

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

_____

Prof. Dr. Sencer AYATA
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

_____

Prof. Dr. Meliha Altunışık
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

_____

Prof. Dr. A. Nuri Yurdusev
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members (first name belongs to the chairperson of the jury and the second name belongs to supervisor)

Prof. Dr. Atila Eralp (METU, IR) _____

Prof. Dr. A. Nuri Yurdusev (METU, IR) _____

Prof. Dr. Hüseyin Bağcı (METU, IR) _____

Prof. Dr. İhsan Dağı (METU, IR) _____

Prof. Dr. Enver Bozkurt (Kırıkkale University, Law) _____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name : Murat Gül
Signature :

ABSTRACT

GERMAN FOREIGN AND SECURITY POLICY: SUSTAINING CIVILIAN AND MULTILATERAL ORIENTATION

Gül, Murat

Ph.D., Department of International Relations

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. A. Nuri Yurdusev

January 2009, 208 pages

The “German Question” was on the agenda of the international community from the last quarter of the nineteenth century to the mid-twentieth century. Following the end of the World War II, due to the existence of a Soviet threat, the incorporation of West Germany into the liberal-democratic institutions of the western world was the principal issue to be dealt with. Following the reunification of Germany and the end of the bipolar international structure, the “German Question” was revisited. The German insistence on the early recognition of Croatia and Slovenia and German participation in the Kosovo War brought questions whether Germany has become more assertive and on the way to return to the power politics. This dissertation will analyze German foreign and security policy in the post-Cold War era in order to understand whether Germany has shifted from its civilian and multilateral orientation or has made small adjustments in its policies to adapt to the new international structure. In approaching the issue, the study attempts to link the theoretical and practical aspects under the guidance of a conceptual framework provided by realist, neorealist and constructivist approaches. Through contextualizing the coexistence of realist, neorealist and constructivist factors in German foreign and security policy, the dissertation argues that although Germany has made some small policy adjustments to adapt to the new international structure, German foreign and security policy has not shifted from its civilian and multilateral orientation.

Keywords: “German Question”, Civilian and Multilateral Orientation, Conceptual Framework, International Structure, Political Culture

ÖZ

ALMAN DIŞ VE GÜVENLİK POLİTİKASI: SİVİL VE ÇOK TARAFLI ORYANTASYONU SÜRDÜRMEK

Gül, Murat

Doktora, Uluslararası İlişkiler Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. A. Nuri Yurdusev

Ocak 2009, 208 sayfa

"Almanya Sorunu" ondokuzuncu yüzyılın son çeyreğinden yirminci yüzyılın ortasına kadar uluslararası toplumun gündemindeydi. İkinci Dünya Savaşı'ndan sonra, Sovyet tehdidi nedeniyle, Batı Almanya'nın batı dünyasının liberal-demokratik kurumlarına dahil edilmesi başlıca mesele idi. Almanya'nın yeniden birleşmesi ve iki kutuplu uluslararası yapının sona ermesinden sonra "Almanya Sorunu" tekrar gündeme geldi. Almanya'nın Hırvatistan ve Slovenya'nın erken tanınması konusundaki ısrarı ve Kosova Savaşı'na katılması, Almanya çok daha iddialı bir hale mi geldi ve güç politikalarına geri mi dönüyor sorularını beraberinde getirdi. Bu çalışma, Almanya sivil ve çok taraflı oryantasyonundan ayrıldı mı yoksa yeni uluslararası yapıya adapte olmak için politikalarında küçük ayarlamalar mı yaptı konusunu anlamak için, Soğuk Savaş sonrası dönemdeki Alman dış ve güvenlik politikasını analiz etmektedir. Konuyu ele alırken, teorik ve pratik yönlerin birlikteliğinin ortaya konulmasına, realist, neorealist ve constructivist görüşlerin sağladığı kavramsal yapının yol göstermesiyle, özel bir önem verilmiştir. Realist, neorealist ve constructivist faktörlerin Alman dış ve güvenlik politikasında birlikteliği bağlamında, çalışma Almanya yeni uluslararası yapıya adapte olmak için politikalarında küçük ayarlamalar yapmış olsa da Alman dış ve güvenlik politikasının sivil ve çok taraflı oryantasyonundan ayrılmadığını savunmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: "Almanya Sorunu", Sivil ve Çok Taraflı Oryantasyon, Kavramsal Yapı, Uluslararası Yapı, Politik Kültür

To My Parents…

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am grateful to several institutions and individuals, who have contributed in various ways to the process of writing and research of this dissertation. First of all, I would like to thank to the Middle East Technical University for providing me the opportunity to conduct my studies in a highly stimulating research environment. I am also grateful to the German Council on Foreign Relations and to the Humboldt University. I have greatly benefited from my research process at these institutions.

Particular thanks are due to the members of my PhD examining committee members for their critical reading of the thesis and their encouraging support during my research: Prof. Dr. Atila Eralp, Prof. Dr. Hüseyin Bağcı, Prof. Dr. İhsan Dağı, Prof. Dr. Enver Bozkurt and Prof. Dr. A. Nuri Yurdusev.

I would like to especially thank to my supervisor Prof. Dr. A. Nuri Yurdusev for his contribution to this dissertation through his constructive criticism, precious feedback and encouragement during the process.

I would also like to thank to Prof. Dr. Hüseyin Bağcı and Prof. Dr. Enver Bozkurt for their guidance that helped me to overcome the obstacles I have faced during the completion of this thesis.

My endless thanks go to my parents, Fatma and Cemal Gül, for their continuous love, support and patience during my entire education life that leads towards an academic career. This dissertation is dedicated to them.

Last but not the least, I would like to thank to everybody, who have in any way contributed to the completion of this dissertation. I may not have found the chance to claim their names here, but their contribution, support, love and patience reside in my mind and heart.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1648, 1815, 1918, 1945 and 1989 or 1991… What do these dates refer to? Although they imply different things for different perspectives, these dates refer to the end of long and disastrous wars, but with a crucial nuance. Whether considered to be successful or not, whereas the former four established a post-war order, the latter brought neither a peace treaty nor a new legal body (an international institution) to define the new international or world system, new rules of conduct between states and the new principles to be upheld in inter-state relations. Was/is the emerging new system, following the end of the Cold War, to be defined as a multi-polar one, a uni-polar one, or as James N. Rosenau puts it a "post-international system?"[1] Whatever the definition would be, uncertainty and unsustainability have become the most popular conceptions in recent academic studies with respect to the international system. In this regard, foreign policy analysis in an uncertain and unsustainable environment has in the same manner become more and more complex. As Francis Fukuyama claims: "… the Cold War did in fact provide a very recognizable framework that all of us operated in…Today, we are evidently entering a very different kind of world… and I don't think that the assumptions that

[1] Rosenau, J.N., *Turbulence in World Politics: A Theory of Change and Continuity*, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1990, p.6

undergirded either the cold war, or this extended period of American hegemony, are going to be sufficient to guide us in the world that is emerging"[2].

Following the collapse of the Soviet Union, the web of relations (that had been in play with the process of globalization) has been increasing both in quality and quantity, and interdependence has become one of the main characteristics of world politics. Today, many actors (other than the nation states) are involved in political, economic, technological and cultural affairs and they play a more prominent role than ever. However, would the extended activities of non-state actors be able to reduce the strength and importance of the role played by the nation-states? Not actually. As Robert Kagan maintains, "The world has become normal again. The years immediately following the end of the Cold War offered a tantalizing glimpse of a new kind of international order… But that was a mirage… the nation-state remains as strong as ever" [3]. According to Kagan, the United States remains the sole superpower in the international system. In addition, international competition among great powers has returned, with Russia, China, Europe, Japan, India, Iran, the United States, and others vying for regional pre-dominance. Accordingly, the central feature of the international system has become the struggle for status and influence. The new world disorder with uncertain and unsustainable framework of political interactions and the return of great power competition enable the nation-state to remain as strong as ever. The most striking point with regard to Kagan's claim is that although he points out a competition among the associated great powers in the international system, Europe is mentioned as a power center by itself. The process of European integration has been in play for more than five decades and the European Union has become to some extent, or at least has the intention to become, an international actor. However, that does not mean that the nation-states within the EU have given up their identities. Even in many policy areas, particularly in the areas of

---

[2] Fukuyama, Francis, "Is America Ready for a Post-American World?", Address by Francis Fukuyama delivered at the Pardee Rand Graduate Schooli Santa Monica, CA, 21 June 2008

[3] Kagan, Robert, *The Return of History and the End of Dreams*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf Publisher, 2008, pp.3-4

foreign and security policy, nation-states have preserved their weights within the EU mechanism.

Germany, given its huge economic and political capabilities, and central geographical location in Europe, has been considered as one of the most influential 'engines' of the European integration process, probably the most important one. Following the World War II, the civilian and multilateral orientation of foreign and security policy became a significant part of the national identity of West Germany. The reconstruction of Germany was not only a process of forgetting traumatic history or otherization of the crimes of the Third Reich, but also was a process within which values like liberal democracy, human rights, cooperation, civilian and multilateral type of foreign policy were internalized. Following the reunification, Germany strengthened its geopolitical position in Europe. Germany's central location has conferred new responsibilities to the country in terms of the future prospects and development in the European continent. Germany as the most powerful state in the middle of Europe has started to play an increasing role in the implementation and reconstruction of the post-Cold War international politics, and has pulled its responsibilities within a multilateral framework. The construction of the 'United States of Europe' and making EU a coherent and effective international actor within which Germany 'should' play a leading role, and thus, realizing the 'Europeanization of Germany' have been of primary concern for German governments after reunification. In addition to this intra-integration in the Western Europe, the integration of the Eastern and Western Europe has been one of the primary foreign policy objectives of the successive German governments as well. In a nutshell, since the end of the Cold War, Germany has been one of the most-willing countries, maybe the most, for European integration and has devoted time and energy for the success of the integration process. On the other hand, Germany's strong insistence on deepening and widening European integration and making EU a coherent and effective actor in international arena do not mean that Germany is not pursuing its own national interests. However, does that mean a return of Germany to power politics?

In fact, following the reunification of Germany, the collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the bipolar international structure, concerns and curiosities about the future prospects of German foreign and security policy came up to the surface. After the reunification, economically giant Germany started to pursue a more independent and proactive foreign policy, which abolished the image of 'political pigmy' living under the security umbrella of the western alliance. This was reflected in the speeches of the former German Chancellor Helmut Kohl when he underlined the re-emergence of Germany as an equal and effective member of the international community, in the very first years of the reunification. Even before the reunification (but at a time when the collapse of the Berlin Wall was signaling that the reunification was not far away), Arthur M. Schlesinger published an article in the *Wall Street Journal*. In the article Schlesinger wrote the possibility that Germany would have by far the largest army in Europe west of Russia, could even acquire nuclear weapons, could demand *Lebensraum* to put the issues of revision of its eastern borders, new *Anschluss* with Austria and new outreach to German-speaking minorities in neighbouring countries[4]. In the aftermath of the reunification, Kenneth Waltz predicted that Germany was on the way to return to power politics and to become a nuclear power[5]. Comments and concerns less alarmist than these also expressed their scepticism on the course of German foreign and security policy. Stanley Hoffmann contended that Germany did not depart from its reliance on multilateralism, but this reliance was now founded on a more assertive Germany, less inhibited by its past and the international enviroment[6]. The common thing in these comments was that there aroused a considerable amount of expectations towards a significant change in German foreign and security policy fostered by the end of the Cold War and the reunification of the country (the developments through

[4] Schlesinger, Arthur M., Jr., "Germany's Fate Will Determine Europe's", *Wall Street Journal*, 21 December 1989

[5] Waltz, K. N., "The Emerging Structure of International Politics", *International Security*, Vol.18 No.2, 1993, pp.44-45

[6] Hoffmann, Stanley, "Reflections on the 'German Question'", *Survival*, Vol.32, No.4, July/August 1990, pp.291-292

which Germany faced fewer constraints, new opportunities and new pressures to act in its external environment).

Germany's insistence on the early recognition of the independence of Croatia and Slovenia in 1991 created anxieties in the international community. Although the Badinter Commission – the Commission established under the presidency of French jurist Robert Badinter as a part of UN-EC peace efforts for the non-violent solution to the Yugoslav crisis – reported that early recognition could make the situation worse, Germany announced the recognition of Slovenia and Croatia on 23 December 1991. The Kosovo War in 1999 and German involvement in the War, without a UN mandate, raised further questions on the leanings of German foreign and security policy in the post-Cold War era. Germany's policy, with regard to the use of military force, was considered as a central element of a remilitarization of German foreign and security policy. It was argued that the increasing German interest and readiness to participate in military interventions was the consequence of a deliberate strategy of German decision-makers who envisaged the use of force as an accepted means of German foreign and security policy. In line with this view, German decision-makers gradually expanded the scope of Germany's contributions to "out-of-area" operations by utilizing what was called 'salami tactics'[7]. So that, the pressure of Germany's western partners was to be seen less as causes of German policy changes, but more as welcome opportunities for the proponents of re-militarization to legitimize their course. Even, it was argued that Germany was in the process of "coming of age", becoming more "self-confident" and assertive, feeling less inhibited by its pre-World War II legacy. In the eyes of the abnormalization critics, Germany was again "militarizing" its foreign and security policy, thereby returning to the dubious past of "power politics" (*Machtpolitik*) and "a security policy of reconfrontation"[8]. In a nutshell, the anxieties, created by the early recognition of Croatia and Slovenia increased with the Germany's involvement in the Kosovo War,

[7] Baumann, Rainer and Hellmann, Gunther, "Germany and the Use of Military Force:'Total War',the 'Culture of Restraint' and the Quest for Normality", *German Politics*, Vol.10 No.1, April 2001, pp.63-64

[8] Ibid., pp.64-66

and brought the question whether Europe and the wider international community would face a new ‘‘German Question’’ or would this question be resolved in a peaceful and democratic way given the habitual civilian and multilateral policy orientation of German foreign and security policy?

The academic studies since the reunification of the country have focused on whether German foreign and security policy is in a process of radical change or is continuity dominating over change. However, these studies have mostly held a biased view to the issue. The tendency in these studies has been to take a theoretical position and to correct this position without looking at the issue in a wider sense and without taking the practice into consideration. This thesis tries to avoid such a biased and one-sided perspective and asserts that the evolution of Germany’s foreign and security policy from the early 1990s to the Kosovo War of 1999 enable us a comprehensive policy record to test whether there is a radical shift from the civilian and multilateral policy orientation and established parameters of German foreign and security policy or not. On the one hand, civilian orientation is tested through a particular emphasis on the evolution of country’s policy vis a vis the use of force and Germany’s participation in the “out of area” operations. On the other hand, the established multilateral character of German foreign and security policy will be based on Germany’s membership in international organizations, especially in EU. The key questions with regard to Germany’s multilateralism have been (regarding EU) whether Germany has kept its objectives of European integration and the extension of ‘European values’ to the Eastern Europe or has it moved from this multilateral orientation and pursued a ‘go it alone’ policy? From this point of view, this study aims to analyze German foreign and security policy with a strong reference to its civilian and multilateral character and finds that although there have been some modest modifications, civilian and multilateral policy orientation remains a fundamental parameter for German foreign and security policy. In this sense, the main concern will be the civilian and multilateral orientation of German foreign and security policy and the conceptual and practical dimensions of the international and domestic factors shaping German policies. A special emphasis will be given to link

the theoretical and practical aspects of the issue to a more analytical and wider framework.

In approaching the issue and linking the theoretical and practical aspects, the study will make use of the conceptual framework of the selected (realist, neorealist and constructivist) international relations theories to contextualize and conceptualize German foreign and security policy in a more comprehensive way. In other words, the study will use *The Intellectual and Political Functions of Theory*[9] as the title of Hans Morgenthau's article suggests: Firstly, the conceptual framework provided by the theories is significant due to the fact that today the scope and complexities of world politics demand an understanding of a much wider range of issues. Especially, since the end of the Cold War, the structures and processes of world politics have been undergoing a speedy transformation, which in turn has created more interdependence. The greater interdependence in world politics involves greater complexity and dynamism as more and more actors engage in more and more elaborate relationships with each other. The expansion of these relational networks increases the probability that any new development in one relationship will have ever more extensive and intensive rippling effects across the network of relationships. In this sense, in order to deal with this transformation and complex web of relational networks, especially regarding German foreign and security policy, it can fairly be argued that the conceptual framework provided by theories enable intellectual order to the subject. From this perspective, the conceptual framework becomes a necessary and primary tool to enable the study to conceptualize and contextualize historical and contemporary events regarding German foreign and security policy.

Secondly, it is recognized that any theoretical approach has an explanatory capability on its own conceptual base. However, the scope of this study has made the choice of the conceptual framework provided by the realist, neo-realist and

[9] Morgenthau, Hans, "The Intellectual and Political Functions of Theory", in Morgenthau, Hans, *Truth and Power: Essays of a Decade, 1960-1970*, New York: Praeger, 1970, pp.260-261

constructivist accounts more logical in the sense that each of them has strong arguments in explaining the issue. The selection of these three approaches is far from a total neglect of other approaches or theoretical perspectives regarding the issue, but rather, this is a practical reason. The relative strength of the selected approaches vis a vis the others have been influential in selection process and it is argued in this study that an interaction between the conceptual framework of these three accounts may set forth a more comprehensive understanding and explanation to the phenomenon under question. The perspective held here is contrary to the general tendency within the discipline of international relations that has not largely been so far from the chicken-egg discussion. Many studies within the discipline have been colored by the biased thinking and strictly positioned theoretical and conceptual approaching. Mostly the analysts have followed the methodology of selecting an approach and then aiming to explain the focused issue through the lens of the selected approach. This has caused a neglect or disregard of other approaches. Rather than providing a comprehensive and analytical analysis of the issue under focus, the strict choice-based studies have remained one-sided. Leaving aside the strong points of other approaches in the name of theoretical consistency and without a focus on the overall process and dimensions of the issue, they have thus missed a better analysis of the issue.

This study rejects the above-mentioned biased perspective and aims at a comprehensive and analytical analysis of the issue through using the strengths of the conceptual framework provided by the realist, neorealist and constructivist perspectives. Regarding the issue of sustaining civilian and multilateral orientation of German foreign and security policy during the post-Cold War era, it is to be clearly set forth that the three perspectives do not challenge each other while constructing the research questions and methodology, analyzing the foreign policy practices via the conceptual framework and explaining the answers to the questions towards the issue. Rather than substituting each other, these perspectives and their conceptual frameworks are contextualized within a manner to converge and coexist in the study. This is due to the fact that all three approaches have some points in

addressing and explaining the issue because factors they put forward have played concerted and prominent roles during the reconstruction process of German national identity, in the larger context, and in German foreign and security policy-making, in particular.

The realist conceptual framework that regards the anarchical international system as a system due to the structural power competition among the sovereign, rational and unitary states, will enable the study to deal with Germany's national interests. Hence, in realist conceptualization, the pursuit of power by individual states takes the form of promoting national interests, and thus, the state can be defined as the organization that provides protection and welfare in revenue[10]. Among the objectives of the states, the most important is the protection and promotion of vital interests. Although the definition of vital interest may shift due to the changing political, economic and technological conditions, it is no doubt that every state regards the safeguarding of certain interests to be of overriding importance to its security. Ralph G. Hawtrey claimed that "So long as international relations are based on force, power will be a leading object of national ambition"[11]. The claim about the pursuit of power by any state in an anarchical international system is acceptable and understandable, but to define power solely in military terms and disregarding the importance of political, economic and technological power is misleading. As argued by Joseph S. Nye, a "soft power" as an actor that co-opts rather than coerces other actors, may obtain the outcomes it wants in world politics due to the fact that other countries admire its values, emulate its example, aspire to its level of prosperity and openness. Nye calls this as command power that is essentially the power of attraction, distinguishing it from coercion and inducement[12]. However, this does not mean that military power and its use in the inter-state relations is out of the agenda. As A.J. P. Taylor mentions in his analysis of Otto von

[10] Gilpin, Robert, *War and Change in World Politics*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981, p. 15

[11] Hawtrey Ralph G., *Economic Aspects of Sovereignty*, London: Longmans, 1952, p.19

[12] Nye, Joseph S., *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*, New York: Public Affairs, 2004, p.5

Bismarck: "Though Bismarck lacked humbug, he did not lack principles… They were principles founded in distrust of human nature, principles of doubt and restraint… Take his most famous sentence: 'The great questions of our time will not be settled by resolutions and majority votes – that was the mistake of the men of 1848 and 1849 – but by blood and iron'"[13]. From this perspective, the realist conceptual framework will be used to identify and explain Germany's national interests in terms of providing security and welfare without shifting from its civilian and multilateral orientation. However, the use of force as a last resort, within a multilateral framework, to prevent human suffering and to promote the observance and strengthening of international law in German foreign and security policy will also be approached (the part dealing with the involvement of Germany in the Kosovo War will approach the issue within this context).

The neorealist conceptual framework will enable the study to focus on the international setting and the systemic-structural considerations shaping German foreign and security policy. As Kenneth Waltz suggested "by depicting an international political system as a whole, with structural and unit levels at once distinct and connected, neo-realism establishes the autonomy of international politics and thus makes a theory about it possible"[14], this study will make the use of neorealism and its conceptual framework to understand and explain structural considerations of German foreign and security policy. According to Robert Gilpin, the essential elements of the system, and its characteristics, are determined by the perceptions of the actors themselves. The system encompasses the actors, states, whose actions and reactions are considered by the other states as source of foreign and security policy. This makes the system become in effect an arena of calculation and interdependent decision-making[15]. The international system, in this sense, becomes a realm created by states, but going beyond their control. As Gilpin

[13] Taylor, A. J. P., *Rumours of Wars*, London: Hamish Hamilton, 1952, p. 44

[14] Waltz, K. N., "Realist Thought and Neo-Realist Theory", *Journal of International Affairs*, Vol.44 No.1, 1990, pp.29-32

[15] Gilpin, Robert (1981), op. cit., p.38

mentions “states create international social, political, and economic arrangements in order to advance particular sets of interests. However, obviously they do not have complete control over this process” [16]. For Gilpin, the international system has a reciprocal influence over the state behaviour: On the one hand, the system constrains the state behaviour and exercises form of control on the state’s foreign and security policy practices not to destabilize the established international order. On the other hand, the system affects the ways in which the states in the international system seek to achieve the above-mentioned interests and goals. In this sense, international system becomes a mechanism to provide constraints and opportunities for actors to advance their national interests[17]. In a similar vein, Kenneth Waltz identifies the regularity and similarity in forms of state behaviour and interests via the systemic forces upon the states[18]. Based on the realist accounts but with systemic considerations, Waltz claims that in anarchical international system, the struggle for power and security has become the recurrent feature of international relations and will reassert itself, and says, “In international politics, overwhelming power repels and leads others to try to balance against it”[19]. Yet, given the systemic-structural considerations of Germany and constraints on German foreign and security policy, can German foreign and security policy-thinking and making be understood merely through struggle for power? Not, for sure. The bipolar international structure constrained West German foreign and security policy and conferred on it a role of civilian power with a multilateral orientation. When the bipolar structure ended with the dissolution of the Soviet Union, did the structural constraints, shaping German foreign and security policy, end? John Mearsheimer argued that the long peace of the Cold War was a result of three factors: The bipolar distribution of military power in continental Europe, the rough equality of military power between the US and the

[16] Ibid., pp.25-26

[17] Ibid., pp.25-26

[18] Waltz, K. N., “The Origins of War in Neorealist Theory”, *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, Vol.18 No.4, Spring 1988, pp.615-628

[19] Waltz, K. N., “America as a Model for the World?”, *PS: Political Science and Politics*, Vol.24 No.4, 1991, p.669

SU, and the pacifying effect of the presence of nuclear weapons. Thus, the collapse of the SU removed the central pillar upon which the bipolar stability was built, argued Mearsheimer. For Mearsheimer, multipolar systems were notoriously less stable than bipolar systems because the number of potential bilateral conflicts was greater, deterrence was more difficult to achieve, and the potential for misunderstandings and miscalculations of power and motive was increased[20]. Within this perspective, it is fair to argue that the Cold War period was relatively more stable due to the reasons pointed out by John Mearsheimer. However, it is misleading to argue that German foreign and security policy is no more shaped by structural considerations and constraints. As the conceptual framework of the neorealist approach sets forth and as this study shows in dealing with the international setting, systemic-structural considerations and constraints play a crucial role in both shaping German national interests and providing mechanisms to pursue these interests.

The constructivist framework will enable the study to deal with the social factors and structures shaping German foreign and security policy. The two core assumptions of constructivist approach will guide the study in organizing the conceptual framework: The first one is that the fundamental structures of international politics are (also) social rather than strictly material. Second assumes that these structures shape the identities and interests of the actors, not only their behaviour[21]. Accepting the existence of material realities, in addition to social ones, constructivists focus on how the material world shapes, affects and changes interactions, and also is affected by it. In the words of Emanuel Adler, "the view that the manner in which the material world shapes and is shaped by human action and

[20] Mearsheimer, J. L., "'Back to the Future': Instability in Europe After the Cold War", *International Security*, Vol.15 No.4 Summer 1990, pp.6-19

[21] Wendt, Alexander, "Constructing International Politics", *International Security*, Vol.20 No.1, 1995, pp.71-72

interaction depends on a dynamic normative and epistemic interpretations of the material world"[22].

The end of the Cold War was neither predicted nor could be adequately explained by neorealists and neoliberals. This facilitated the aim and need to bring an understanding to world politics and to political issues studied within the discipline, and for the purpose of this study to German foreign and security policy. The constructivist concepts play a crucial role in understanding and explaining the foreign and security policy orientation and Germany's policy practices those have been implemented with a strong reference to these concepts:

One of the key constructivist concepts is identity. The concept is helpful in explaining a wide variety of German foreign and security policy actions. As Barry Buzan and Ole Waever mentioned, "We prefer to take a social constructivist position 'all the way down'. However, identities as other social constructions can petrify and become relatively constant elements to be reckoned with". For Buzan and Waever, "when an identity is … constructed and becomes socially sedimented, it becomes a possible referent object for security". Moreover, Buzan and Waever claim that "Especially, we believe security studies could gain by a constructivism that focuses on how the very security quality is always socially constructed: issues are not security issues by themselves, but defined as such as a result of political processes"[23]. Identity is socially constructed through identification and self-other bifurcation and becomes a determinant in defining the parameters and range of inter-state relations. Identity is constructed within the social environment of political spheres, and state identity constructed by both international and domestic spheres. The identities of states vary across time and space, and these identities depend on political, historical, social and cultural processes and contexts. Within this framework, West German identity was constructed on the principles of liberal-

[22] Adler, Emanuel, "Seizing the Middle Ground: Constructivism in World Politics", *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol.3 No.3, 1997, p.322

[23] Buzan, Barry and Waever, Ole, "Slippery? contradictory? sociologically untenable? The Copenhagen school replies", *Review of International Studies*, Vol.23 No.2, April 1999, p.243

democratic ethos. The self-other identification of West Germany, following the World War II, was contextualized in a framework within which West Germany was recognized as an equal partner within the western community, as a country that had to be incorporated into western bloc and its institutions. Following the reunification the situation did not change. The liberal-democratic ethos continued to be the determinant factor in German political system, and thus in the structure upon which Germany's foreign and security policy was settled. With regard to the self-other identification, Germany continued to be committed to political system and institutions of western community and with no serious direct threats to its security.

Another concept is culture. Culture is presented to refer both to a set of evaluative standards, such as norms or values, and to cognitive standards, such as rules or models defining what entities and actors exist in a system and how they operate and interrelate[24]. This study will make use of five functions of culture in contextualizing and conceptualizing German political system and German foreign and security policy: The first function is that culture forms the framework within which political process occurs. Within this context, it creates a structure that points out the actors what is dear to them, what is important and precious to achieve. Second, culture fulfils the function of a bridge in the sense that it connects individuals and collective identities through providing and maintaining a sense of shared common past and a common future[25]. Third, culture has the function of defining group boundaries and organizing action within and between them. Fourth, culture provides the framework for the members of the group to interpret and explain the motives and actions of other group members. Fifth, through all these functions, culture becomes one of the main sources of political organization and mobilization of a community, society or nation.

---

[24] Jepperson, R. L., Wendt, A. and Katzenstein, P. J., "Norms, Identity, and Culture in National Security", in P. J. Katzenstein (ed.) *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politic,* New York: Columbia University Press, 1996, p.33

[25] Ross, M. H., *The Culture of Conflict: Interpretations and Interests in Comparative Perspective*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993, Chapter 1

The concept of interest is also crucial in constructivist terminology in the sense that identity, culture and self-identification of Germany is reflected and instrumentalized through the foreign and security policy interests of Germany. The tendency of the mainstream approaches has been to define interest as the pursuit of power by individual states that takes the form of promoting national interests. However, rather than an outcome-based focus, the constructivist approach aims to improve the explanatory capability of its analysis through treating the concept of interest as a social construction that is not fixed, natural or universal. In this sense, what is important for constructivists is the content of the interest, which is constituted through various processes, and that is shaped differently depending on the inter-state interactions, domestic structures of the state and society, and the social structure of the international system. As these processes and structures shape interest, (for constructivists) there becomes a clear connection to be established between the identity, (political) culture and the interests of the state.

The concept of interest and its contextualization in German policy practices, as reflected in later parts of this study, has been a good test case for the relevance of theoretical and conceptual perspective held here. As P. J. Katzenstein has correctly set forth while conceptualizing his culture of national security, some interests such as mere survival and minimal physical well-being exist outside the specific social identities; they are relatively generic[26]. In this sense, the realist and neo-realist perceptions those are accused to be deterministic and acting with the givens are corrected by a constructivist, Katzenstein, who regards survival and minimal physical well-being as generic. This is actually not so far from the realist and neo-realist premise claiming that state interest is survival within a self-help system. If the international system is anarchic and this structure of the system shapes state interests, policies and actions, the realist and neo-realist premise can be reflected from the constructivist perspective as the socializing effect of the anarchic

[26] Katzenstein, P. J., "Introduction: Alternative Perspectives on National Security", in P. J. Katzenstein (ed.) *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politic,* New York: Columbia University Press, 1996, p.60

international system that shapes state's identity as an entity that has to stand on its own and construct its national security culture with the basic objective of survival.

As mentioned earlier, the context designed to study the selected issue shall be far from mere determinism. In this study, I argue that the explanatory capability of the theoretical perspectives and their conceptual framework may differ according to the issue selected. For some studies or approaches, there may not be a necessity to meet conceptual thinking with practical discourse. However, this study will become more comprehensive and enhanced when Germany's foreign and security policy practices are contextualized within a conceptual framework, and will provide an analytical analysis of the issue under focus. As the concern of this study is German foreign and security policy, the factors determining German political interests, the implications of systemic-structural factors over policy-making process and identity-culture factors shaping the very core of German political and policy choices, all, play prominent role in this study.

On the one hand, as realist approach and realist concepts set forth and Katzenstein agrees, Germany's generic interests of survival, physical well-being and desire for security, in a system of uncertainties, remain effective as if they are given. West Germany kept the goal of reunification (throughout the Cold War period) as the central strategic objective of the country, sustained it as an issue on the agenda, prepared the ground and timing to achieve this objective and realized it when systemic conditions became proper. West Germany's determination for reunification reflects that issues determined to be national interests, in the case of reunification it can even be presented as a generic interest, have been permanent for West Germany. Following the reunification, (as stated in White Paper 2006) "ensuring the sovereignty and integrity of German territory and preventing regional crises and conflicts that may affect Germany's security, wherever possible, and helping to

control crises"[27] as one of the basic objectives of German foreign and security policy is a reflection of the existence of national interest in Germany.

On the other hand, the changes in the international system with the dissolution of the Soviet Union and the end of the bipolar international structure shaped/shape German foreign and security policy-making and acting. The international system and the structure within have had impact on Germany in two ways: On the one hand, it has been influential in determining security and threat perception of Germany, and on the other, it has created structures to shape German policy-making and actions.

In addition, the existence of these realist and neo-realist elements and concepts does not mean the absence of constructivist elements and concepts. The civilian and multilateral policy orientation of West Germany following the World War II has been sustained during the post-Cold War period. This is to a great extent due to the new security culture of the country that came into being after World War II that has not only been identical with "never again"s (such as never again war, never again human suffering) but also with internalized values (such as liberal democracy, economic welfare, human rights, civilian means and ends in foreign and security policy) and has been processed with multilateral institutions.

Given the above-mentioned facts and premises, the conceptual framework provided by the realist, neo-realist and constructivist perspectives provide a comprehensive and strong framework to analyze German foreign and security policy. Such an approach empowers the explanatory and analytical capacity of the study in approaching the issue. To this end, this introduction chapter tried to set forth the initial and basic remarks for the conceptual framework (that is to be detailed in the following chapter) for the organization of the study.

[27] White Paper 2006 on German Security Policy and the Future of the Bundeswehr, issued by the German Federal Ministry of Defence, 2006, p.28

Following this introduction chapter, within which the subject matter of the study, methodology to approach the issue and initial remarks for the conceptual framework is set forth, the second chapter deals with the conceptual framework in a detailed manner. This will be done in connection with the early discussions and concerns on German foreign and security policy in the aftermath of German reunification and end of the Cold War. In this regard, I will primarily deal with the anxieties caused by the sudden and unexpected reunification of Germany. I will reflect concerns and questions of the international community about how German foreign and security policy would be shaped with reunification and the new international structure. While dealing with these discussions and concerns, the conceptual framework will be used to organize the study, in order to reflect that realist, neorealist and constructivist factors coexist in German foreign and security policy. This coexistence and conceptual framework will be established on a variety of powerful influences that have militated against sharp and destabilizing departures from Germany's civilian and multilateral foreign and security policy orientation. The first set of these influences are located at the international level (international structure and international institutions). The analysis at the international level will focus on structural considerations and constraints shaping German foreign and security policy. Considering that the neorealist approach and concepts accomplish a reciprocal impact on policy-making process (constraining state behaviour and providing mechanisms for states to pursue their interests), the question of how the structural considerations shape Germany in defining its national interests (realist factors) will be studied in this part. The constructivist considerations and concepts shaping policy-making process will be analyzed in the part dealing with the second set of influences located at the domestic level (national capacity and national predispositions; national predispositions with ideational and institutional sources with a strong reference to political culture). In this part, I shall make primary use of John S. Duffield's *World Power Forsaken*. In addition to Duffield's book, official documents, such as the White Paper of 1994 and White Book of 2006 (both issued by the German Ministry of Defense), will be used in this chapter.

The third chapter will be on the institutional setting for the making of German foreign and security policy. Since the conceptual framework brings the international and domestic settings together, this chapter will focus on the analysis of the latter. As the national institutions are the sources of national predispositions, one of the pillars of the domestic setting, the process of domestic interest formation and foreign policy formulation and the role of various actors in foreign and security policy-making will enable the study to become more comprehensive. The chapter will start with the initial concern about the diversification between foreign policy and external relations. The structural transformation and growing interdependence in the international system has deepened decentralization and has enabled new actors to get involved in policy-making process. The remaining parts of the chapter deal with the issue of authority sharing in foreign and security policy, the structure and changing tasks of the foreign service and involvement of Bundestag and Bundestrat in policy-making process. Through referring to UNIDO debate of 1996, it will be reflected in this chapter that foreign policy is a primary area in German's institutional organization. In the final part of this chapter, I will argue that decentralization, involvement of various actors and democratic control on political process have contributed to the sustainability of civilian and multilateral orientation.

The fourth chapter will give a historical background of West German foreign and security policy. Since the previous chapter deals with the domestic setting of the country with special focus on interest formation and national institutions involved in foreign and security policy-making process, this chapter will approach the international setting and the way international structure and international institutions shaped West German foreign and security policy. In order to identify whether there is a shift from policy orientation or there have been small policy adjustments without a fundamental shift from civilian and multilateral orientation, a historical background is necessary. The historical background will enable the study to identify the parameters of West German foreign and security policy, during the Cold War era, in order to have a better understanding of the evolution of German foreign policy, during the post-Cold War era, with regard to the new roles, responsibilities

and objectives. This chapter will make an analysis of why the "German Question" could not be solved following the World War I, but could be solved in a peaceful way following the World War II. I will argue that whereas following the World War I the Versailles Treaty was one of the main reasons for the continuation of the "German Question", following the World War II, the existence of a serious Soviet threat played a crucial role in providing proper conditions for integrating West Germany into the western community. After this analysis, the following part of this chapter mainly deals with the adoptation of West Germany into the political system and the institutions of the western community and alliance. Germany's role in European integration, as well as the 'path' to the country's reunification, will be tried to be examined.

The fifth chapter will approach the issue of German foreign and security policy in the post-Cold War era and the use of force. In line with the conceptual framework, the coexistence of the realist, neorealist and constructivist factors will be revealed through both the international and domestic settings: How the internalized values, political culture and domestic institutions (constructivist factors) shape foreign and security policy and national interests; how the international setting (neorealist factors) constrain policy-making and interests through the international structure and provide mechanisms (international institutions) for Germany to pursue its interests; besides these, there will be concern on Germany's generic interests (realist factors), such as the security and well-being of the German territory and citizens and welfare of the country. The chapter will start with a focus on the changing international structure, new issues facing German policy-makers and priorities of German foreign and security policy in an era of uncertainties. Germany and the use of military force and German multilateralism, with an initial concern of conceptual clarification - clarifying what civilian power means – will be analyzed in the following part of the chapter. The issue of the use of military force will be held within a historical context and the evolution of the "out-of-area" debate will be approached through reference to specific involvements in the use of force. The Kosovo War, with a special focus on Germany's diplomatic efforts for a diplomatic

and non-military solution to the problem and Germany's participation in the Kosovo War, will be discussed in a detailed manner. The Kosovo War is crucial in the sense that for the first time since 1945 German forces took part in offensive combat mission against a sovereign state. The most striking point was that it took place under a Red-Green coalition (who were traditionally anti-militarist) and without a UN mandate. The following part of this chapter will approach German multilateralism that has become a guarantee for Germany and international community, in the process of addressing Germany's foreign and security policy concerns and interests, and preventing a shift in political orientation of Germany. However, it will be mentioned in this part that it has not been an easy task for Germany to match different responsibilities in different international institutions. Finally, the problems Germany has as member of NATO, EU and the OSCE and difficulty of keeping balance in Washington, Paris and Moscow axis will be discussed. The study will conclude with an overall evaluation.

CHAPTER 2

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK FOR GERMAN FOREIGN AND SECURITY POLICY

Although the foreign and security policy-making process is defined to be a designed and purposeful process, the events leading to the end of the Cold War were neither anticipated nor adequately explained. In the academic literature, this lack of anticipation and explanation is evaluated, to a great extent, as a consequence of the dominance of the positivist understanding in the study of international relations. It is argued that this understanding contends that there is a world out there to be explained and that it takes the world as granted. Since the realists concentrate on relations between great powers on the basis of military power, they could neither predict nor adequately explain the social dynamics of the change leading to the dissolution of the Soviet Union and the end of the bipolar international structure. From another point of view, the realist conceptualization explains change in the international system with reference to war, and so, it lacked/lacks to explain the end of the Cold War without an actual war. The criticism on the approach that disregards domestic and social factors is understandable and acceptable. However, while focusing on the impacts of domestic and social factors on inter-state relations, disregarding systemic-structural and some generic factors (survival and minimal physical well-being) is also misleading.

With systemic-structural and domestic considerations and reflections of these considerations on political process, foreign and security policy becomes a particular field of overlapping perspectives. It can also be considered as a never-ending process for the state. It is through such a process of foreign and security policy-making that the state constantly tries to adjust itself to its ever-changing environment. In addition, this process has to be sustained in a manner to coincide with its internal definition. The outcomes of these processes have vital importance for any state in the sense that the success enables and provides the state with the chance of survival and security. From this point, the foreign and security policy is a designed and purposeful process of systematic activities.

In order to understand and explain designed and purposeful process of systematic activities, this chapter is designed to provide a conceptual framework to study German foreign and security policy. The conceptual framework provided by the theories is significant due to the fact that with the structural transformation in world politics (the end of bipolar structure), the scope and complexities of world politics demand an understanding of issues in a wider framework. Thus, in order to increase the analytical capability of studies, conceptual framework fullfils an important function and contributes to the organization of the study. In this sense, this study will become more comprehensive and enhanced when Germany's foreign and security policy practices are contextualized within a conceptual framework. For this study, this framework is (more) necessary in the sense that German foreign and security policy is a unique case, within which realist, neorealist and constructivist factors coexist: It is realist in the sense that Germany aims to realize its national interests (protect its territory and well-being of its citizens, its liberal democratic political order, economic welfare and tackle with global risks and challenges); it is constructivist in the sense that identity, values and norms determine the interests and orientation of German political system and German foreign and security policy as well (on civilian and multilateral parameters); and it is neo-realist in the sense that structural considerations play a crucial role both in determination of Germany's foreign policy priorities and threat perception on the one hand, and on the other

hand, providing mechanisms for Germany (international institutions) to pursue its foreign and security policy objectives in accordance with means and ends of Germany's political orientation. Within this organizational and conceptual framework, the chapter will deal with the powerful influences of this framework on foreign and security policy-making and implementation, through the international and domestic setting.

As mentioned, the structural transformation in the international system, with the collapse of the Soviet Union, made the issue of German reunification a more sensitive issue. It was strongly argued that the rigid bipolar system and the existence of a Soviet threat had put structural constraints on German foreign and security policy. As these structural constraints disapperared with the end of the Cold War, German political orientation could change radically paralel to this structural change. The main concern of studies dealing with German foreign and security policy became whether there would be a shift in Germany's policy orientation of civilian power and multilateralism. This was basicly due to Germany's strong capability to devastate the political, economic and military atmosphere and order in the continent and in the international system.

The above-mentioned concern was depicted by Arthur M. Schlesinger, even before the reunification was realized, but where the collapse of the Berlin Wall was signaling the reunification. In his article in the *Wall Street Journal*, Schlesinger openly spoke of the possibility that Germany would have by far the largest army in Europe west of Russia. Referring to technological capabilities of Germany, Schlesinger mentioned the possibility that Germany could even acquire nuclear weapons and this overwhelming military might would be bound to reinforce both the ability and the will to dominate the continent through diplomatic, political and economic means. Arthur Schlesinger went much further and argued that by the turn of the century, a reunified Germany that was likely to become the most powerful and dynamic state in Europe, could demand *Lebensraum* to put the issues of revision of its eastern borders, new Anschluss with Austria and new outreach to German-

speaking minorities in neighbouring countries[28]. Schlesinger's view was the reflection of the chaotic situation in Europe and the wider international community.

The sudden and unexpected reunification of Germany in a short span of time created anxieties. The comments softer than Schlesinger's pointed out that the reappearence of a reunited Germany in the heart of Europe could be a mixed blessing, if not a decidedly destabilizing development[29]. For these commentators, the foreign and security policy of the reunited Germany would be characterized by a much greater independence and unilateralism, than hitherto. The aggresiveness and assertiveness would increase in the course of German foreign and security policy and according to the worst scenario, as Schlesinger put forward, Germany would seek to dominate its neighbors and even to expand at their expanse.

These scenarios took early confirmation by some German political acts and decisions following the reunification. Germany's reluctance to offer firm guarantees of Poland's western border and later the considerable pressure exerted by Germany on its European Community partners for the recognition of the breakaway Yugoslav republics of Croatia and Slovenia, formed the basis of these fears and worst-case scenarios. These fears appeared to be in line with the neorealist propositions. As neorealism strongly underpins the causal influence of a state's external environment and the state's position in the international system with a strong insistence on its relative power, the change in the international system could reinforce a significant change in German foreign and security policy.

The dissolution of the Soviet Union could sweep away many of the external constraints that had been exerting pressure on German foreign and security policy. Mainly, as the military threat posed by the Soviet Bloc ended, this could decrease the security dependence of Germany on its western allies and could result in greater

[28] Schlesinger, Arthur M., Jr. (1989), op. cit.

[29] Pace, Eric, "Scholars Say Veneer of Nonchalance Masks Worry on German Unification", *New York Times*, 11 November 1989 and Riding, Alan, "Fear of Germany Is Focus at East European Meeting", *New York Times*, 5 February 1990

freedom of action and room for maneuver for the reunited Germany. Meanwhile, reunification could augment Germany's already substantial power resources, thereby could further enhance its opportunities for pursuing influence in Europe and beyond. In addition, the potential for political and economic instability in Central and Eastern Europe and the actual conflicts in the Balkans could generate considerable pressure on Germany to act to ensure its own security.

As a result of those radically changing geopolitical circumstances, the expectations about a profound reorientation of German foreign and security policy were not illogical. From this point of view, neorealists suggested that a reunited Germany would possibly seek to acquire nuclear weapons and that it could allow its previous alliances to lapse. The neorealist approach claimed that the new course of German foreign and security policy might well have been characterized by increased unilateralism and assertiveness, Germany might normalize the use of force, and might once again seek to play the role of a great power[30].

The questions on the course of German foreign and security policy were/are directed, whether Germany will experience pronounced change and Germany will act more independently and assertively as a traditional great power; or will it continue along the line of self-restraint and parameters determined during the post-World War II era? These questions are still valid today to a lesser degree and with decreasing scepticism. The answers to the above-mentioned questions necessitate a comprehensive analysis that seeks to identify the crucial international and domestic determinants of German foreign and security policy during the post-reunification period.

The White Paper 1994[31], issued by the Ministry of Defense of Germany, stated that with the end of the East-West confrontation in Europe, Germany's

[30] Mearshimer, John, "Back to the Future: Instability in Europe After the Cold War", *International Security*, Vol.14, No.4, Summer 1990, pp.36-38; and Waltz, Kenneth (1993), op.cit., pp.66-76

security situation improved tremendously, and Germany was, indeed, perceived to be securer than at any time since the first unification in 1871. In the new geostrategic structure, Germany was/is surrounded by allies and other friendly countries rather than lying on the dividing line between two hostile blocs, and was/is faced with no direct military threats. However, this does not come to mean that Germany can afford to do completely without a national security policy.

In the immediate period following the dissolution of the Soviet Union and the end of the bipolar international system, the optimistic analysts were expecting a much peaceful and orderly international environment. However, the time quickly proved the contrary. It was the "new world disorder" that the international community encountered. Germany was no exception and even in the much more benign environment of post-Cold War Europe, Germany was/is faced with numerous and serious threats that it had to protect itself against. However, whatever form or content is, the heart of the issue found its expression in the statement of the former German Chancellor Helmut Kohl that he made to the German Parliament, "the fate of Germany and of its people will be determined by its foreign and security policy"[32].

Moreover, one could argue that the course German foreign and security policy will pursue, will also determine the fate of the continent and the wider international system. Hence, due to its central location and strong economy, reunified Germany will inevitably have considerable influence over the ongoing developments and events in Europe and the wider international system. Either Germany becomes active or remains inactive; this will have implications on the neighbouring countries. Within this framework, how Germany will take over the new responsibilities and use its power and capabilities will shape the peace, stability and order in Europe and the wider international system in the post-Cold War era. As

[31] White Paper 1994 on German Security Policy and the Future of the Bundeswehr, issued by the German Federal Ministry of Defence, 1994, pp.1-2

[32] Kohl, Helmut, "Rede des Bundeskanzlers vor dem Deutschen Bundestag", *Bulletin*, No.73, 10 September 1993, p.762

Germany's actions and policies play a crucial role in shaping the fate of the continent and the international system, a detailed and comprehensive analysis of German foreign and security policy is necessary to make projection for the future of the developments.

As mentioned earlier, the early expctations, mainly shaped by the neorealist perspective, were towards a reorientation of German foreign and security policy. However, in contrast to such expectations, German foreign and security policy since reunification has been marked by a high degree of continuity and some moderation at the same time. Since 3 October 1990, Germany has exercised considerable restraint in its foreign and security policy decisions and actions. On the one hand, the country has continued to stress cooperative approach in its security policy through a strong reliance on international institutions. Contrary to the expectations that Germany could allow its previous alliances to lapse, it has sought to maintain its previous alliances while trying to create and strengthen other European security frameworks to foster stability and cooperation in the continent. On the other hand, it has continued to underpin the use of non-military instruments to provide the security of the country, wherever possible. Within this context, it is no surprise to see that Germany has been an outspoken advocate of all types of arms control agreements and has done more than any other country to promote and support political and economic reform in the former communist countries of Central and Eastern Europe.

As stated in the White Book 2006, the overall military capabilities of the country have declined considerably and German foreign and security policy-makers have shown no interest in the acquisition of nuclear weapon[33]. In this sense, contrary to the initial fears, Germany has acted with little more assertiveness or self-consciousness (maybe to be termed as self-awareness) in the field of foreign and security policy since reunification when compared to its policy record of the Cold War period. Even, as will be reflected in the following chapters, German political leaders have consciously refrained from the role of a traditional great power.

[33] White Paper (2006), op. cit., p.23 and p.36

The argument of continuity does not mean that there have not occured some noteworthy adjustments in German foreign and security policy since the reunification. As the neorealist approach foresaw, the changes in the international system and conditions necessitated some policy adjustments for Germany. The most significant one is that Germany has become increasingly involved in international peace missions in places called "out of area", the territories not covered by NATO area. However, it has to be mentioned that these departures or adjustments have been highly consistent with Germany's overall approach to the concept of security, especially its multilateral character.

The departures or adjustments may at the first sight seem to be coinciding with the expectations of the neorealist approach. However, as the foreign and security policy record of Germany has been characterized by continuity and restraint, this record does not fit easily within the neorealist theory. It is due to the fact that neorealism strongly emphasizes the international distribution of power and suggests substantial, even menacing change, following the change in the international system or power distribution. Although some sort of assertiveness or self-consciousness seems to be existing in the course of policy, Germany's record does not coincide with increased unilateralism that neorealist theory expected due to the country's enhanced capabilities and the greater room for maneuver the country has enjoyed since the dissolution of the Soviet Union and the reunification of the country.

In line with the above-mentioned inconsistency, in *Social Theory of International Politics*, Alexander Wendt formulated three kinds of macro-level systemic structures to replace the neorealist approach: The first is the Hobbessian which entails orientation of the self towards the other with the subject position of enemy. In Hobbessian understanding, adversaries observe no limits to violence towards each other. The second is the Lockean approach in which the subject position is rival. Rivals are competitors who can use violence to advance their

interests. However, violence has limits and members will refrain from killing each other. The third is the Kantian in which the subject position is friend. In this understanding, parts develop common values, allies come together, do not use violence towards each other and take a common position against the aggressor[34].

Whatever position is taken, the common thing in these three views is that in the formulation of foreign and security policy what is important is not only how a state perceives the outside world and constructs its identity (and accordingly formulates its policy), but also how it is perceived by other states. Thus, foreign and security policy becomes a process of mutual construction, in which the systemic/structural and domestic/internal factors interact and play a crucial role. Within this context, from Wendt's dictum that "anarchy is what states make of it", the system or policy is what the states construct of it.

The interplay of various factors makes the concept of national security a highly contested concept. Even at the height of the Cold War period, although the analysts argued that the concept of security had often been cast too narrowly in purely military terms, it was described as an "ambiguous symbol"[35]. During the Cold War and before, security was primarily defined in military terms and was concerned primarily with the national security of the territorial state. In an anarchical international system – that refers to the absence of a legitimate international authority – states were responsible for their own security and the only reliable means to guarantee their own security was the military power. The position of smaller states necessitated alliances with or security guarantees from larger powers, whereas the great powers regarded the balance of power as the key mechanism for status quo and providing security in the international system.

[34] Wendt, Alexander, *Social Theory of International Politics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999, pp. 247-250

[35] Wolfers, Arnold, *Discord and Collaboration: Essays on International Politics*, Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1962

In this understanding, security referred to the absence of threat or the capability to deter the threat primarily through military means. Thus, increases in the military power have been sought to increase security by lowering the possibility of defeat. Such military preperations, although lowering the probability of defeat, may raise the probability of war by provoking the other side. This has been conceptualized as the security dilemma which Robert Jervis defines as a situation in which "the means by which a state tries to increase its security decreases the security of others"[36].

The way to overcome the security dilemma was found in integration and creating collective/multilateral structures to enhance (security) cooperation. The dissolution of the Soviet Union and the end of the East-West conflict led the discussion to the formulation of a European security architecture, in which the focus was on the need to go beyond the above-mentioned traditional Cold War focus on military power and territorial defense. The primary goal has become to develop new structures and relations that avoid realpolitik approaches to security and reduce the possibilities of the emergence of new security dilemmas. The new architecture would be designed to promote cooperation among the members; facilitate communication and provide information; develop common principles, norms and rules; constrain aggressive behaviour; and provide a basis for collective action, conflict prevention, crisis management, and the peaceful resolution of the disputes[37].

[36] Jervis, Robert, "Cooperation Under the Security Dilemma", *World Politics*, Vol.30 (January 1978), p.76

[37] Keohane, Robert O., Nye, Joseph S. and Hoffmann Stanley (eds.), *After the Cold War: International Relations and State Strategies in Europe, 1989-1991*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press,1993, p.2

The new architecture seems to be coinciding with Karl Deutsch's security community:

> A *security community* is a group of people that has become "integrated". By integration we mean the attainment, within a territory, of a "sense of community" and of institutions and practices strong and widespread enough to assure… dependable expectations of "peaceful change" among its population. By sense of community we mean a belief… that common social problems must and can be resolved by processes of peaceful change [that is, the] assurance that members will not fight each other physically, but will settle their disputes in some other way[38].

A security community involves not only the absence of war but, more importantly, the absence of the military option in the interactions of states within the security community. In pluralistic security communities such conditions can hold even among a set of independent, nonamalgamated states. The conditions for these security communities are: compatible values for the member states; that states must be relevant to each other and mutually responsive (criteria can be assessed by the level of communication, consultation, and transaction); and shared identity[39].

The end of the East-West conflict did not only start the questioning of the state behaviour, but also set forth the necessity of conceptual redefinition and enhancement. As the nature of international system and security is undergoing dramatic developments and which in turn necessitates a more conceptually sophisticated set of analytical tools, traditional approaches to security become less capable to deal with the new security agenda by themselves.

To argue that the issue of territorial defense is no more a primary issue or objective for the state is a statement that is illusionary. However, while states will

---

[38] Deutsch, Karl (et al.), *Political Community and the North Atlantic Area*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957, p.5

[39] Gartner, Heinz, Hyde-Price, Adrian and Reiter, Erich, *Europe's New Security Challenges*, Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2001, p.4

continue to pay attention to territorial defense, other security challenges are likely to demand greater attention. The new security agenda is to be filled by the issues of human rights, political stability and economic development, environmental degradation, social issues, cultural and religious extremism, migration, drug tafficking and the spread of weapons of mass destruction.

In such a complex conjuncture a comprehensive definition of security is needed. However, the key problem is to define clear criteria for specifying what is and what is not a security problem. The lack of a set of criteria and an expanded definition may cause the loss of intellectual coherence in the concept of security. In this sense, the increasing importance of the non-military dimension of security seems to pose a serious obstacle to security studies if it is to remain an analytically rigorous discipline. In addition, it poses difficulties for the nation states and specific ministries in defining the threats and determining the jurisdiction of the specific ministries if they are to formulate sound policies.

The above mentioned complexity deepened with the end of the Cold War bipolarity, the broadening and deepening of the European integration process (that is institutionally embodied in European Union), and the uneven impact of the deep-seated and far-reaching processes of globalization and regionalization that are shaping the structural dynamics of the global system. These processes have profound implications for international security, and for German foreign and security policy. Thus, there are a variety of factors that are likely to be important determinants of foreign and security policy in a wide range of settings. However, for analytical purposes and coherence of the study, these factors will be grouped into two broad categories: the factors associated with Germany's external environment and its position in the international system and the factors residing within the state itself.

Actually, this purposeful selection is a reflection of the general academic tendency, but with a prominent difference: Traditionally, scholars of international relations have aimed to explain national foreign and security policy in two most

common ways. The realist tradition looks at the state's international environment and asks how it shapes the state behaviour. The other scholars focus on the domestic sources of policy and policy-making process. It is no doubt that both approaches have greatly contributed to the analysis and explanation of foreign and security policy. However, while focusing on one aspect, neither has set forth an analysis capable of explaning the other aspects of policy. Thus, a comprehensive analytical perspective that integrates the multidimensional aspects and determinants of foreign and security policy that reside at the international framework and at the domestic setting through taking ideational, material and institutional factors into consideration, is the primary concern of this study.

As German foreign and security policy is shaped by multiple components and numerous factors shaping them, giving a conceptual and practical framework to explain the policy record and the rhetoric behind the policy-making process, is not an easy task. In order to have a better understanding and explanation of German foreign and security policy, this conceptual and practical framework will be based on realist, neorealist and constructivist approaches and the concepts they use in explaining international relations. This is due to the fact that realist, neorealist and constructivist factors coexist in German foreign and security policy. While explaining this coexistence and conceptual framework, John S. Duffield and his *World Power Forsaken*[40] will assist the study. In his book, Duffield points out a variety of powerful influences that have militated against sharp and possibly destabilizing departures from the pre-reunification status quo. The first set of these influences are located at the level of the international system or Germany's external environment. Even some of these factors are consistent with the neorealist theory if it is broadened to include features of the international environment other than the distribution of power, such as the political rhetoric and values of the nearby states.

Regarding the sources of continuity and restraint, two major factors, which do not fit in the neorealist proposition, have to be stressed in this point: At the

[40] Duffield, John S., *World Power Forsaken*, California: Stanford University Pres, 1998

international level, German foreign and security policy has been greatly shaped by the dense network of European security institutions in which Germany has been enmeshed. This has affected the policy-making of Germany in two ways; on the one hand, they have placed concrete constraints on some aspects, especially Germany's military posture. On the other hand, they have provided Germany with valuable opportunities for addressing security concerns and otherwise pursuing its national interests, which have served to channel German foreign and security policy in predictable and non-threatening directions[41]. Whether it is done with this motive or not, a simple cost/benefit analysis sets forth that: Although it may not be fully satisfactory from the German perspective, institutionalized cooperation with other countries has continued to offer Germany greater returns at less cost than a unilateral and much more assertive policy course would have yielded.

The other important factors can be found in the domestic setting of German foreign and security policy. In addition to the guiding and constraining effects of the Europe and international-wide institutions where Germany takes part, the country's distinct post-World War II security culture that has not changed much following the end of the Cold War and the reunification of the country, reinforces the idea of continuity and restraint[42]. German political and academic elite in particular and German society in general sustain a well-defined set of fundamental beliefs and values having crucial implications on the foreign and security policy rhetoric and policy formulation. These values can be claimed as: deep skepticism about the appropriateness and utility of using military force in external relations, a pronounced preference for multilateral over unilateral action, a fervent desire to be perceived as a reliable partner, and a strong aversion to assuming a leadership role in international security affairs[43].

[41] Duffield, John S. (1998), op. cit., p.5

[42] Müller, Harald, "German Foreign Policy After Unification" in Stares, Paul B., ed., *The New Germany and the New Europe*, Washington D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1992, pp.161-62

[43] Duffield, John S. (1998), op. cit., p.5

The non-militarist and multilateralist security culture has become a determining component of Germany's security policy, and in larger context, political culture. Though the use of force within a multilateral context and for humanitarian reasons is not totally neglected, the civilian or non-military instruments of foreign and security policy have been upheld, and the influence of the European security institutions on German politics has been enhanced through this culture. As a result, German policy-makers have consistently acted to work with institutional rules and through institutional channels. Therefore, it is not surprising that Germany has favoured to strengthen the existing international institutions.

The following part of the study will deal with considerations and factors shaping German foreign and security policy located at the international and domestic levels.

2.1 The International Setting

As comes with the concept itself, international relations as a discipline is primarily concerned with the actions and interactions of the states in the international system. Therefore, it is the most logical step to start the foreign and security policy analysis with the international setting. As neorealists (structural realists) mention, the international system shapes foreign policy of states by placing constraints on state behaviour. The international system is the source of any state's foreign and security policy concerns and provides mechanisms or channels to deal with these concerns, such as international organizations or alliances. In dealing with the sources and determinants of the state behaviour, there is a diversity of views focusing on different aspects of the state behaviour and its international

determinants. Among these determinants in the international system or international setting, the first one this study will be concerned is international structure.

2.1.1 International Structure

The realist school formulated its views in reaction to the liberal utopians of the 1920s and 1930s. Realists regard power politics as a necessary and endemic feature of all types of relationships among the sovereign states. The states are presented as the primary actors and basic units of analysis, whose behaviour can be understood rationally as the pursuit of power conceptualized to be the primary component of the national interest. In this sense, states are defined to make similar choices on specific issues, and their foreign and security policies are shaped, even determined, by the security-related goals of survival and autonomy in a self-help system.

Realists argue that inter-state behaviour occurs in an environment of ungoverned anarchy that makes states seek to maximize their utility and make choices among alternative policies on the basis of cost-benefit calculations. This is the basic reason that realists draw attention to the reality of conflict in international relations and to the lessons to be learnt from its cyclical and recurrent patterns. Being the first to offer such a comprehensive account of the practice in connection to theory, realism is considered by many as the foundational theory of the discipline.

Accepting the realist premises on the characterization of state (that presents state as a sovereign, rational and unitary actor) and the international system (an anarchical system within which states seek to maximize their power capabilities for survival – in this self-help system, the structural power relations between states and the existence of conflict as a real factor within a system characterized by struggle for

power), neorealists aim to bring a systemic approach to the study of international relations. The basic difference comes out with regard to the sources of these premises. Whereas the traditional realists argue that power and the struggle for power is rooted in the nature of states seeking survival (based on the realist considerations on human nature), neorealists focus on the anarchical condition of the international system that imposes the accumulation of power as a systemic requirement on states. In this sense, neorealism goes beyond the actions of individual states and treats the international system as a separate domain that conditions the behaviour of constituent states through its structure[44]. Thus, through depicting an international political system as a whole, with structural and unit levels at once distinct and connected, neorealism establishes the autonomy of international system and makes a theory of it possible. In this sense, the premise that international relations can be contextualized as a system with a precisely defined structure becomes neorealism's fundamental departure from traditional realism[45]. In Kenneth Waltz's own words, "neo-realism develops the concept of a system's structure which at once bounds the domain that students of international politics deal with and enables them to see how the structure of the system, and variations in it, affect the interacting units and the outcomes they produce" and through this conception Waltz points out that "international structure emerges from the interaction of states and then constrains them from taking certain actions while propelling them toward others"[46]. Through this understanding, the structure of the system becomes system-wide component that differentiates neorealism from classical realism and the structure appears to be the central concept to be studied and explained by the neorealist approach[47].

[44] Burchill, Scott, "Realism and Neo-Realism" in Burchill, Scott (et al), *Theories of International Relations*, New York: Palgrave, 2001, p.90

[45] Waltz, K. N., (1990), op. cit., pp.27-28

[46] Ibid., pp.27-28

[47] Waltz, K. N., *Theory of International Politics*, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1979, p.101

In the above-mentioned sense, the structuralist approach of neorealism focuses on the constraining characteristic of the international system and international structure on state behaviour, the way structure shapes foreign and security policy and national interests of a state; for the purpose of this study, German foreign and security policy and Germany's national interests. In this regard, the several centuries-long anarchic arrangement of the international system that has enabled the organizing principles of self-help and the need for security, direct the efforts of states towards national policies seeking survival in the system. Thus, the structure forces all states to cope with this structural principle[48].

Kenneth Waltz distinguishes between structures and his analysis is concerned with one particular aspect of the international system. This is to say that the neorealist approach of Waltz treats and analyzes the political dimension of the international system as distinct from the economic, social or other aspects of the international system. Thus, Waltz's neorealist approach confines itself to the political realm and focuses on international political structure. However, it will be misleading to argue that the entire neorealist and realist explanation of foreign and security policy is completely coloured by power-structural factors. The geographical context, the proximity of powerful adversaries and the types of military capabilities the states possess have crucial impact on the policy-making process. Whether states can and do acquire defensive or offensive military capabilities shapes the behaviour of the states, although the consequences vary depending on the relative advantages of defensive and offensive military postures[49]. Even, classical realists such as Morgenthau consider the character and internal properties of other states as determinants of foreign and security policy of a state. Whether the states are seeking to preserve international political and territorial status quo or they seek to revise the settled order is considered to have great importance[50].

---

[48] Tayfur, M. Fatih, "Systemic-Structural Approaches, World-System Analysis and the Study of Foreign Policy", *METU Studies in Development*, Vol.27 No.3-4, 2000, p.10

[49] Posen, Barry R., *The Sources of Military Doctrine: France, Britain, and Germany Between the World Wars*, New York: Cornell University Press, 1984, pp.3-6

From all these, the international structure (with its political, geographical and other realms) shapes the foreign and security policy of the state. Primarily, it determines the nature of the security problems a state may face and their sources, whether they stem from the internal instability of neighbouring states, the aggressive intentions or actions of expansionist powers, or simply the mere existence of states with offensive military capabilities. Thus, the international structure affects the policy mechanism in both ways, namely determining the sources and responses of the process: On the one hand, it determines the magnitude and the immediacy of the problems, on the other hand, it shapes the form of the responses the state will enable to pose the problem.

The following part of the chapter deals with international institutions that have been instrumental in the above-mentioned reciprocal influence of international setting and international structure. Through constraining policies of states with institutional affliations and values, and providing mechanisms for states to pursue their interests, international institutions play a prominent role in shaping foreign and security policy of a state, for this study, of Germany.

2.1.2 International Institutions

Although it will be discussed in detail later (through German considerations and policy practices vis a vis and in international organizations), the role of the international institutions that has a crucial significance on the foreign and security of

[50] Morgenthau, Hans J., *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*, New York: Knopf, 1966, pp.39-40.

a state, even greater in case of Germany, needs to be mentioned here for the coherence of the conceptual framework. It is not difficult to observe that the realist perspective, which is mainly motivated to study the role and distribution of power, pays little attention to the role of international law, treaties, regimes, organizations and institutions. As institutionalist thinkers such as Stephen D. Krasner and Robert O. Keohane point out, international institutions may have influence on foreign and security policy of states. They argue that like international structure, international institutions can shape, and even, alter the incentives that sovereign, rational and unitary states face in the external environment.

The international institutions can influence the foreign and security policy of the states through three mechanisms: International institutions may effectively control the state behaviour through treaties; regimes and other types of agreements; and norms and rules. These mechanisms are specified to define the actions that states are expected to legitimately make or unmake under the determined conditions. Many aspects of the foreign and security policy (such as armament-disarmament, customs and conventions of war) are regulated by the international institutions[51].

Even though the act of constructing international mechanisms and working within the international institutions imposes restrictions on the freedom of states, there are satisfactory reasons for states to comply with the rules of international institutions. Most of the states tolerate some sort of constraint on their actions and decisions to exploit the opportunities provided by the international institutions because disregarding institutional rules may risk jeopardizing the useful instruments of policy for the states.

There are three most important ways the international institutions are more likely to effect state behaviour: First, compliance may foster compliance by other parties, to the institutions, effectively conferring a degree of control over their military capabilities, or it may enhance a state's reputation, resulting in lower levels

[51] Duffield, John S. (1998), op. cit., p. 18

of mistrust and a greater willingness on the part of others to cooperate on specific issues. The means for enforcing compliance is weak, or even non-existent in some institutions, but the violation of rules and obligations is not cost-free. This non-compliance with the rules and obligations may result in a reduced reputation in trustworthiness, the enmity of other states, or the imposition of punitive sanctions[52].

Secondly, through providing valuable opportunities for addressing security concerns, and thus, pursuing national interests, international institutions provide another channel to shape the state behaviour. Institutional channels established by these organizations, may reassure the states about the others' intentions, and thus, may reduce tension and mistrust by predictable state behaviour. With the help of international institutions, states may achieve some security goals at less cost or more effectively. As in the case of Germany, alliances enhance the security of states against the external threats and may permit them to maintain smaller military forces. In the same manner, arms control agreements may place constraints on states and provide information about other states' activities and capabilities, and thus, may enable states to forgo the acquisition of certain military capabilities and other destabilizing actions.

Thirdly, international institutions may become a source of pressure for states to adopt certain policies. By joining an institution, a state may assume obligations to take actions in some contingent circumstances that it otherwise might not wish to take by itself, such as providing assistance to one another even at the risk of being drawn into war[53].

[52] Ibid., p.18
[53] Ibid., p.19

2.2 The Domestic Setting

To start the analysis of the foreign and security policy of a state through the international setting may be the logical step, but it is not satisfactory by itself. As mentioned earlier, the international system shaping foreign policy of states *via* constraints on state behaviour is the source of any state's foreign and security policy concerns and may also provide mechanisms or channels to deal with these concerns. International structure and institutions may suggest specific guidance for state decisions and actions, but state compliance is not automatic and state decisions in other areas of foreign and security policy may be lacking. Thus, even if the international setting offers some injunctions, states do not always conform their decisions and actions to those guidelines. This may create disjuncture between the national policy that might be prescribed and that might be pursued by a state in the given international setting. Then it is no surprise that states which find themselves in similar strategic conditions may act differently or states which can be in different strategic conditions may act similarly.

As Peter Gourevitch made the point "The world sets constraints and offers opportunities. The explanation of the variance within those limits… requires analysis of internal politics"[54]. Historical, domestic political, economic and social conditions can also have pressure on state decisions as well as the international setting, and thus, can shape the foreign and security policy decisions and actions of

[54] Gourevitch, Peter, "The International System and Regime Formation: A Critical Review of Anderson and Wallerstein", *Comparative Politics*, Vol.10 No.3, April 1978, p.436

the state. This makes the consideration of domestic setting necessary for a comprehensive analysis of the state behaviour and to explain why states in similar international conditions may behave differently and why states may even act in defiance of international structural and institutional imperatives.

In dealing with how the domestic factors and social conditions (constructivist elements) shape the ends and means a country (for this study, Germany) contextualizes its foreign and security policy to define and pursue its national interests, the ontological propositions and conceptual framework provided by constructivism will be helpful.

Regarding the ontological propositions of constructivism: The first one is that to the extent that structures can be said to shape the behaviour of states or individuals, normative or ideational structures are just as important as material structures. Like the strong insistence of neorealists on the material structure of the balance of military power and of Marxists on the material structure of the capitalist world economy, constructivists argue that systems of shared ideas, beliefs and values also have structural characteristics and they exert a powerful influence on actions and interactions of actors.

Secondly, constructivism proposes that understanding how non-material structures condition the identities of actors is important due to fact that identities inform interests and actions. From the constructivist perspective, neo-realists and neo-liberals are not interested in where preferences of actors come from and they only deal how they pursue these interests strategically. With such a perception, both the domestic and international society are considered strategic domains, places in which previously constituted actors pursue their goals, places which do not alter the nature or interests of these actors in any meaningful way, for neo-realists and neo-liberals. However, for constructivists understanding how actors develop their interests is key to explaining a wide range of issues that rationalists fail to understand and explain. In order to do so, constructivists focus on the social

identities of actors and follow the principle that "identities are the basis of interests"[55].

The third proposition contends that agents and structures are mutually constructed. Normative and ideational structures shape identities and interests of actors, but these structures would not exist if it were not for the knowledgeable practices of these actors. To explain this claim with an example Christian Reus-Smit says, the international norms that uphold liberal democracy as the dominant model of statehood and license intervention in the name of human rights and the promotion of free trade, just exist and persist through the continued practices of liberal democratic states[56].

In the same line with ontological propositions, John Ruggie asserts that "Constructivism is about human consciousness and its role in international life" and for Ruggie constructivist premises may be outlined as follows: human interaction is shaped primarily by ideational factors, not simply material ones; the most important ideational factors are widely shared or "intersubjective" beliefs those are not reducible to individuals; these shared beliefs construct the identities and interests of purposive actors[57]. The ideational factors and social conditions find their place in constructivist conceptual framework through identity, culture and interest (as explained in the introduction part) and these factors are contextualized in this study under the domestic setting that shapes foreign and security policy of a state.

There may be identified two ways through which the foreign and security policy of a state is shaped by the domestic setting: The domestic setting determines the ability of a state to pursue different courses of action to be called as the national

[55] Wendt, Alexander, "Anarchy is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics", *International Organization*, Vol.46 No.2, 1992, p.398

[56] Reus-Smit, Christian, "Constructivism", in Burchill, Scott (et al), *Theories of International Relations*, New York: Palgrave, 2001, p.218

[57] Ruggie, J. G., "Together? Neo-utilitarianism and the Social Constructivist Challenge", *International Organization*, Vol.52 No.4, Autumn 1998, pp.855-858

capacity. States sharing similar rankings in the international distribution of power may vary in their ability to support or implement particular type of policies due to varying national capacities. Secondly, the domestic setting effects estimations of the necessity, effectiveness, appropriateness, and desirability of alternative policies, to be considered as national predispositions. These predispositions are used in a closer manner with the concepts of national interests and national preferences.

Although the realist and neorealist studies identify international setting as the main mechanism for the determination and shape of these national interests and preferences, it is a fact that besides the international systemic conditions and as constructivists set forth, domestic setting also plays a crucial role during the process. The domestic setting may vary temporally and cross-nationally, even though the international setting seems to be relatively stable. In order to have a better understading and explanation of domestic factors on the ends and means of foreign and security policy, the domestic setting will be studied through national capacity and national predispositions.

2.2.1 National Capacity

In democratic political systems, one can speak of three forms of domestic factors shaping the national capacity, and thus the foreign and security policy of the state. First of all, national capacity refers to the totality of material and immaterial resources, available for policy activities. Economic, technological and demographic conditions, like the number of people to serve in the military and the level of economic activity are the basic sources of the national capacity. It is no doubt that the strength of these resources effects the power position of state in the international

system. However, as much as the international setting, the level of resources affect the policy choices of the states, such as their ability to produce nuclear weapons or to improve conventional military capabilities necessary for national defense.

Secondly, the ability of the state to mobilize and extract resources from the country to use for both domestic and external political concerns is one of the determinants of the national capacity. Constitutional, political, economic and administrative structures of the state determine its extractive capacity. This capacity may vary with the state's authority and legitimacy, in cases where the consent of the population is needed, as in the cases of taxation and conscription.

Thirdly, the existence of other domestic and external concerns may cause competing claims over the state resources. The use of national resources for domestic problems and social programs limits the amount of resources to be used for the implementation of foreign and security policy actions of state.

It can fairly be argued that many of the domestic determinants of national capacity are relatively stable and vary only slowly over time. However, fluctuations in the national economy and changess in the magnitude of competing social demands can be subject to sharp short-term shifts. Thus, the ability of and the policies pursued by the state may vary for domestic reasons even the state's position in the international setting remains relatively stable.

2.2.2 National Predispositions

The choice of a particular political community regarding the foreign and security policy decisions is shaped by two basic sources when the national predispositions are taken into consideration: the first one is the sets of ideas relevant to foreign and security policy those are widely shared within the society or particularly by the political elites. The other source might be coming from the national institutions' effectiveness in the formulation of the policies.

a) Ideational Sources of National Predispositions: Political Culture

The most important source of national predispositions, and thus the foreign and security policy, of a particular society is its political culture. The concept of "political culture" refers to the subjective and often unquestioned orientations toward and assumptions about the political world that characterize the members of the community in guiding and informing their behaviour[58].

Ronald L. Jepperson, A. Wendt and P. J. Katzenstein are more concerned about the materialist tendency to remove political culture from the study of national

[58] Ebel, Roland H., Taras, Raymond and Cochrane, James D., *Political Culture and Foreign Policy in Latin America: Case Studies from the Circum-Caribbean*, Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991 pp.3-10; and Duffield, John S. (1998), op. cit., p.23

security. For them, "materialists need not ignore cultural factors altogether. But they treat them as epiphenomenal or at least secondary, as a 'superstructure' determined in the last instance by a material 'base'". However, Jepperson, Wendt and Katzenstein consider the concept of political culture to be key to the study of national security policies. They claim that "We require an approach to security that does not assume that actors deploy culture and identity strategically, like any other resource, simply to further their own self-interests"[59]. Instead, interests are treated as contingent upon the social environments from which they derive meaning, by these theorists. For them, "security environments in which states are embedded are in important part cultural and institutional, rather than just material", and thus, they look at these environments and interests of states through the lens of political culture. In this sense, political culture is presented to refer both to a set of evaluative standards, such as norms or values, and to cognitive standards, such as rules or models defining what entities and actors exist in a system and how they operate and interrelate[60].

While dealing with the political culture, it must be set forth that the concept is not dealt with in a monolithic manner. Charles Tilly, in his *Coercion, Capital, and European States AD 990-1992*, states that the character of state (the political culture and activities of state) depends on the function of economy. The way and the ends economic activity is used determines to what extent the political culture of state becomes coercion-intensive, capital-intensive or capitalized coercion. Coercion-intensive states, such as 19th century Germany, become more central with high taxes on people and ready for military activities. In this sense, it might be argued that as the state gets more involved in military activities, its political culture is shaped by coercion-intensiveness. Whereas in capital-intensive states, such as Great Britain, the way the economy functions prevents a strong central structure, and in these states the taxes are lower and spread to longer periods. The state is involved more in economic activities and military activity is limited, and thus, its political culture is

[59] Jepperson, R. L., Wendt, A. and Katzenstein, P. J. (1996), op. cit., p.38

[60] Ibid., p.33

shaped by capital-intensiveness. In states of capitalized coercion, such as France, there is an intermediate situation and political culture is neither solely shaped coercion-intensiveness nor capital-intensiveness. Tilly defines this as:

> Both the character and the weight of state activity varied systematically as a function of the economy that prevailed within a state's bondaries. In *coercion-intensive* regions, rulers commonly drew resources for warmaking and other activities in kind, through direct requisition and conscription. Customs and excise yielded small returns in relatively uncommercialized economies, but the institution of head taxes and land taxes created ponderous fiscal machines, and put extensive power into the hands of landlords, village heads, and others who exercised intermediate control over essential resources. In *capital-intensive* regions, the presence of capitalists, commercial exchange, and substantial municipal organizations set serious limits on the state's direct exertion of control over individuals and households, but facilitated the use of relatively efficient and painless taxes on commerce as sources of state revenue. The ready availability of credit, furthermore, allowed rulers to spread the costs of military activity over substantial periods rather than extracting in quick, calamitous bursts. As a result, states in those regions generally created slight, segmented central apparatuses. In regions of *capitalized coercion*, an intermediate situation prevailed: however uneasily, rulers relied on acquiescence from both landlords and merchants, drew revenues from both land and trade, and thus created dual state structures in which nobles confronted – but also finally collaborated with financiers[61].

Tilly's definition provides a valueable contribution to analyze political culture through the means and ends the economic activity used. However, it may not be enough to understand and define political culture. There are some other factors as ingredients of political culture such as systems of beliefs, values, patterns of attitudes, mindsets and values. In this regard, in defining political culture, political scientists mainly insist on three basic components: the cognitive aspect includes empirical and causal beliefs; whereas the evaluative aspect insists on values, norms

[61] Tilly, Charles, *Coercion, Capital, and European States AD 990-1992,* London: Blackwell Publishing, 1990, p.99

and judgements; and the expressive component sets forth emotional attachments, patterns of identity and loyalty, and feelings of affinity, aversion or indifference.

Besides this, political culture has three important characteristics: First, political culture is a property of collectivities rather than simply of the individuals who constitute the society. This necessitates a focus on the beliefs and values shared by most of the members of the community, if not all, or its political elites rather than the individual members[62]. Secondly, principally political cultures are assumed to be distinctive. The political culture of one society or its political elite is not one to one identical with that of another society. This quality of the political culture is significant in explaining the different political behaviours of the states those are similarly situated in the international system[63]. Thirdly, political cultures are relatively stable when compared to the developments in the international system and even within the society itself. As in the case of Germany, due to dramatic events and traumatic experiences, significant adjustments which are required to discredit core beliefs and values of the society may occur, but as mentioned, these are not frequent. The stability of the political culture is a result of: First, alternative ideas are relatively few and enjoy little support by the members of the society. Second, it is difficult to change the evaluative elements such as values, norms and moral judgements. Third, potentially disconfirmable cognitive aspects of the policy can be underestimated by the psychological phenomenon of consistency-seeking[64].

As mentioned earlier, the role of the political culture in foreign and security policy choices of the states has been underestimated due to the strength of the strategic (culture) studies. However, shared attitudes of the society may be crucial in

[62] Elkins, David J. and Simeon, Richard E. B., "A Cause in Search of Its Effect, or What Does Political Culture Explain?", *Comparative Politics*, Vol.11 No.2, January 1979, pp. 127-129

[63] Pye, Lucian W., "Culture and Political Science: Problems in the Evaluation of the Concept of Political Culture" in Schneider, Louis and Bonjean, Charles M. eds., *The Idea of Culture in the Social Sciences*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973, pp.72-73

[64] Larson, Deborah W., "The Role of Belief Systems and Schemas in Foreign Policy Decision Making", *Political Psychology*, Vol.15 No.1, March 1994, p.25

understanding and explaining the policy-making process. Although the military strategy is component and reflection of the both political and strategic culture, normative and effective components of the political culture shall not be disregarded, in order to make a comprehensive analysis of the foreign and security policy of a state. The components of the political culture can be grouped into five. Whereas the first three are more concerned with the subjective beliefs of individuals rather than shared or inter-subjective cognitive phenomena, the remaining two can be presented as the more formal and explicit categories[65]: The first of these concerns is derived from the world views or perception about the nature and functioning of the international system and state's position vis a vis the others in the system. Thus, world views condition the range of issues to which attention is devoted by influencing what people notice in the external environment. In this sense, through influencing the diagnosis of the political situations, world views shape how foreign and security policy issues are defined. As K. Boulding mentions:

> The people whose decisions determine the policies and actions of nations do not respond to the "objective" facts of the situation, whatever that may mean, but to their "image" of the situation. It is what we think the world is like, not what it is really like, that determines our behaviour[66].

In accordance with the nature of the state in a states system, the views and perceptions that influence the diagnosis of the political situations and shape foreign and security policy of the states are required to structure a complex and confusing world in order to sustain its existence[67]. As Boulding makes the point state perceives

[65] Duffield, John S. (1998), op. cit., pp.24-25

[66] Boulding, K. E., "National Images and International Systems", *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol.3 No.2, June 1956, p.120

[67] George, Alexander L., "The 'Operational Code': A Neglected Approach to the Study of Political Leaders and Decision-Making", *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol.13 No.2, June 1969, p.200

the international system as it thinks what the system is like. Thus, state 'mind' is concerned with the questions of what are the principal features of the international system; what are the possibilities of cooperation and the peaceful resolution of conflicts, and thus, is conflict inevitable or avoidable; regarding the intentions of other states are they friendly or hostile, do they pose threats or offer opportunities*. The perception of the state (of the international system) and these questions lead the state's definition of itself and its position in the international system.

The second category is related to the matters of identity loyalty and emotional attachments. These are related to the questions of how strong the sense of national identity is; if there are feelings of affinity, aversion or indifference toward other states; whether the members of the society identify with and express loyalty toward larger regional or global political entities.

The third category aims to question a subset of the evaluative component of political culture and consists of the principal goals and values of political life and asks what are the appropriate and desirable aims of national foreign and security policy; how should they be prioritized; in the most common way what is the national interest. On the one hand, some certain minimal policy goals follow from views the people hold, and on the other hand, basic values may establish a range of ends that policy might be designed to achieve.

The remaining two categories seem to have a more direct effect on the foreign and security decisions and actions of the state. The first one sets forth the necessity of the causal beliefs to provide guidance to achieve the preferred outcomes in the case of uncertainty about the external environment. The questions to be asked here are what are the likely consequences of alternative courses of action; will the benefits of an action outweigh the costs; which kinds of instruments are most useful

* Keith L. Shimko divides images of other states into six categories: their goals, objectives and intentions; their underlying motives; their capabilities; their decision-making processes; their likely responses to one's own policies; their images of one's own state. For further information on state perception and images see Shimko, Keith L., *Images and Arms Control: Perceptions of the Soviet Union in the Reagan Administration*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1991

for achieving foreign and security policy goals; and the most crucial is how effective the use of military force is. The view the people hold define the framework of possibilities for state action, and thus, the types of options that states may use in decision-making and implementing policies are conditioned.

The final category is more ethical and legalistic. It underlines the shared norms regarding the appropriate political behaviour. What actions and policy instruments are legitimate for achieving political goals; what are the proper and ethical forms of conduct *vis a vis* other states are the key questions. The norms and values define the instruments and tactics that are considered to be acceptable or legitimate and place restrictions on the types of policies to be implemented[68].

Political culture is likely to narrow the range of policies to be implemented in certain circumstances. In addition, political culture is a crucial factor in providing continuity in political process against the rapidly changing conditions in the external environment. As in the case of Germany following the reunification, even in the case of change in the international system, or particularly in the external environment, decision makers insist on coping with the security problems in traditional ways* or thay may continue to favour familiar approaches in trying to address new security concerns.

John S. Duffield mentions that policy decisions and political actions of the state are effected by the political culture in two major ways: First, the influence of the political culture becomes stronger at times when the international setting is characterized by relatively high levels of complexity, uncertainty and ambiguity. In such situations, the security problems facing the state are less clear and the costs/benefits of alternative actions are less obvious. In this sense, policy-makers tend to more readily fall back on their pre-existing world views and notions of the

[68] Duffield, John S. (1998), op. cit., pp. 24-25

* By traditional ways, it is meant here the democratic, multilateralist and civilian political culture settled following the World War II.

effectiveness of alternative policies. In addition, as mentioned above, the political culture provides continuity in political discourse and the settled elements of political culture are less likely to be challenged by the steady arrival of discrepant information about the external environment.

The second aspect I think resembles democratic conditionality. Political culture, no doubt, finds explanation when the decision-making, or in general policy arena, is not under jurisdiction of one person or a small group of people. As far as the influence a single person or a small group exerts on political process is kept limited, the policy is more likely to conform to the general principles suggested by the political culture and not be coloured by idiosyncratic beliefs and values. Democratic control of the society provides broad trends in policy over long periods and prevents specific and spontaneous actions held under high secrecy[69].

Most of the studies, on foreign and security policies of the states, within the discipline of international relations, have underestimated the role of the political culture. However, I think that political culture plays a significant role in foreign and security policy choices of states. The shared attitudes of the society may be crucial in understanding and explaining the policy-making process. As mentioned earlier, the military strategy is a component and reflection of the both political and strategic culture. However, normative and effective components of the political culture shall not be disregarded in order to make a comprehensive analysis of the foreign and security policy of a state because political culture is an ingredient of the framework within which policy-making and implementation is made.

Political culture is a significant ideational source of national predispositions, but it is not the only one. The following part will deal with another source of national predispositions; institutional sources.

[69] Duffield, John S. (1998), op. cit., pp.27-28

b) Institutional Sources of National Predispositions

Following the ideas related to political culture and thus foreign and security policy of a state, the second basic source of national predispositions is the national institutions. Like its counterpart political culture, national institutions as the sources of national predispositions assume continuity in the political discourse. These predispositions are the vestiges of the previously dominant policy-related ideas those have been transmitted as the rules, missions and procedures of policy-making process and administrative structures within it. Through institutionalization, certain values and principles may continue to constrain the range of political decisions and actions.

The constitution of a state may be one of the most important institutional sources of predispositions as it serves as the enduring sources of constraints and imperatives. However, constitutions offer few explicit or substatantive guidelines and they may not decisively determine the political discourse. Thus, the institutions acting under the central government's authority and responsible for the formulation and implementation of policy seem to be the most important institutional sources.

Primarily, the organizational processes and operating procedures of these institutions may act as lenses the policy-making mechanism perceives the outside world and constrain the information to which decision-makers are exposed. In addition, these institutions delineate specific policy instruments and actions available at a certain time. As Graham Allison explains in the analysis of the Cuban Misilse Crisis "existing organizational routines for employing present physical capacities constitute the range of effective choice open to government leaders confronted with any problem"[70]. Finally, the preferences of the bureaucracy and some other organizations responsible for policy-making and implementation may play crucial

[70] Allison, Graham T., *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis*, Boston: Little, Brown, 1971, p.79

role. These organizations generally act in the direction of their organizational character and may sometimes advocate policies that serve their interests. Then, it is no surprise that particular attention has been paid to the impact of military organizations on the making of foreign and security policy[71].

As mentioned earlier, this chapter tried to establish a conceptual framework for this study for organizing the study to overcome the complexity of issue (difficulty of foreign policy analysis in an international system that is characterized by uncertainty, unsustainablity, interdependence and complex web of interactions together with involvement of various actors). For a comprehensive analysis of foreign and security policy of a country, both the international and domestic settings of the country must be analyzed. The analysis of international and domestic setting is done through the coexistence of the conceptual framework provided by realism, neorealism and constructivism. This stance is different from the general academic tendency in International Relations, within which the biased thinking has coloured the theoretical approaching. Mostly the analysts have followed the methodology of selecting an approach and then aiming to explain the focused issue through the lens of the selected approach. This has caused a neglect or disregard of other approaches. Rather than providing a comprehensive and analytical analysis of the issue under focus, the strict choice-based studies have remained one-sided and leaving aside the strong points of other approaches, in the name of theoretical consistency, have lacked capability of a better analysis of the issue.

Rather than competing with each other, realist, neorealist and constructivist perspectives and their conceptual frameworks are contextualized in a framework to converge and coexist in analyzing German foreign and security policy. This is due to the fact that all three approaches have capabilities in addressing and explaining the issue. More clearly, factors they put forward have played concerted and prominent roles during the reconstruction process of German national identity, in the larger context, and in German foreign and security policy-thinking and making

[71] Duffield, John S. (1998), op. cit., pp.29-30

specifically. The international setting (neorealist factors), with its international structure and international institutions, has a reciprocal influence on German foreign and security policy: On the one hand, it constrains and shapes Germany's foreign and security policy interests (realist factors). On the other hand, it provides mechanisms for Germany to pursue its national interests. The domestic setting (constructivist factors), with its national capacity and national predispositions, also, shapes German foreign and security policy. As the identity, culture (political culture), norms and values shape considerations, ends and means of German foreign and security policy through the domestic setting, the analysis of domestic setting is also crucial for the analytical capability of the study. To conclude, in this chapter, the conceptual framework provided by realism, neorealism and constructivism was contextualialized through the international and domestic settings. Then, this conceptual framework will be reflected through German foreign and security policy practices in the following parts of the study, starting with the latter.

The success of the study necessitates an analysis of the foreign and security policy-making process within the country as the national institutions are the sources of national predispositions and political culture, and thus the foreign and security policy of the country. In this sense, the following chapter will deal with the process of domestic interest formation and foreign policy formulation for a comprehensive analysis.

CHAPTER 3

DOMESTIC INTEREST FORMATION AND FOREIGN POLICY FORMULATION

This chapter will deal with the process of domestic interest formation and foreign policy formulation of Germany in order to have a better and comprehensive understanding and explanation of German foreign and security policy. The conceptual framework, set forth in the previous chapter, necessitates and guides this part of the study. Since the national institutions were/are presented as the sources of national predispositions, one of the pillars of the domestic setting, the analysis of the role of national institutions in foreign policy-making and the role of policy-making process on German foreign and security policy orientation, enables this study to be more comprehensive and analytical. The implications of the structural change (the end of Cold War and the process of globalization) on interest formation and policy-making process will be studied in this chapter. It will be argued that although the foreign and security policy-making process has become more complex with new issue areas and involvement of new actors (specialized ministries and non-governmental actors), foreign policy is still a primary area of concern for Germany, with the Foreign Office in charge. Moreover, the democratic control on policy-making process, decentralization in German political system and discontinuity in domestic politics are presented among the sources of continuity for Germany to sustain its civilian and multilateral foreign and security policy orientation.

Actually, the process of increasing international integration through the means of shared political values, common economic systems, information technologies and transportation networks, has been underway for some time and had/has attained dimensions which are implicated in the concept of globalization. In the existing state of the international system growing interdependence has become one of the main characteristics of the international or global system. Within this international or global system, no state is any longer in a position to defend itself on its own against the threats and dangers emanating from political, economic and socio-cultural problems. When these systemic trends and tendencies combined with reunification and attainment of full sovereignty on its existing territories, the necessity for redefining its position in the international system and the role its foreign and security should play, became inevitable for Germany.

The transformation in the international system was triggered with the end of the East-West conflict. With the dissolution of the Soviet Union, the direct military threats towards Germany disappeared. However, this has not eased the formulation and implementation of foreign policy. It is likely that the emerging new threats like ethnic and religious conflicts, economic crises, environmental degradation, problems of migration and organized crime may pose a greater danger to stability and security. Since the parameters of threat perception and security are to be adapted to the new environment and conditions, so the analysis of foreign and security policy and policy-making process have to be analyzed in order to identify and understand how a country (for this study Germany) adjusts its policy-making structure and institutions to the new international structure and security environment. With these adjustments in policy-making structure and institutions, foreign and security policy-making becomes an area that shall not be restricted to the institutions with which it is traditionally associated. When the former Foreign Minister Klaus Kinkel envisioned the future role of the Foreign Service as to provide services to commerce and business representatives, journalists and politicians in addition to the Service's

traditional duties[72], he signaled some sort of structural adjustments in foreign and security policy-making mechanism.

Through the transformation process, both in the international system and foreign and security policy-making structure, specialized ministries are also getting involved in bilateral, multilateral and international network in addition to the Foreign Service. Such a transformation in the field of foreign and security policy has brought about consequences for the policy-making process and necessitated a redefinition for the policy areas and actor involved in these areas: Whereas 'foreign policy', by definition of the appropriate actors such as the cabinet, the chancellor and the foreign ministry, serves the official interests of the state as a whole; 'external relations' refers to the totality of relations with the outside world that may be maintained by other political and societal actors, political parties and interest groups, which are not traditionally associated with foreign policy.

The above-mentioned necessity for redefinition of the policy-making process and institutions, and bifurcation between the foreign policy and external relations has raised the question of the extent to which a traditional concept of national foreign and security policy can be functional and successful within an international system that is characterized by complex interdependence, uncertainty and unsustainablity. The emergence of new issues and new forms of threats in the post-Cold War era combined with the broadening of participation in foreign policy by various actors has made the policy-making process further complex. It is a fact that states continue to define the regulatory framework for these transnational and non-state actors. However, transnational and non-state actors, whose decisions affect foreign and security policy and whose activities at times have considerable domestic, regional and international consequences have joined traditional actors and institutions, dominant in foreign and security policy-making.

[72] Kinkel, Klaus, "Diplomat: ein Beruf ohne Zukunft?", *Die Welt*, 12 November 1997

Traditionally, foreign and security policy has been the only area without a significant influential pressure group in Germany. In the domestic context, foreign policy is not at the top of the list of priorities of social groups or public. However, domestic problems in general and problems emanating from German reunification in particular have tied up a major portion of the resources to be used for state activity. Thus, whenever foreign policy decisions entail financial costs, domestic debates on foreign policy priorities follow and in such cases domestic policy has the upper hand[73]. In this sense, in order to be successful, foreign policy must be based on a broad public consensus. This necessity, emanating from discontinuity in domestic politcs and providing democratic control, shapes the decisions of German governments on foreign and security policy. As was the case during the debate on the introduction of the single European currency, foreign policy issues have same potential for domestic conflict which can in the end limit the margin of manoeuvre of the government. Given Germany's changed role in the international system, it has become just as important to take stock of these institutions and resources as it is for policies to adapt[74].

In order to have a better and comprehensive understanding and explanation of German foreign and security policy, there is the necessity to make an analysis of the foreign and security policy-making process. This necessitates an analysis of the structural change in foreign and security policy-making process:

a) In terms of structural change, changes in international system or setting take the first place. Since the international setting is a primary source for the state to formulate its foreign and security policy (through creating the environment for the state to identify its interests, forms of threats posed to its security and forms of responses it can exercise to tackle with these threats and pursue its interests),

[73] Haftendorn, Helga, "Aussenpolitische Prioritaten und Handlungsspielraum: ein Paradigma zur Analyse der Aussenpolitik der Bundesrepublik Deutschland", *Politische Vierteljahresschrift*, Vol.30 No.1, 1989, pp.32-33

[74] Eberwein, Wolf-Dieter and Kaiser, Karl, "Academic Research and Foreign Policy-Making" in Eberwein, Wolf-Dieter and Kaiser, Karl (eds.), *Germany's New Foreign Policy: Decision-Making in an Interdependent World*, New York: Palgrave, 2001, p.7

changes in the international structure necessitate a transformation or adjustments in the foreign and security policy-making process and institutions to enable the state to adapt the new international structure. With regard to the transformation or change in the international structure, it is a fact that there are new issue areas and new types of actors in the international system, and thus, more actors and more policy areas interrelated with the formulation of foreign and security policy in Germany.

b) Parallel to the changes in the international structure, adjustments in national structures (triggered by the emergence of new issue areas, new forms of threats and new types of actors involved in foreign and security policy process) are important as well. Since other political and societal actors, political parties and interest groups become more involved in the foreign and security policy process, and the domestic concerns on the success and financial costs of foreign and security policy are increasing, the bifurcation between the domestic politics and foreign and security policy is becoming narrower. In this regard, the internationalization of domestic policy has become a critical issue.

Under the light of these considerations, it is fair to argue that with the growing interdependence and interconnectedness, today German interests abroad are being pursued by many actors both within and outside the Federal Government. In addition to this, government policy has become subject to extreme pressure and greater requirement for justification of policies and actions. With the structural reforms of 1998: 250 comparable units were created, concerned with foreign and European policy matters; 68 operative units were created for specific countries and subjects. Moreover, for the year 2000, DM 11.18 billion was allocated to foreign affairs and the Foreign Office received only one third. Additionally, as mentioned above, with Article 23 of the Basic Law, 16 Lander have become more directly involved in European integration process; each Land has office in Brussels with a

total of 137 staff (summer 1999 statistics), of whom 87 were senior staff and Germany's Permanent Representation to EU comprised of 65 senior staff[75].

Outside the directly responsible ministries, the Federal College for Security Policy Studies (founded in 1992) aims: to increase dialogue between new and old politicians and all institutions; provide support to German companies in the international arena; create international competence – awareness of long-term national interests, which requires an awareness of history and development in international environment. In terms of international competence, the Foreign Service and the Ministry of Defense have systematic approach, whereas the other ministries and actors are more specialized and cannot read the whole system – no specialized training for work with an international dimension. In addition, the Federal College that is one of the five teaching groups of the Federal Academy of Public Administration, at the Federal Ministry of Interior, is advanced in international and supranational cooperation. Also, the Post-Graduate School of Administrative Sciences, in Speyer, offers a specialized European integration programme[76].

c) The adjustments in foreign and security policy-making process and the narrowing bifurcation between domestic politics and foreign and security policy, triggered by the changes in the international structure, brings out the third aspect of the adjustment in foreign and security policy structure: Concerns on the respective roles of various actors in policy-making process.

The following part of the chapter deals with the roles of various actors in foreign and security policy-making process, with a primary concern on how the authority is shared in this area by these actors.

[75] Von Ploetz, Hans-Friedrich, "New Challenges for the Foreign Service", in Eberwein, Wolf-Dieter and Kaiser, Karl (eds)., *Germany's New Foreign Policy*, New York: Palgrave, 2001, pp.70-73

[76] Ibid., pp.73-74

3.1 The Authority Sharing

Who or what is the actual vehicle for the conduct of foreign policy is not clearly stipulated in the German Basic Law[77]. Apart from the Article 73 which states that 'the Federation shall have exclusive legislative jurisdiction in respect of foreign affairs', the competence in this area is not specifically allocated. Actually, the Bundestag has various functions in German political system: It has the overall political responsibility vis-a-vis the electorate, whereby the election and support of a workable government, as well as the control of government can be stated as its primary tasks. In addition, a central function of the parliament is to ensure a majority capable of governing the country, and in this sense, provides a central prerequisite for the state's ability to act in foreign policy. However, although the Bundestag is legally entitled to do so, it is not able to exercise its function regarding the issue due to the close link between the government and the parliamentary majority[78]. Therefore, the debate over whether formulation and implementation of foreign policy is the sole responsibility of the executive or is a competence to be exercised jointly by both the executive and parliament is a debate raised in Germany on different occasions.

The case is complex even within the executive itself. The distribution or share of responsibility among the traditional institutions of foreign policy – the Federal Chancellery, the Federal Foreign Office and the Federal Ministry of Defense – is fluid. However, although the burden-sharing and hierarchical relationship within the executive is not clearly determined by the German constitution, it is affected both by the historical precedent and the personalities those holding the office. The

[77] Grewe, Wilhelm G., "Auswartige Gewalt", in Isensee, Josef and Kirchof, Paul, eds., *Handbuch des Staatsrechts der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, Vol.III: Das Handeln des Staates*, Heidelberg: Müller, 1988, p.921

[78] Krause, Joachim, "The Role of the Bundestag in German Foreign Policy", in Eberwein, Wolf-Dieter and Kaiser, Karl (eds.), *Germany's New Foreign Policy*, New York: Palgrave, 2001, p.158

prevailing view is that the chancellor "rules the roost"[79]. With Article 65 of the Federal constitution chancellor is given the right to determine general policy guidelines and with Article 64 he/she is vested with the power to appoint and dismiss ministers. If to mention again, the extent to which the chancellor exercises his/her constitutional authority and uses it for conducting a consistent foreign policy depends on factors such as his/her personality, ministerial appointments, coalition maintenance and party cohesion. This style of government has given rise to the notion of 'chancellor democracy' that is both a historical phenomenon and a structural element of constitutional-political system established by the Basic Law, in the German political system and foreign and security policy discourse[80].

In the above-mentioned regard, the chancellor remains the most influential and important actor in the field of foreign and security policy in principle. Moreover, the particularistic interests of various ministries have strengthed his/her position. The vague definition of the Article 65 enables the chancellor to take personal initiative and control important issues. However, changes in the international structure (new issue areas and new actors in the international system) make the chancellor remain dependent on specialized knowledge of various ministries. Thus, coordination among the ministries becomes the major task of the chancellor in practice[81].

Besides determining the policy guidelines, Chancellor is the supreme commander of armed forces in 'state of defense', responsible for external security and national defense, takes final political decisions and coordinates ministries (mainly through the Federal Security Council – Bundessicherheitsrat: BSR). In the 1980s the positions of the chancellor, foreign and defense ministers seemed to be more balanced. However, during the 1990s Chancellor became dominant and the

[79] Maunz, Theodor (et al.), *Grundgesetz Kommentar*, Munich: Beck, Article 65, LFG. 32 October 1984

[80] Siwert-Probst, Judith, "Traditional Institutions of Foreign Policy", in Eberwein, Wolf-Dieter and Kaiser, Karl (eds.), *Germany's New Foreign Policy*, New York: Palgrave, 2001, pp.19-20

[81] Ibid., p.33

case was so in the Schröder Cabinet. Under Chancellor's leadership, BSR acted/acts as a cabinet committee for security affairs. It takes decisions for the Federal Government or makes suggestions to cabinet. BSR is responsible for external and internal security. Participants of BSR include: Chancellor, foreign minister, ministers of interior, justice, finance, economics, economic cooperation and development, defense and chief of staff of Bundeswehr. Chancellor decides on the agenda and when it should convene. Ministries can, also, request a BSR meeting but whether BSR would convene or not depends on the weight of minister. It is argued that BSR was a crucial institution during the Cold War but its importance decreased since the end of the East-West conflict. However, this is not the case: Coalition agreement of Schröder Government envisaged increasing political significance of BSR[82].

3.2 The Foreign Service and Its Changing Tasks

The UN currently has 192 members, with the OSCE having 56 participating states and NATO and EU having 26 and 27 members respectively; since the World War II more than 300 international and supranational organizations have acquired prominent role in providing international cooperation, balancing interests and thus maintaining international order; over 10 000 non-governmental organizations, active in transnational relations, interface between foreign policy and citizens and play an important role in bringing foreign policy closer to the public; over 40 000 companies whose turnover are greater than the GDP of medium-sized countries, have become

[82] Rühl, Lothar, "Security Policy: National Structures and Multilateral Integration", in Eberwein, Wolf-Dieter and Kaiser, Karl (eds.), *Germany's New Foreign Policy*, New York: Palgrave, 2001, pp.104-107

significant players on the international stage; media and modern information technology have become tools of increasing international integration and increase in the amount of information available to the public; regional cooperation has increased both in quantitative and qualitative ways, and thus, some of the intergovernmental elements of countries have been transferred into Community level that has effected the constitutional structure of member countries including aspects related to foreign and security affairs[83].

During this prominent era of increasing interconnectedness and interdependence, Germany has relieved of limitations over its sovereignty and became a player in international politics with further-reaching responsibilities. This has been in concert with the developments called as 'transnational politics', and interdependence in wider context, the developments that have been reinforced by the end of the Cold War[84]. The transnational movements among societies through trade, direct investment, financial movements, the mobility of people and free flow of ideas and information have grown rapidly. This has brought certain amount of authority for the actors that have brought complex networks of interdependencies and new vulnerabilities. Such a compexity makes it difficult for states to influence the developments and conditions, and nearly impossible to control them entirely.

Germany is a country whose export form a quarter of its gross national product, and through the Schengen Agreement that provides open borders among the signatory states, German society is greatly influenced by developments in other countries. When these factors are taken into consideration, it is fair to argue that although the political objectives and priorities of Germany must be based on its own interests, it is compelled to incorporate within the definitions of its own interests the interests of other countries whose welfare, economic and political stability are of

[83] Von Ploetz, Hans-Friedrich (2001), op. cit., pp.71-72

[84] Kaiser, Karl, "Transnationale Politik: zu einer Theorie der multinationalen Politik", in Czempiel, Ernst-Otto (ed.), *Die Anachronistische Souveranitat: zum Verhaltnis von Innen- und Aussenpolitik*, Cologne: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1969, pp.80-81; Keohane, Robert O., Nye, Joseph S., *Power and Interdependence: World Politics in Transition*, Boston: Little, Brown, 1977

special concern for Germany. In this sense, each specialized ministry has de facto become a foreign ministry for its respective sphere of competence. The case of the Federal Ministry of Interior is striking. This ministry was perceived to be concerned with the domestic issues. However, the issues of international crime, illegal migration, refugees, asylum seekers, drug trafficking and border protection have automatically led the ministry, and indeed other ministries, to be involved in international issues through regular contacts with the corresponding ministries and bureaucracies in other countries[85].

In the above-mentioned sense of globalization, increasing interdependence and international integration (and an integration process within which member states of EU become more European), the challenges facing the Foreign Service are increasing. However, although the challenges facing the Foreign Service are increasing, the Foreign Service has been a key institution for Germany to pursue its national interests and it is likely to remain the central institution for the conduct of foreign and security policy. Since the foreign minister remains essentially responsible for the conduct of German foreign policy, the Foreign Service has been the most prominent institution for the conduct of this task. In this regard, the Foreign Office has developed into a cross-sectional ministry that considers itself responsible for coordinating all foreign policy, a task that is of vital importance for Germany[86].

The ability of the Foreign Service to master challenges and its well-functioning is significant for Germany to act effectively in the international system and in the multilateral organizations. The changes in the international system vest increasing responsibilities to the traditional institutions of foreign and security policy, especially to the Foreign Service, in order to ensure that German foreign and security policy is unified and acts constructively to shape the developments in the international system. This necessitates a well- and efficiently-constructed Foreign

[85] Andreae, Lisette and Kaiser, Karl, "The 'Foreign Policies' of Specialized Ministries", in Eberwein, Wolf-Dieter and Kaiser, Karl (eds.), *Germany's New Foreign Policy*, New York: Palgrave, 2001, pp.38-39

[86] Siwert-Probst, Judith (2001), op. cit., p.33

Service structure (in coordination with other ministries and actors involved in foreign and security policy-making process) to adapt the new international system. The former President of Germany Roman Herzog stated that "In a shrinking world, in which opportunities and risks alike can globalize, the globalization of German foreign policy will also be inevitable"[87]. In this regard, the following part will deal with the issue of the changing tasks of the Foreign Service to master the challenges coming up with globalization and the new international system.

With Regard to the Changing Tasks of the Foreign Service:

It is not only the nature of international relations has been changing with these developments, but also the dividing line between foreign policy and domestic policy has been blurred. There are more and more actors today involved in pursuing their own and German objectives abroad, not necessarily having the same position. The change in the structure and content of foreign policy and the number of actors involved in the field and their evolving functions give rise to significant adaptation of the Foreign Service, yet it is still the prime institution in German foreign policy.

The Foreign Service, comprising the Foreign Office and the missions abroad, holds the core ministerial competence in the field of foreign affairs residing with the foreign minister, within a single federal authority. However, it is an obvious fact that foreign and security policy-making, decisions and implementation have not been the exclusive domain of the Foreign Office. Due to the ever-evolving domestic and international conditions, specialized ministries increasingly get involved into the process[88].

[87] Herzog, Roman, "Die Globalisierung der deutschen Aussenpolitik ist unvermeidlich", *Bulletin des Presse- und Informationsamts der Bundesregierung*, No.20, 15 March 1995, p.162

[88] Andreae, Lisette and Kaiser, Karl (2001), op. cit., pp.38-42

The strong position of the foreign minister comes less from the administrative base and the competences of his/her Office than from the primacy of foreign policy itself. However, this primacy is increasingly questioned by ever-expanding activities of other ministries and by interplay of state and non-state actors. This forces the Foreign Service to take measures to adapt to these challenges[89]. In addition, the co-ordinating function of the Foreign Service brings up the problem that foreign policy can no longer be conducted as 'a unified whole' and hence the monopoly of the Foreign Service in conducting foreign policy is mostly replaced by the co-ordinating functions in areas where foreign policy is no longer comprehensive. With not only the Foreign Office, but the involvement of approximately 250 units of other ministries (excluding the Ministry of Defense) somehow in foreign and European policy of Germany, reflects how it is difficult to bring together all the individual positions to present binding unified foreign policy positions on specific issues[90].

Within this framework, with regard to the changing tasks of the Foreign Service[91], some may be outlined as follows:

• The role played by Germany's diplomatic missions in EU countries and CEECs is in the process of change. Presentation of Germany's European policies in partner countries through the means of public diplomacy has become prominent part of gaining support for German policies and position in Brussels.

• The second pillar of the Maastricht Treaty, the development of the Common Foreign and Security Policy, brings forward a qualitatively new dimension of co-ordination and action among the member states. In order to do so, the formation of a

[89] Von Ploetz, Hans-Friedrich (2001), op. cit., pp.70-71

[90] Siwert-Probst, Judith (2001), op. cit., p.26

[91] Von Ploetz, Hans-Friedrich (2001), op. cit., pp.74-75

Policy Planning and Early Warning Unit was agreed in the Treaty of Amsterdam for efficiency in decision-making and unity of action.

• Increase national and EU support for the eastward enlargement of the EU.

The new tasks, the diversification of actors involved in foreign policy and growing interdependence among these actors and policy areas make coordination a prime task for the Foreign Service. Objectives within a specific policy area of a specific ministry have to be defined and implemented in accordance with the interests of the entire state in order to enable the preservation of a policy identity at the national and international level. The asymmetric global challenges (international terrorism, environmental and climate challenge, migration, spread of nuclear weapons and energy, drug trafficking, democratization, human rights, good governance, etc.) go beyond the traditional political field and responsibilities of the ministries and force them to change their structures[92].

3.3 Foreign Policy: Still Primary

The globalization process and the involvement of specialized ministries and other actors to the conduct of foreign relations have made it more difficult to justify the particular emphasis given to foreign policy. Even, this has brought the question does traditional foreign policy continue to be so dominant that leads the primacy of foreign policy? In response to these concerns, all post-Cold War Federal Governments have underlined the primacy of foreign policy. Besides the overriding authority of the chancellor in determining general policy guidelines, the Foreign

[92] Ibid., p.75

Office remains in charge and this is valid especially in cases where the pursuit of the state's interests as a whole is opposed to special interests of other ministries. In this sense, the Foreign Office is vested with one of the most important aims of foreign policy that is to maintain smooth relations (within the context of security and economic policy) with countries having particular significance to Germany. The Foreign Office is, also, in charge of sustaining integration of Germany in multilateral organizations through renouncing a unilateral foreign policy option, with a strong insistence on using civilian means for pursuing the foreign policy objectives.

The end of the East-West conflict and the complex and interdependent structure of the international system, with more and more actors involved in broader issues of the system, have brought discussions over the primacy of foreign policy and the primacy of the Foreign Office in foreign policy. These rhetorical and institutional discussions and tensions have been taking place in Germany, especially between the Foreign Office and the Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development. The disagreement between the two institutions in the late 1996 regarding membership in the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) has been a test case: Carl-Dieter Spranger, the former Minister for Economic Co-operation and Development, called for Germany to leave UNIDO due to the fact that he regarded it as inefficient and wanted to use the funds elsewhere. However, Klaus Kinkel, the former Foreign Minister, argued to the contrary that such a move would influence directly the Federal Government's efforts to obtain a permanent seat on the UN Security Council. Withdrawal of the funds by the second largest contributor to UNIDO budget would have affected some developing countries whose support was necessary in a General Assembly meeting for the permanent seat. Thus, the Foreign Office was able to assert itself against the Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development[93].

The argument that the Foreign Office entirely controls the foreign-policy mechanism and foreign policy is sustained comprehensively, is rather misleading.

[93] Andreae, Lisette and Kaiser, Karl (2001), op. cit., pp.43-45

On the other hand, the argument denying the primacy of foreign policy and the role played by the Foreign Office within the process is another exaggeration. The situation can be better explained through a *via media* understanding. It is true that 'external relations' is challenging the dominance of 'foreign policy' both theoretically and practically through the variety of actors and issues. However, foreign policy, with the Foreign Office in charge of the process, is still primary.

3.4 The Policy-Making Process of Germany: Involvement of *Bundestag* and *Bundestrat* in European Policy

In the analysis of the foreign and security policy of a country, international and domestic settings may provide guidance to varying degrees. However, for a comprehensive analysis of German foreign and security policy, this analysis is inevitable. In addition, the national foreign and security policy of Germany is greatly influenced by the overall policy process. It is the institutional structures and rules of the policy process that determine how differing preferences are distributed and aggregated and thus which subsets of values and principles will have greater influence on which aspect of the policy-making process[94].

It is difficult to make generalizations about the policy-making process as it varies from state to state. In liberal democracies, feature of the policy process is shaped by a large continuum from party structures to electoral rules. At one extreme, as in the British political system, the members of a single political party may occupy

[94] Thelen, Kathleen and Steinmo, Sven, "Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Politics", in Steinmo, Sven, Thelen, Kathleen and Longstreth, Frank (eds.), Structuring *Politics: Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Analysis*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992, pp.1-3

all significant policy-making positions. At the other extreme, power may be divided between opposed parties, as in the American political system. German political system lies somewhere in-between and political authority may be shared by not entirely like-minded coalition partners. As Werner Hoyer sets forth, the mechanisms and structures involved working both horizontally (at the level of Federation, within the Federal Government) and vertically (between the Federation and Lander) are so complex in Germany that it makes the Federal Republic more decentralized than other countries. In this sense, German political system is defined as practicable and fair to all interests[95].

For Hoyer, the long and continuing process of European integration is the cause of the existing administrative, and in general political, system in Germany. European policy-making mechanism enables close links among decision-makers of EU member states and European actors in the wider context that leads to the definition of national positions through taking into consideration the interests of partners. Thus, this policy-making mechanism improves more far-reaching European policy objectives and keeps European policy-making away from a purely domestic understanding. In this sense, co-ordination within the Federal Government and co-operation with Bundestag, Bundestrat and the Lander takes place at various levels and has become a process subject to rules with constitutional status, laws and agreements among respective institutions. The process takes place under intense time pressure and informal contacts and forms of co-operation are established to achieve successful results with the objective of a coherent and active European policy. This web is also designed to facilitate a proper and timely representation of German interests within the European institutions[96].

---

[95] Hoyer, Werner, "National Decision-Making Structures for German European Policy", in Eberwein, Wolf-Dieter and Kaiser, Karl (eds.), *Germany's New Foreign Policy*, New York: Palgrave, 2001, p.89

[96] Ibid., pp.89-90

As to the Bundestag, the Federal Government is obliged to brief the Bundestag and give it the opportunity to give opinions on European policy issues. With Article 45 of Basic Law, Bundestag has created a Committee on Affairs of EU that is responsible for working on the fundamental European policy decisions of the Bundestag. Mechanism is sustained through the intense contacts between EU Committee, Foreign Office, Ministry of Finance and Ministry of Economics. Under certain conditions, the Committee represents Bundestag and presents opinions to the Federal Government. The procedure works in this way: Government makes available to the Bundestag relevant documents with an outline of German position. The EU Committee, also, receives reports. Issues are clarified by the Government representatives before the Committee. Committee forwards its opinions to the Government and Government takes them into account in negotiations with other member states for stronger position. Government is required to present basic opinions of Bundestag at the IGC, to ensure parliamentary consent in ratification proceedings. Any Bundestag committee is able to invite Member of European Parliament (MEPs), of Council and Commission to its sessions concerned with European policy issues. German MEPs are entitled to attend EU Committee sessions and some of them, appointed by the President of Bundestag, are authorized to participate as Committee members.

In relation to Bundestrat, Lander participate in EU affairs through Bundestrat. Each Land government has a minister responsible for European issues. Bundestrat has the right to be briefed but its participation depends on issue-base. The Article 23(5) of the Basic Law brings two clauses:

a) The Federal Government shall ‘take into account’ the opinion of the Bundestrat where in an area of exclusive federal legislative jurisdiction Lander are affected or where in other respects the Federation has the right to legislate, that is, areas of concurrent legislation or framework legislation of the Federation. The Federal Government includes the opinions of the Bundestrat here, but is not bound by them.

b) ‘Substantial consideration’ is to be given to the opinions of Bundestrat when essentially the legislative powers of the *Lander*, the establishment of their authorities or their administrative procedures are affected. The Federation’s responsibility for the country as a whole is to be observed in these instances. In the event that the Federal Government and the Bundestrat disagree, they are to attempt to reach an agreement through renewed discussions. In case they are unable to provide this, the Bundestrat may overrule the Federal Government by a majority of two-thirds[97].

Lander are involved in European policy in various ways: The Federal Government includes Lander representatives (appointed by Bundestrat) in its internal consultations. If legislative powers of Lander are affected, the Federal Government takes Lander representatives to EU-level negotiations (below the Council-level) and representatives can make statements with the consent of the Federal Government. Leadership of German negotiating team is to be transferred by the Federal Government to representatives of Lander when exclusive legislative jurisdiction of Lander is affected. This even applies to Council meetings. With the Federation-Lander Law on Co-operation in the Affairs of EU, Lander are able to maintain their own direct contacts to EU institutions and so Lander have their own Information Offices in Brussels (but this does not affect the authority of the Republic’s Permanent Representation). The Observer of EU Affairs for Lander work independent of Offices in Brussels, but in close contact, briefs to Bundestrat on activities of various bodies in Brussels and ensures that the rights of Bundestrat are respected. In addition to these, by the Maastricht Treaty, the Committee of the Regions (CoR) was established. This Committee is another direct venue for the Lander to get involved in European policy-making, with some representatives of local authorities, to compensate for the loss of certain domestic participation rights[98].

[97] Ibid., p.97

[98] Ibid., pp.95-99

To sum up, the Federal Government shares responsibility, for foreign and security policy, jointly with the Bundestag. In 1993 rulings on Maastricht Treaty and during the out-of-area debate of 1994, the Federal Constitutional Court enabled, in certain circumstances and on certain issues, the participation of Bundestrat and Lander in the formulation process of foreign policy. In addition, the formulation and the implementation of security policy is subject to the control of Bundestag through the parliamentary committees.

3.5 Decentralization for Continuity

Considerable variation in the policy-making is reflected primarily through the varying degrees of effective authority distribution, or sharing, to determine policy among the executive and legislative bodies. The distribution of power and responsibility for the prospective areas may be more or less decentralized even within the executive[99]. The distribution of positions or approaches, vis a vis the the policies to be implemented, among the major actors is another component of the picture. Different groups of policy-makers, with distinct sub-cultural backgrounds, may have different perception of the external environment of the country, and may uphold different policy goals and instruments to realize these goals.

Although it might seem to be deterministic, it may be argued at this point that the relatively decentralized political system of the Federal Republic and the domestic interest formation of the country have played a crucial role in the

[99] Kaarbo, Juliet, "Power and Influence in Foreign Policy Decision Making: Coalition Partners in German and Israeli Foreign Policy", *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol.40 No.4, December 1996, pp.501-502

characterization of the country's foreign policy. The ideas for the continuity in German foreign and security policy are, in fact, to a great extent, assured by the discontinuity in domestic politics.

The views and studies aiming to establish the connection between the domestic policy-making structure and the issue of continuity/discontinuity in foreign policy focus on how decisions are formulated and how the roles played by various actors are shared during the process. Within this context, the reunification of Germany and its repercussions on decision-making bodies have been under focus. The daily functioning of the distinct bodies, their role played within the decision-making process and decentralized structure of German political system favour those who predict the limited implications of reunification on the process and actors. As the daily activities of the Committee of Permanent Representatives (COREPER) reflect, reunification has had little perceptible impact on the European policy of Germany: No members of the diplomatic service of the GDR were introduced in the German foreign service; the foreign policy advisers of the Chancellor have been the same as they were a decade ago; and the upper reaches of the Ministry of Finance have not changed meaningfully in the last few years[100]. Thus, the basic triangle (head of government, head of foreign affairs and the Finance Ministry) has gone through the reunification process without experiencing any substantial change. The main advisers of the government are drawn from a bureaucracy whose members have spent their administrative career in a culture of European integration.

On the other hand, reunification has incorporated the new Eastern *Lander* into the German political landscape. The public in former East Germany was not involved in the European integration process in the 40 years between 1950 and 1990. Knowledge and understanding of what the Community is, how it works, what it can and cannot do, how and why it came into being is limited in other part of Europe to which the GDR once belonged. Also, the *Lander* have acquired a greater weight in

[100] De Schoutheete, Philippe, "Germany,Quo Vadis?A View From the Diplomatic World", *German Politics*, Vol.10 No.1, April 2001, p.135

European affairs as a result of constitutional changes agreed during the Maastricht Treaty ratification process in Germany. Their attitude on European issues is frequently defensive. Their ministers and officials (unlike federal politicians and civil servants) are not directly exposed to the socialization effect of repetitive contacts, ministerial meetings and European Councils. On the contrary, they fear the consequences of these meetings for their own powers of decision.

From legal point of the issue, the Basic Law not only binds German foreign policy to certain fundemental values and opens the state to supranational integration; it also establishes a constitutional environment for a strong civil society against the state in the form of basic rights. With the introduction of the new article 23 of the Basic Law, the Lander not only hold a veto power on important issues of Germany's European policy-making, but that they also sometimes oppose foreign policy choices of the federal government. As an example; in June 1997, during the Amsterdam EU Treaty (re)negotiations, the Kohl government blocked further integration in the field of Home and Justice Affairs (HJA) due to pressure by German Lander which feared losing the "national veto" in asylum policies[101].

To sum up, there is an international or global system, within which the process of increasing international integration through the means of shared political values, common economic systems, information technologies and transportation networks is underway. Moreover, in this system no state is any longer in a position to defend itself on its own against the threats and dangers emanating from political, economic and socio-cultural problems. When these systemic trends and tendencies combined with reunification, the necessity for redefining its position in the international system and the role its foreign and security should play, was inevitable for Germany. This necessitated adjustments in foreign and security policy structure and institutions to master the above-mentioned challenges. The new issue areas with the involvement of new actors has made foreign and security policy-making to

[101] Harnisch, Sebastian "Change and Continuity in Post-Unification German Freign Policy", *German Politics*, Vol.10 No.1, April 2001, pp.46-47

become an area that should not be restricted to the institutions with which it is traditionally associated. This situation decreases the ability of the Foreign Service to sustain foreign and security policy unilaterally. Thus, the Foreign Service has changed its tasks and made adjustments in its structure to adapt the new international structure and security framework, and to realize the foreign and security policy objectives of guaranteeing well functioning diplomatic relations with those countries which are of particular significance to Germany in terms of security and economic policy. However, although the new issue areas and various actors getting involved in policy-making process pose challenges to traditional institutions of foreign policy, the foreign policy is still primary area of concern with the Foreign Service in charge. The involvement of Bundestag and Bundestrat (and other actors) in policy-making process, especially in European policy, has provided democratic control on foreign and security policy. In addition, the decentralized political system of Germany, together with the democratic control and discontinuity in domestic politics, has contributed to continuity in foreign and security policy.

In the above-mentioned sense, this chapter tried to explain the process of domestic interest formation and foreign policy formulation. The analysis of the foreign and security policy-making process within the country is crucial. This cruciality is due to the fact that the adjustments in policy-making structure and institutions enable Germany to adapt the new international structure and prevent Germany of paying a high price for not fulfilling its role in the international system that comes with its increased weight and increasing responsibilities.

The analysis of the domestic interest formation and foreign policy formulation process and the adjustments in policy-making structure and institutions is conducted under the light of the conceptual framework provided in the previous chapter. The conceptual framework sets forth that the domestic setting (constructivist factors) shapes German foreign and security policy through national capacity and national predispositions, with its ideational sources (political culture) and institutional sources (national institutions). Since the national institutions are the

sources of national predispositions and also reflect Germany's political culture, and thus the foreign and security policy of the country, the analysis of foreign and security-policy making enables the study become more comprehensive. It is argued in this chapter that decentralization in German political system, democratic control on policy-making process and discontinuity in domestic politics have become (among) the sources of continuity for Germany in sustaining its civilian and multilateral foreign and security policy orientation. The domestic setting is a crucial factor in the analysis of German foreign and security policy, but is not the only one for a comprehensive and analytic analysis. The international setting that shapes and constrains foreign and security policy of a country and provides mechanisms for the country to pursue its national interests is also important. Thus, the following chapter will deal with the international setting, with a historical background that will enable the study to analyze the process of West Germany's integration into the western bloc and the parameters of West German foreign and security policy. In analyzing continuity and change in German foreign and security policy, the historical background will identify on which parameters this policy is oriented.

CHAPTER 4

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The conceptual framework provided in the introduction part and detailed in the second chapter clearly sets forth that a comprehensive and analytical analysis of German foreign and security policy necessitates the understanding and explanation of the international and domestic settings. Since the previous chapter focused on the domestic setting, mainly with the national institutions as sources of national predispositions, this chapter will deal with the international setting. As mentioned earlier, the international setting has a reciprocal influence on the foreign and security policy of a state, namely determining the sources and responses of the process, through the international structure and international institutions: On the one hand, it constrains and shapes the considerations and policies of the state, determines the magnitude and the immediacy of the problems those are influenced by proximity and relative power capabilities. On the other hand, it shapes and provides mechanisms for the form of the responses the state will enable to address its considerations and national interests.

The international setting will be analyzed here with a focus on the historical background of West German foreign and security policy. For the studies dealing with the issue of continuity and change in foreign and security policy, a historical

background is necessary. The historical background will enable the study to identify how the international setting shaped West Germany's political orientation and the parameters of West German foreign and security policy during the Cold War era, in order to have a better understanding of the evolution of German foreign policy, during the post-Cold War era, with regard to the new roles, responsibilities and objectives.

Actually, after 18 January 1871, with the unification into one national state under Otto von Bismarck, Germany had become too strong for any balance of power within the European system, which had been defined since the Utrecht settlement of 1713. The late unification of Germany as a 'nation state' was the beginning of the, so-called, 'German Question' to become a continuous problem in the international fora in general, in Eurpean political and academic landscape in particular. Timothy G. Ash defines the "German Question" as the fears of Germany's neighbours to keep such a dynamic, over-populated and geographically central-oriented country, with its huge economic capabilities, under control and not to let it again destabilize the political order and peace in the continent[102]. The 'German Question' has three important aspects related to the three dimensions of unification: First one is the German unification in terms of Germany's territorial and national unity; second one is Germany's unification in terms of Constitutional unity; and third as a problem of international status, Germany's unification within the framework of the treaties conducted to provide the stability of the European states system[103]. With all these aspects, separately or together, the German Question was a serious problem to be solved for order and peace in the European continent, and in the wider international fora.

Just as one of the main concerns of the European, and of the international, political agenda was how to solve the German Question in the last quarter of the 19th century, the German Question was once again on the table when the World War I

[102] Ash, Timothy G., *In Europe's Name*, New York: Random House, 1993, p.23

[103] Bağcı, Hüseyin, *Almanya: Yeni Bir Dünya Gücü?*, Ankara: Dış Politika Enstütüsü, 1992, pp. 2-3

ended. Thus, the following part of the chapter will deal with the way the German Question was tried to be settled following the World War I and will analyze the reasons behind the failure to find a peaceful and democratic solution to the German Question.

4.1 The Weimar Republic: Republic without Republicans

When the hopes of a victory that had been raised by the German offensive of March 1918 were destroyed by the Allied counter-offensive, the German Military High Command was to admit that the war to bring German supremacy in Europe was lost and the only way to prevent a complete military collapse was to end the hostilities immediately. The German request for an armistice was accompanied by a reform of the Reich Constitution and of the electoral system. On 3 October 1918 a new government that was also including the representatives of the majority parties was established under the new Chancellor Prince Max of Baden. On 19 January 1919 the National Assembly was elected, with women being entitled to vote and stand for election for the first time, and the Social Democrats emerged as the strongest party but did not obtain an overall majority. Together with the Centre party and the German Democratic Party, the SPD formed the, so-called, Weimar Coalition and Friedrich Ebert became the first President of the new Republic.

The constitution of the new Republic was drafted by the new State Secretary at the Ministry of the Interior, Hugo Preuss, who was a left-wing liberal and had been influenced by the liberal and democratic tradition of 1848 Revolution. The Reichstag became the central political organ. The government became dependent on its confidence and the legislative decisions were subject to hardly any restriction by

the Reichsrat, the body through which the Lander were represented. In order to create a counterweight to the Parliament, the Reich President was given considerable powers: he appointed the government and could dissolve the Reichstag; especially the Article 48 of the constitution gave him extensive powers during a state of emergency[104].

The new constitution of the new Republic was designed to pave the way towards a democratic social order and incorporate Social Democratic ideas on the welfare state. However, the disparities between the constitution and a social reality that lagged far behind its aims placed a heavy burden and led to the collapse of the Weimar Republic. In this sense, the Revolution of 1918/19 failed to bring about a truly democratic political and social order in Germany. Although constitutional monarchy was replaced by parliamentary democracy, success in realizing the goal of transforming the state, the economy and the society was limited. In the words of the historian Friedrich Meineke, in the spring of 1919, so far "no complete revolution of the political and social order has taken place in our country"[105].

The Treaty of Versailles and its implications for domestic political environment, also, played a significant role in the failure of the transformation. In the Treaty of Versailles the victors dictated that Germany should be largely disarmed and cede certain territories (territories rich of coal and steel reserves), and this considerably weakened the economic power of the country. Reparation demands became a financial burden and this was triggered by the fact that the German currency had lost much of its value as a result of the war debt. The clause that Germany bore sole responsibility for the War was used to justify reparation demands. The unity of the country remained intact, but the Germans in Austria were

[104] *Questions on German History: Paths to Parliamentary Democracy*, German Bundestag Public Relations Division Publication, Bonn, 1998, pp. 211-212

[105] Ibid., p. 206

not permitted to join the Reich and to that extent were denied the right to self-determination[106].

The Treaty of Versailles encountered nearly unanimous disapproval in Germany, with the war-guilt clause being the main reason behind this. The politicians, who had been forced by circumstances (although reluctant) to sign the Treaty, were subjected to vicious slander. The nationalist Right, who found the defeat of the country, the Versailles Treaty and the revolution impossible, spread the "stab-in-the-back"[107] story and accused the politicians and people that had advocated a negotiated peace in 1919.

The radicalization of domestic politics, the serious economic and social problems resulting from the war, reaction against the clauses of the Versailles Treaty and Germany's hopeless situation in the field of foreign affairs hindered the development of democratic revolution in the country and the attempts to end German militarism could not succeed. The right-wing extremist agitation escalated into putsches and assasinations and as well provoked a counter-reaction from the extreme left. Gustav Stresemann's six years in the office of Foreign Ministry could help to control the situation. He tried to strengthen the position of the Reich, to mitigate the consequences of the lost war and to break out Germany's post-World War I isolation. However, with the 1929 world economic crisis, the German political scene was radically transformed. The period of consolidation came to an end and crisis led to an increasing radicalization and polarization in politics crippling democratic institutions and worsening economic situation. This paved the way for the appointment of Adolf Hitler as the Reich Chancellor, by the Reich President Paul von Hindenburg[108].

---

[106] Ibid., p. 213

[107] Ibid., p. 203

[108] Ibid., pp. 203-205

The World War I was, also, traumatic for the Germans. The aim of consolidating democratic revolution in the country through the Weimar Republic and to stop German militarism failed. The Versailles Treaty was prepared with the aim to punish Germany. Its clauses, especially war-guilt, were nearly unanimously unacceptable for the Germans and war reparation debts caused an economic collapse. Germany was isolated and the political scene inside the country was started to be dominated by the radicals. The 1929 world economic crisis became the last fist to the revolution process. There was no fundamental change in the political culture and policy orientation that was militarist, undemocratic and coloured with the feeling of isolation.

4.2 The Post-World War II Period: A New Start

After the surrender of Germany on 8 May 1945, the future of Germany was once again the most important of all European questions. However, this time (different from the post-World War I era) there was the world structural divide in 1945, and division in Europe, between 'the Free West' led by the US and 'the Communist East' led by the SU. Within this picture, Germany's position between 1945 and 1949 was, to a certain extent, also the inexorable consequence of its geographical situation in the center of Europe – torn between the West and East Europe, between the liberal West and the left-wing totalitarian East, with the strongest communist party outside Soviet Russia.

Anglo-Soviet interests during the World War II had been defined as the need to contain Germany and to devise the best means of preventing the revival of a

strong and aggressive Germany. However, the note sent by the British Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin to British Prime Minister Clement Attlee on 10 April 1946 stated that: "The Russians have decided upon an aggressive policy based upon militant communism and Russian chauvinism". This statement had a great impact on the British government's policy in the sense that, up to that time the British had thought of the German problem solely in terms of Germany itself and had aimed to prevent the revival of "the German war machine". However, Bevin wrote in a top secret Cabinet paper on 3 May 1946 that: "The worst situation of all would be a revived Germany in league with or dominated by Russia"[109]. From January 1947, an economic unit, with the name of '*Bizonia*', was created. However, its creation was more than just the economic fusion of the British and American (occupied) zones. *Bizonia* was a turning point in post-war Germany: it marked the end of four-power (US, SU, Britain and France) cooperation and the beginning of Anglo-American collaboration in Germany. Thus, Bizonia was the beginning of the end of German unity. Even before the founding of the Federal Republic, basic decisions had set the course for West Germany: the fusion of the three western occupation zones (of the US, Britain and France) in 1947 and 1948 foreshadowed the future Federal Republic. A Six-Power Conference (by the US, Britain, France, Belgium, Netherlands, Luxembourg – the last three so-called Benelux countries) was held in London between February and June 1948 and the formal decision was to set up a West German State[110].

[109] Steininger, Rolf, "The German Qestion, 1945-95", in Larres, Klaus (ed.), *Germany Since Unification: The Domestic and External Consequences*, London:Macmillan Press LTD, 1998, p.9

[110] Ibid., pp.10-12

4.2.1 Konrad Adenauer Era

The first federal elections of West Germany, held on 14 August 1949, enabled Konrad Adenauer's Christian Democrats (CDU/CSU) to form a coalition with the Free Democrats (FDP) and the Deutsche Partei (DP). Afterwards, the 73-years old new West German Chancellor became the key personality for the reconciliation process between the West and West Germany. Thus, analyzing Adenauer era and his political role is crucial for understanding the West German politics after 1945 because he left his stamp on the foreign policy of the Federal Republic. Adenauer was so determined that the future of West Germany lied in integration with the West and adoption of West Germany into the Western institutional structures, through complete break with the legacy of the *Third Reich*. Adenauer and his supporters, within the CDU/CSU, sought a European political order that would irrevocably tie West German state and society to the political and cultural system (and values) of Western Europe. This was to be achieved by making West Germany an equal and respected partner of the Western powers and by forging a fundamental reconciliation between West Germany and France. The strategy and policies of Adenauer emanated from the perception of a credible threat from the SU. Adenauer's solution for the communist challenge was the creation of a "united Western Europe". In addition to this, there were other reasons for Adenauer's strong insistence on West European integration: The emotional controversy about how to define Germany's national identity and which priorities were to triumph – European or German unification – was continuing. Adenauer's policy was to join the West, making the West and West Germany so strong that one day the Soviet Union would give way and grant German reunification in its own interest. Thus, it can be argued that Adenauer assessed reunification as a further step that would come after West Germany consolidated its power, and reunification could be imposed on the East,

while the latter was weakening. Some scholars formulate this policy as: "Adenauer found the connection between the concepts of Western integration and German reunification in the belief that a consolidation in the West would automatically lead to the collapse of the Soviet dominance in the Eastern zone, what was termed as the 'magnetic concept''[111].

Adenauer's "west-oriented" foreign policy was called as *Westpolitik* and its main goals were defined as: Cooperation with West and making West Germany member of Western organizations; restore confidence for the country through making West Germany a reliable partner; give priority for improving relations with France and realize European integration through which West Germany could achieve its foreign, security and economic policy goals. Actually, the main facets of Westpolitik can be summarized by two concepts: the supranationalization and westernization of West Germany's foreign and security policy.

Supranationalization implied a basic abandonment of the (extreme) nationalist thinking of the former German foreign and security policy. The new West German state became a leading champion of the schemes for Atlantic and European integration processes. The interplay of national and supranational perspectives became a central theme in West Germany's post-World War II foreign and security policy culture.

Westernization aimed at basic reconciliation of the historical (political) alienation between the West and West Germany. The pro-western civilization tendency (*Abendland*) that was stressing the political, philosophical and ideological values that West Germany was sharing with its western allies, was shaped by the CDU/CSU administration, under Adenauer's leadership.

[111] Pfetsch, P. Frank, *West Germany: Internal Structures and External Relations,* New York: Praeger Publishers, 1988, p.184

In accordance with the above-mentioned facets, Adenauer's foreign policy-making, mainly, rested on three components that aimed to restore both political and economic sovereignty for West Germany: First of all, after recognizing the strong reputation and continuing mistrust for West Germany abroad, Bonn acted in a way through which it would achieve its foreign policy goals within a multilateral framework. One, and the first, aspect of this multilateral framework was that the civilian representatives of Washington, Paris and London (in West Germany) did the final work on the West Germany's external relations and on certain domestic questions (like; armament). Since the very beginning of his term in office, Adenauer had to (and preferred to) walk in a line of cooperation with his three western allies, for the defense of the West German interests. The second component of his foreign policy was that through entering into multilateral commitments of ECSC and EEC, Adenauer was willing to confront the legacy of the pre-World War II German policy and to implement confidence-building measures (for West Germany), in order to counter the effects of history. Finally, a major component of Adenauer's western strategy of recognition and reconciliation was his emphasis on, what was called in the 1950s, "the memory of the hopeful but abortive rapprochement between Paris and Berlin in the 1920s"[112].

The motives that fostered Germany's initial orientation of European integration can easily be found in Adenauer's own words: ''It was important to establish close ties with those peoples that 'by their nature' held concurrent views on government, human rights, freedom and property''[113]. By this, Adenauer expressed that he held the European culture and values as the basis of European integration. Adenauer perceived Russia as an imminent threat toward the west and he used this perception to justify his policy of European integration in the minds of West Germans. In accordance with this line of thinking, Adenauer continuously tried to improve relations with Western states, primarily with France. According to him,

[112] Geiss, Imanuel, "The Federal Republic of Germany in International Politics Before and After Unification", in Larres, Klaus and Panayi, Panikos (eds.), *The Federal Republic of Germany Since 1949*, New York: Addison Wesley Longman, 1996, pp.140-142

[113] Pfetsch, P. Frank (1988), op. cit., p.181

hostility between Germany and France would be like a "decaying body in the middle of Europe" –as Churchill had put it- and would be "just as detrimental for Europe as a victorious Nazi Germany."[114]

Soviet attempts to prevent rapprochement between the West and West Germany and prevent possible West German membership in NATO, could not alter Adenauer's pro-Western policy orientation and objectives. With his famous note of 10 March 1952, Stalin tried to torpedo the integration of West Germany into the Western Europe and prevent West German rearmament. Stalin offered a united Germany, including a small national army for its self-defense, with the only precondition that the unified Germany should not become a member of any kind of military alliance that involved the USA. On 16 March Chancellor Adenauer responded and said that there was nothing new in Stalin's offer and it was intended to isolate West Germany through neutralizing the country and preventing its integration with the West[115].

All steps made in the field of foreign and security policy also affected the status of the West Germany and Germany as a whole. The first bone of contention was how best to regain sovereignty, and as mentioned above, Adenauer sought it by an arrangement with the Western powers. The Korean War at the end of June 1950 raised the specter of a communist military advance in Europe. Pressures from America to provide some contribution to the defense of Western Europe and Adenauer's offer to supply a West German military contingent sparked off bitter controversies about the rearmament of West Germany. Adenauer wanted to use West German divisions as a lever to regain sovereignty for West Germany.

The basic problem was finding some way to appease French and British apprehensions about the potential threat to their security from a powerful West

---

[114] Ibid., p.181

[115] Steininger, Rolf (1998), op. cit., p.12

German military existence. The result was the European Defense Community (EDC), into which West German troops were to be integrated from the level of divisions. However, the EDC foundered in the French National Assembly in August 1954. Despite the bitter resistance from the West German opposition parties, West Germany's 'military contribution' was made through the alliance mechanism. The Federal Republic became an ally of the Western powers, who now left their troops stationed in West Germany, to protect West Germany and Western Europe against the threat of a Soviet attack. The three Western powers (the US, Britain and France) reserved for themselves only the final decisions over the status of West Berlin and of German unification as a whole.

The membership of West Germany was termed as "quasi-sovereignty" or "near-sovereignty" (which continued up until the reunification of Germany in 1990), implying that the rearmament of the West German state had been accepted, but this would be in a limited scale and would be done within a multilateral context (NATO). The consequences of quasi-soveregnity were far-reaching: since the Federal Republic claimed to be the only truly legitimate German state, it tried to isolate the communist East Germany by the Hallstein Doctrine (the Doctrine which was first implemented by the Adenauer Administration up until the Chancellorship of Willy Brandt in 1969). According to this doctrine, all states that recognised the GDR would be punished by breaking off diplomatic relations with the Federal Republic. Adenauer administration had to make an exception with the Soviet Union, because Moscow held the key to any possible German reunification. Thus, Bonn resumed diplomatic relations with Moscow and achieved the release of the last 10.000 German prisoners of war (in the SU), who had been held back as "war criminals" (since the World War II), during Adenauer's visit to Moscow in September 1955. Chancellor Adenauer made his first Moscow visit on 9 September 1955 and implied the opening of diplomatic relations between West Germany and the SU. A Christian Democrat expert on foreign policy, Alois Mertes, called this as "German Ostpolitik began"[116]. The discussion over the nuclear weapons was

[116] Ash, Timothy G. (1993), op. cit., p.35

another aspect of the issue. The Bundestag adopted a resolution which demanded "equality" for the Federal Republic in the domain of nuclear weapons. However, in fact, nothing ever came of it, certainly because West Germany's Western allies, including US, were just as wary of nuclear weapons in German hands, as was the Soviet Union. In addition to this external opposition, the highly emotional movement of 1958 against atomic weapons for West Germany, organized by the SPD (Social Democratic Party), trade unions and pacifist groups, were influential. Another far-reaching consequence of the quasi-soveregnity was that the GDR achieved a comparable status within the communist Eastern Bloc: It became a member of the Warsaw Pact in January 1955. In spite of its internal weaknesses, the GDR rose to become the second strongest political, economic and military actor within the Soviet Bloc.

After the Schuman Plan for the coordination between the French and German coal and steel industries in 1950 and foundation of the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) in 1951, the principle of controlling West German economic power through European integration was institutionalized and widened by the European Economic Community (EEC) in 1957. The EEC broadened the original Franco-German arrangement to include Italy and Benelux countries. Economic gains for West Germany, from the European Common Market were great and contributed to the 'German economic miracle' that was going on.

Actually, Adenauer's rejection of Stalin's note of 10 March 1952, the uprising of 17 June 1953 in East Berlin and East Germany (East Germans demanding more freedom, improvement in humane conditions and economic situation), which was the first of comparable turmoils shattering the SU, had destroyed all chances for early German reunification. The next crisis, over Berlin, came out in 1958. Refugees from the GDR had kept slipping over to West Berlin through the borders of East Berlin. Kruschev's Berlin Ultimatum of 1958 to West Germany (to stop influx of refugees) could not solve the problem. When the number of refugees to West Germany rose to unprecedented heights, the East German

Communist Party Leader Walter Ulbricht wanted to eliminate West Berlin by a military coup, but was deflected from this attempt by the compromise solution of Kruschev: sealing off the intra-Berlin boundaries between West and East Berlin. This brought about the building of the Berlin Wall on 13 August 1961.

The year 1963 marked a milestone in West Germany-France relations. Chancellor Adenauer made a move with the Elysée Treaty of 1963, with which he hoped to forge unbreakable links between West Germany and France. It was important within the European context and the logic of Franco-West German relations since 1950, because both countries had become the nucleus for any meaningful integration of Europe. However, French President de Gaulle had drifted into his own peculiar brand of nationalism: he had vetoed Britain's entrance into the EEC in 1963 and 1967, pulled out of NATO in 1966, cultivated his own nuclear force and followed a course of almost headlong collision with the US. The Elysée Treaty thus, provoked the controversy between the "Atlanticists" and the "Gaullists". The West German policy-makers had to find an uneasy balance between the superpower beyond the Atlantic and their closest and greatest immediate neighbor on the continent. Thus, commitment to the "West" was no longer so easy to define and practice, if the West itself was divided and the interests were conflicting. However, the controversy between "Atlanticists" and "Gaulists" became irrelevant due to another consequence of the US global policy: After the height of Cold War confrontation between the US and the SU in the Cuban Missile Crisis of autumn 1962, the two superpowers opened a phase of de-escalation and relations with the Eastern Bloc gained importance. NATO's 1967 Harmel Report can be reflected as a milestone in NATO's strategy towards the Warsaw Pact. Also, West Germans cited Harmel Report as the bible of East-West relations because the report put German division to the centre of Western concerns and defined defense and détente variously, in a comprehensive manner.

4.2.2 Willy Brandt Era

In 1969 elections, the SPD received 43% of the votes, whereas the FDP and CDU/CSU received 6% and 46% of the votes, respectively[117]. As the FDP preferred to form a coalition with the SPD, Willy Brandt, who had served as foreign minister and vice-chancellor between 1966 and 1969, became the new chancellor of West Germany and served until 1974. The new government brought the impetus for improving the relations with the Eastern Bloc. However, although there was a relaxation in tensions between NATO and Warsaw Pact members, in conformity with the process of détente and although a leftist-led coalition government was in power in West Germany, the perception of threat coming from the Soviet Union did not disappear.

Brandt and his Social Democratic Party realized that the establishment of closer contacts, between the Federal Republic and German Democratic Republic, required an improvement of relations with Eastern Europe and Bonn's territorial recognition of the status quo of Europe's post-World War II borders. For Chancellor Brandt, "small steps were better than none" and "small steps were better than big words". Brandt's foreign policy was called as *Ostpolitik* that implied "two states in one nation", through which the GDR would preserve its identity. As mentioned above, Ostpolitik aimed at improving relations with the Eastern Bloc. Walter Scheel, who became the President of West Germany on 15 May 1974, stated: "Ostpolitik is an expression of the identity of our interests with the interest of Europe"[118]. Government Declaration of October 1969 recognized the existence of "two states in

[117] Siekmeier, Mathias and Larres, Klaus, "Domestic Political Developments II: 1969-90", in Larres, Klaus and Panayi, Panikos (eds.), *The Federal Republic of Germany Since 1949*, New York: Addison Wesley Longman, 1996, p.100

[118] Ash, Timothy G. (1993), op. cit., p.19

Germany" and the Ministry for All-German Questions was renamed as the Ministry for Intra-German Relations. However, it should be noted that Ostpolitik was not, completely, an alternative to Adenauer's Westpolitik. The alliance with the West, still, kept its importance and the new foreign policy orientation was tried to be kept in a compatible manner with the principles and parameters of Westpolitik.

Egon Bahr, Willy Brandt's chief adviser, had suggested a strategy of "change through rapprochement", in 1963[119]. According to Bahr, West German strategy should be pursued within the context of "the policy of transformation" through which East Germany should be transformed with agreement of the SU and this was supported by Chancellor Brandt who thought that German question could only be solved with the SU, not against it. J. Joffe termed this as "relaxation through reassurance" between West and East Germany in particular, East and West in general through which détente between states in East and West should lead to détente between state and society in East[120]. This was facilitated by a global détente process. After the 1962 Cuban missile crisis, the SU and the US had recognized the necessity of defusing tensions between the two blocs, which later led to the signing of the SALT I in 1972. Thus, the relaxation of tensions encouraged the Brandt administration to improve relations with Eastern Europe and implement Ostpolitik. Ostpolitik contributed to the signing of a host of bilateral treaties between West Germany and the East European countries. Negotiations between Bonn and Moscow culminated in the signing of Moscow Treaty on 12 August 1970. This accord stipulated the mutual renunciation of force, the acceptance by West Germany of the Oder-Neisse line, the border between Poland and East Germany, and the existing border between the Federal Republic and German Democratic Republic - all on the condition that a permanent settlement of the border questions was reserved for an eventual peace treaty for the whole of Germany. In December 1970, Bonn signed a treaty with Poland which restated West Germany's pledge to recognize the post-

[119] Larres, Klaus (1998), op. cit., pp.36-37

[120] Ash, Timothy G. (1993), op. cit., p.177

World War II border between Poland and Germany[121]. Both countries, also, agreed to establish diplomatic relations and renounced the use of force. Chancellor Brandt, in his visit to Poland to sign this treaty, recognized "Germany's terrible crime against humanity during World War II" and received worldwide attention[122].

In September 1971, the four former allied powers (the US, SU, Britain and France) signed the quadripartite agreement, which guaranteed unimpeded access between West Germany and West Berlin. Whereas the western allies reaffirmed West Berlin's special status, the SU permitted West Berlin to maintain its ties with West Germany. Subsequent agreements between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic dealt with the regulation of the transit traffic of persons and goods, telephone services, as well as cultural and commercial cooperation between the two states. Brandt and his East German counterpart Willi Stoph met twice in 1970 (in Erfurt and Kassel), but progress towards an understanding between the two German governments could not be made unless Bonn recognized the GDR as a sovereign state. The negotiations resulted in the signing of the Basic Treaty in December 1972, according to which West Germany agreed to recognize the GDR de facto and accept the exchange of permanent representatives (though not ambassadors) between the two states[123]. Within the context of the Basic Treaty, there emerged internal discussions on the issue of recognition of the GDR: Christian Democrats argued that the diplomatic recognition would lead to more substantive recognition of the repressive regime and this would be morally unacceptable for people suffering under this regime. On the other hand, Social and Free Democrats replied that the purely diplomatic recognition did not imply political and moral recognition of the system. On the contrary, the recognition, they argued, was the only practicable way to begin alleviating the hardships imposed by the system.

---

[121] McNeill, Terry, "The Soviet Union's Policy Towards West Germany, 1945-90", in Larres, Klaus and Panayi, Panikos (eds.), *The Federal Republic of Germany Since 1949*, New York: Addison Wesley Longman, 1996, p.263

[122] Steininger, Rolf (1998), op. cit., p.17

[123] Ibid., p.18

Chancellor Brandt's major objective in opening relations with Eastern Europe was to pursue Deutschlandpolitik. This was Bonn's attempt to improve relations with East Germany through which Brandt hoped to enhance the number of the East Germans, who had been cut off from the West since the construction of the Berlin Wall, to have positive approach towards West Germany. In order to increase the number of East Germans, visiting West Germany, "welcome money" was paid to every East German visitor by the West German governments with a total of DM 2 billion from 1970 to 1989. In addition to this, West German credits to GDR increased for: compulsory exchange for pensioners and children, minefields along "German-German frontier", relaxation of border controls for West German travellers, and increase in numbers of East Germans allowed to travel West. The CDU, as the opposition party in West Germany, adamantly denounced the signing of the treaties with the SU and Poland, as well as Brandt's recognition of the GDR. According to the CDU, those treaties violated the commitment to unification as had been stated in the Basic Law, the West German constitution. However, in 1972 the CDU's attempt to unseat the Brandt coalition government failed, and since then, up until reunification, Ostpolitik and Deutschlandpolitik became an integral part of the foreign policy programme of all West German political parties.

At the Moscow Summit of May 1972, the US and the SU, under the leadership of President R. Nixon and L. Brezhnev, signed accords in order to limit strategic weapons and anti-ballistic missile systems (SALT I). The same year, President Brezhnev visited West Germany and emphasized the importance of sustaining long-term Soviet-German economic cooperation and necessity of relaxation on disputable issues. In 1973, NATO members accepted the Soviet proposal for convening a Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), in order to establish goals and standards in four fields: security, disarmament, economic cooperation and human rights. All these attempts, together with Bonn's détente policy (with Eastern Europe) and the Basic Treaty (between the FRG and GDR), led to the signing of the 1975 Helsinki Final Act. It was signed by

the heads of states and governments of 33 European nations and those of the US and Canada. It recognized the post-World War II status quo in Europe, and thus the division of Europe and Germany. Also, by this Act, all the participant states agreed on organizing conferences (on above-mentioned fields), improving relations and deciding on the future activities of this structure[124]. Henry Kissinger, advisor to the Nixon administration in the US, was acting in the old European Realpolitik spirit of Metternich. However, his attitude changed through Helsinki. Following the US defeat in Vietnam and increasing domestic criticism on the US administration, Kissinger tried to secure Soviet acceptance of improving human contacts, information flows and cultural exchange (although he earlier thought human rights was not an appropriate issue for discussions between states). With regard to the Soviet perception of Helsinki; healing Europe's economic division while sealing its political division, and providing recognition of Yalta frontiers, permanence of Soviet domination and Soviet-type regimes were the basic objectives of Moscow. For West Germany Helsinki process as Chancellor Schmidt described it, was 'an attempt to cover West German actions multilaterally' in his confidential Marbella paper of 1977. In the negotiation process, Kissinger negotiated on West Germany's behalf the crucial sentence allowing for the possibility of "a peaceful change of frontiers". As Foreign Minister Genscher observed in 1975: "No one can have a greater interest than us Germans in the Conference achieving its goal, namely to improve the contacts between the states and people in Europe…I believe that no one would neglect their national duty more than us, were he to hesitate to use even the smallest chance for a development that could eventually ease the lot of the divided nation"[125].

The Federal Republic and the GDR became members of the United Nations in 1973[126]. The establishment of the CSCE and the Helsinki-institutionalized détente in Europe had eroding effects on the communist systems after the conclusion of the

[124] Ibid., p.17

[125] Ash, Timothy G. (1993), op. cit., pp.266-267

[126] Geiss, Imanuel (1996), op. cit., p.154

Helsinki Charter, when the Communist Bloc had to barter human rights against economic aid from the West.

Parallel to the external developments and the international atmosphere, within which the foreign policy was formulated, the SPD-led coalition government's foreign policy course gave priority to the process of détente. However, this did not change the NATO-oriented consensus on the primacy of the security of the western allies and recognition of the validity of simultaneous pursuit of defense/deterrence and détente. Deterrence and forward defense, still, were the two principal pillars of Western alliance strategy, which remained at the core of West German foreign and security policy orientation. Deterrence implied that potential enemy was to be dissuaded from aggression by a NATO posture and forward defense implied that if deterrence crumbled, the enemy's attacking armies were to be met and contained as far to the east on NATO territory as possible. From this point, rather than being a total challenge to Adenauer's Westpolitik, Brandt's Ostpolitik should be evaluated as the West Germany's opening window to the east. Instead of maintaining the illusion of reunification, the SPD-led coalition government intended to improve the human contacts between the people in both parts of Germany. This, they thought, could be achieved by recognizing the GDR as a sovereign state and seeking cooperation with the East German administration on practical matters. The Brandt administration was at least partially successful because in the 1970s, the GDR government relaxed its stringent policies and permitted a limited number of its citizens to visit West Germany in case of a family emergency. Brandt and his Ostpolitik left its stamp on the foreign policy of West Germany, but in 1974 W. Brandt resigned as a result of the scandal that his personal adviser was working for the GDR as a spy[127].

[127] Siekmeier, Mathias and Larres, Klaus (1996), op. cit., p.111

4.2.3 Helmut Schmidt Era

Following the resignation of Willy Brandt, Helmut Schmidt (from the SPD) became the new Chancellor of West Germany. Schmidt tried to continue Ostpolitik, but he tried to do so in a more compatible manner with Westpolitik. For the new Chancellor, the key word in the conduct of inter-state relations (and East-West relations in particular) was: stability, stability of the overall diplomatic system of Ostpolitik with its dual imperative of vertical and horizontal synchronization. Like Kissinger, Schmidt regarded the balance of power as the key to preserving peace in Europe, and international order more generally; and he regarded détente between superpowers as the necessary condition to reduce division of Berlin and Germany. In pursuing these twin goals, he gave priority to two classical instruments, arms and money. West German-Soviet trade in 1979 was 6 times of 1969 level. Bismarck had described Germany's role as that of an 'honest broker' between great powers to Eat and West, whereas Schmidt described West Germany's role as 'honest interpreters' but honest interpreters 'of Western policy', 'and of German interests', perhaps also; "in Europe's name"[128]. The new chancellor reiterated Europe's and West Germany's close partnership with Washington. According to Schmidt, there could not be security without an approximate balance of military power. He thought that a stable east-west balance of power (in the military sphere) was the precondition for any successful détente policy. By the early 1980s, the SU had deployed nearly 1500 nuclear warheads on missiles, having a range of 600 to 3400 miles, called as Soviet SS-20 rockets[129]. Thus, Schmidt became determined to strengthen the security of Atlantic partnership by demanding the deployment of intermediate-range nuclear

[128] Ash, Timothy G. (1993), op. cit., p.96

[129] Siekmeier, Mathias and Larres, Klaus (1996), op. cit., p.100

missiles (INFs) in West Europe, in order to offset this Soviet missile build-up in East Europe.

As mentioned above, Schmidt promoted improving West Germany's relations with its western allies. However, this was not a shift from Ostpolitik orientation. Actually, the statement of the US President J. Carter in 1977 had reminded, to the West German administration, of the necessity of reducing tensions with the SU and, if possible, improving relations. In 1977, Carter had stated that the defense of Western Europe might start at the Weser-Lech Rivers. However, it was unacceptable for the FRG due to the fact that one third of the West German territory would have been lost without doing any defensive action. The closeness of the Soviet threat and the statistical forecasting about the extent of nuclear destruction increased the anxiety of West Germany. The mood of détente atmosphere was broken with the Afghanistan invasion by the SU in December 1979. Although the US imposed economic sanctions on the SU and wanted its allies to do so, Schmidt administration continued growing commercial relations (with the SU). With the aim of reducing the tensions between the two superpowers, Schmidt visited Moscow in 1980. This attempt was evaluated as the West German administration's desire to pursue both Westpolitik and Ostpolitik. In a sense, West Germany was acting within the framework of its NATO alliance and reflecting western anxiety of Afghanistan invasion and meanwhile, trying to keep relations with the SU and not to antagonize Moscow.

4.2.4 Helmut Kohl Era

The disagreements within the SPD and between the coalition parties, the SPD and the FDP, were increasing. Schmidt's party, the Social Democrats, eventually opposed their own chancellor on the INF deployment issue. Also, differences on economic issues between coalition partners caused the collapse of the center-left government in 1982 that had been in power since 1969 and resulted in a *Wende*, a change of government in Bonn. The Christian Democrats formed a coalition with the FDP under Helmut Kohl as the Chancellor, on 1 October 1982. In transition from social-liberal to conservative-liberal government, new Chancellor brought a blunt neo-Adenauerian reaffirmation of the absolute priority of Western integration on the one hand, and of the long-term commitment to reunification on the other. In October 1982 government declaration; first of all, the central importance of the relationship with the US and West Germany's full commitment to NATO alliance was reaffirmed. Second, it reaffirmed West Germany's commitment to move towards what it called "European Union" inside the existing European Community. Finally, it roundly reasserted the Federal Republic's commitment to the goal of German unity[130].

Although a shift from centre-left to centre-right coalition took place in 1982, Hans-Dietrich Genscher (the foreign minister since 1974) remained in post and pursued with vigour the Ostpolitik. It was Genscher who asked the western allies to take Gorbachev and his reforms seriously and who called for stronger economic and

[130] Ash, Timothy G. (1993), op. cit., p.100

technological cooperation between the East and the West Europe. Genscher remained at the centre of the German foreign policy up until 1992 and he is accepted as the architect of Germany's multidimensional policy. As a result of his attempts, France and Germany led to the re-activation of the WEU and the formation of Franco-German Security Council in 1988. Kohl and his CDU occasionally reiterated their wish to see Germany reunited again. In 1987, the Kohl government hosted East German Party Chief Erich Honecker and thus elavated the international status of the GDR, providing it a greater degree of legitimacy. With the active European policy of the Kohl government, Germany's weight in NATO increased and in 1988 Manfred Wörner became the first German to become NATO Secretary General[131].

Deutschlandpolitik, initiated by Brandt administration, was continued by Schmidt and Kohl goverments. Actually, there has to be made a distinction between Deutschlandpolitik and Ostpolitik; whereas the first one implied the policy towards East Germany, the latter implied policy towards Eastern Europe and the SU and whereas the first was pursued within the context of internal politics, the latter was pursued within the context of foreign policy. Although the rapprochement continued, in 1987 reunification of the two Germanys seemed to be as remote as ever. Not too long before the collapse of the Berlin Wall, Honecker even predicted that the Wall would still exist in fifty or a hundred years. Also, the West German Social Democrats and Greens viewed the division of Germany as permanent[132]. However, reforms in the SU, initiated by the Soviet President M.Gorbachev (who came to power in 1985), contributed to demands for political and economic changes in Eastern Europe, including the GDR citizens. The GDR celebrated its fortieth anniversary on 7 October 1989. Gorbachev, in his speech commemorating the anniversary, alluded to the vulnerability of the GDR's communist regime when he cautioned the GDR leaders that "life punishes those who come too late"[133]. This

[131] Nigel,Thomas, *Modern Germany, Politics, Society and Culture*, Peter James (ed.), Routledge, 1998, pp.10-12

[132] Steininger, Rolf (1998), op. cit., p.18

created large-scale demonstrations among the East German citizens, requesting major political reforms. The opening of the Hungarian border to Austria on 2 May 1989 triggered the collapse of the Berlin Wall. The Berlin Wall, unexpectedly collapsed on 9 November 1989. Less than three weeks after the collapse, Chancellor Kohl presented a ten-point proposal to the Bundestag, suggesting the creation of "confederate structures" with the goal of creating a "federal state order", which would end the division of Germany[134]. The possibility of German reunification raised the question of the creation of a "Fourth Reich". Initially, the SU rejected reunification and British and French politicians and officals expressed their reservations. Germany's closest ally, the US, strongly supported German reunification and strong cooperation between President George Bush and Chancellor Kohl, as well as between the Foreign Ministers James Baker and Genscher, was important in reunification process. Soviet President Gorbachev agreed to reunification, in principle, in January 1990.

In May 1990, the East and West German governments signed a treaty on the economic and social union between the two countries which came into effect on 2 July 1990. The treaty permitted the East Germans to exchange their valueless East German *Ostmark* for West German Deutsche-Marks on the basis of a one-to-one rate. The aim of East Germans to participate in the prosperity of the western world brought about their desire for immadiate reunification. During Kohl's visit to the SU in July 1990, the Chancellor proposed to limit the German armed forces to 370.000. In turn, President Gorbachev granted reunified Germany full sovereignty and agreed that Germany was to sustain its membership in NATO. In 1989 and 1990, Bonn was Moscow's single most important partner in the West and what Bonn wanted in return was progress in Deutschlandpolitik. The FRG and the SU reached agreements in September 1990 on the withdrawal of Soviet troops from East Germany by the end of 1994. Chancellor Kohl promised to finance (totaling to 8 billion dollars) the

---

[133] Moens, Alexander, "American Diplomacy and German Unification", *Survival*, Vol.33 No.6, November/December 1991, p.532

[134] Larres, Klaus (1998), op. cit., p.52

gradual removal of troops[135]. Also, in order to remove France's fears of a strong Germany in the middle of Europe, Kohl reassured the French President Mitterand that reunified Germany would be bound to the European Community, the ideal of the European integration and Franco-German cooperation. The 'Two-Plus-Four' powers' treaty (two Germanys, the US, SU France and Britain), signed in Moscow on 12 September 1990, granted full sovereignty to reunified Germany and was a prerequisite for the actual reunification.

In West Germany, the year 1945 was often referred to as *Stunde Null* ('hour zero'). That's why Ostpolitik was considered as *Erste Stunde* ('hour one'). The beginning of the Cold War had partitioned Germany and the Germans became the principal beneficiaries of its demise. The long process of diplomacy resulted with the reunification of Germany on 3 October 1990.

4.3 Parameters of West German Foreign Policy in the Pre-Reunification Period

West Germany made a remarkable transition from war, defeat and occupation to the establishment and stabilization of a reliable political system and recognition as an equal partner in the international community. The transition process included the problems of rebuilding a destroyed country, restructuring a

[135] Steininger, Rolf (1998), op. cit., pp.24-25

shattered economy, launching a workable governmental system, which met both the needs of the German people and “the Western allies”. In addition, terminating the occupation, regaining for West Germany a place in the society of nations as a welcome participant and ally, and to do so through joining the international organizations were the primary objectives of the West Germany foreign and security policy.

The process of transition can be divided into three main phases: The first commenced with the Nazi surrender and was characterized by Allied occupation, the destruction of Germany’s military might and the marshalling of a concerted program to keep it demilitarized. It should be underlined that although the occupying powers failed to agree in advance to new European political arrangement to stabilize continental relations, they were unanimous in their decision to deny Germany the facility and opportunity of challenging the peace and threatening the security of its neighbours. Then it was no surprise that when the Basic Law of the West Germany was drafted in 1949, it denied a defense function to the new Federal Government. During immediate post-surrender years, German security was of little concern to the occupying powers and foreign relations were handled by the Allies. However, with the commencement of the Cold War and the birth of the West and East German governments, the Western allies assumed responsibility for West German security. Parallel to this, the SU incorporated East Germany into its orbit.

The second phase was within which a major policy shift in which the negotiations of a controlled West German military contribution to Western defense and the beginning of the integration of West Germany into an emerging European community was epitomized. This phase consisted of four major interrelated developments. The first one was the issue of management of the West German steel industry. West Germany was admitted as a partner in the International Authority for the Ruhr (which controlled German steel production) in 1949. Secondly, two years later, this was superseded by the European Coal and Steel Community that marked the first major step for European integration. Thirdly, the keystone of this phase was

the negotiation of the European Defense Community and European Political Community treaties those were signed in 1952 and 1953. These provided, respectively, for a fully integrated European military establishment, functioning as a supranational force under a unified command, to which West Germany would consign manpower and resources (without creating a national army), and for a West European federation with limited, though genuine, authority of governance. However, the rejection of the Defense Community Treaty by the French Chamber of Deputies in 1954 was the final development. The Political Community Treaty went to governments for approval, but failed to reemerge. Related to the plan to incorporate West German troops into a European defense force, the issue was the affiliation of West Germany with the North Atlantic Alliance[136].

Simultaneously with the negotiation of the Defense Community Treaty, the western allies agreed in 1952 to invite West Germany to become an associate member under the North Atlantic Treaty and signed a protocol to this effect at Paris. However, when the French government defaulted on the approval of the Defense Community Treaty, agreement on the process of West German affiliation with the North Atlantic alliance was deferred. The final aspect of the second phase was the internal West German constitutional maneuver to empower the Federal Republic to exercise the defense function. Although the West German Parliament had debated and approved the Defense Community Treaty for ratification, the legality of this action had been challenged in the Federal Constitutional Court. With the amendment of the Basic Law in 1954, the West German government was granted exclusive authority over the national defense of West Germany.

As mentioned above, French rejection of the Defense Community Treaty obliged the western allies to turn from integrating West German troops into an amalgamated European force to creating a separate national West German military establishment. 1954 London and Paris negotiations introduced the third phase of the West German security development. The principal components of the solution were

[136] Kissinger, Henry, *Diplomacy*, New York: Touchstone, 1994, p.515

the creation of the *Bundeswehr* (the West German Military Force), the framing of a formula for its international control that was accomplished by incorporating it within the combined North Atlantic Treaty forces, and fabrication of a European political institution for maintaining restrictions on certain West German military functions. The last of these was the Western European Union, created by amending the Brussels Treaty in 1954 to admit West Germany and Italy into membership and prescribe certain controls on West German arms manufacture[137]. Actually, in the third phase, the Atlantic Allies agreed to empower West Germany to create its own national, but not independent, military establishment and to accept it as a full partner in the North Atlantic Alliance. This afforded West Germany a new and better position, respecting its national defense and European security and achieving foreign and security policy objectives.

At this point, to analyze the West German conception of 'national purpose/basic objectives/foreign policy system' will be meaningful in order to identify the parameters and understand the evolution of the foreign and security policy. In terms of national purpose, it can be stated as the restoration of German unity in freedom and peace-or, more fully, as the revival by peaceful procedures of a reunified, respected, and respectable Germany in control of its own internal affairs and fulfilling its proper role in international relations. Achieving and sustaining national identity, preserving national security, maintaining the peace and enhancing the general welfare can be stated as the country's basic objectives. The third layer, namely the foreign policy system, emphasizes the public policies designed to achieve the above-mentioned fundamental goals[138].

In terms of national identity and international status: to achieve acknowledgement as honorable member of family of nations; acquire sovereign status and acceptance as an equal partner in international community; obtain

---

[137] Plischke, Elmer, *Contemporary Governments of Germany*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1969, p.249

[138] Ibid., p.250

diplomatic recognition by, and establish diplomatic relations with, as many foreign governments as possible (with reservation concerning governments recognizing East Germany – up until the early 1970s); and gain acceptance into membership of international organizations, were the main objectives of the West German administrations. In terms of national security, West Germany aimed to: forestall aggression against integrity of the FRG; provide for own security to feasible extent; affiliate with other countries to establish guarantees of collective security; create West German military establishment – though not necessarily an independent military force (that is to say, to create within a multilateral framework); avoid development of such powerful, independent military force as to produce forceful counteraction; support mutual disarmament (between the two blocs), but not neutralization of West Germany; and buttress national security by affiliating with defensive alliances (like NATO and WEU).

With regard to the issue of Berlin (and the status of Berlin): West Germany tried to maintain freedom from Communist aggression and tried to prevent control or incorporation of West Berlin into East Germany; integrate West Berlin into Federal Republic as constituent Land (state) – full integration, or as complete as possible while preserving four-power commitments regarding all of Berlin; prevent establishment of "free city" in West Berlin, or even for all Berlin – reject "third Germany" concept.

In addition to the issue of Berlin, the basic parameters of West Germany's reunification policy can be cited as follows: to achieve reunification by self-determination of entire German people; negotiate by peaceful means; acquire by democratic process (through popular elections, constitutional assembly, ratification referendum) and then establishment of government of reunified state, election of officials, and reject Communist obverse order; hold division of Germany to be unnatural and intolerable; oppose "two Germanies" policy; and regard reunification as internal, not international, matter so far as German policies and actions are concerned.

The above-mentioned policy on reunification had been characterized from the very beginning of the division. The Preamble of the Basic Law of the Federal Republic of Germany that was approved by the Parliamentary Council in Bonn on 8 May 1949, and entered into force on 21 September 1949, stated that

> Conscious of its responsibility before God and before man,
>
> inspired by the resolve to preserve its national and political unity and to serve world peace as an equal partner in a united Europe, the German people,
>
> in the Laender Baden, Bavaria, Bremen, Hamburg, Hesse, Lower Saxony, North-Rhine-Westphalia, Rhineland-Palatinate, Schleswig-Holstein, Wuerttemberg-Baden und Wuerttemberg-Hohenzollern,
>
> has, by virtue of its constituent power, enacted this Basic Law of the Federal Republic of Germany
>
> to give a new order to political life for a transitional period.
>
> It has also acted on behalf of those Germans to whom participation was denied.
>
> The entire German people is called upon to achieve, by free self-determination, the unity and freedom of Germany[139].

The Article 23 of the Basic Law stipulated that "for the time being the Basic Law applies in the territory of the [above-mentioned *Lander*]… It is to be put into force in other parts of Germany on their accession"[140].

[139] Documents on Germany 1944-1985, United States Department of State Publication 9446, 1985, p.221

[140] Ibid., p.226

The Article 1 (under the Fundamentals of State Authority) of the Constitution, that was promulgated on 7 October 1949, of the German Democratic Republic also stated that:

> Germany is an indivisible democratic republic, the foundations of which are the German Laender.
> The (German Democratic) Republic decides on all issues which are essential to the existence and development of the German people as a whole, all other issues being decided upon by independent action of the Laender.
> As a rule, decisions of the Republic are carried out by the Laender.
> There is only one German nationality[141].

While considering the issue of reunification, for the West German elite, West German administrations and political parties, the German Question and the European Question were closely related. For most of Germans, "the division of Germany was the division of European continent" and "to overcome division of Germany is simultaneously to overcome the division of Europe". As Chancellor Schmidt wrote in his memoirs: "… there was hardly a government in Europe which genuinely regretted the partition of Germany. That was more the case in Washington or distant Peking….The world thus seemed to be quite content with the division of Germany; illogically it was much less content with the division of Europe"[142].

The other parameters (and priorities) of West German foreign policy can be stated as follows: integrate the European Communities – by supranational ''federalism'': unite West and Central Europe – by limited ''confederation''[143]; end division of Europe into two opposing, uncooperating axes; achieve European political and power stabilization; develop influence in international affairs commensurate with realities of West German power status; play significant,

---

[141] Ibid., p.278

[142] Ash, Timothy G. (1993), op. cit., p.19

[143] Plischke, Elmer (1969), op. cit., p.253

recognized and respected role in international political affairs; and join international organizations for collective purposes.

Within the context of the formulation and implementation of foreign and security policies, West German administrations repeatedly stated that the ‘‘will to preserve peace and to promote international understanding is…the first and the primary concern of the West German foreign policy’’[144]. Parallel to this, they renounced the use or threat of force for the attainment of its political aims, they claimed that their policies and objectives were not intended as a threat to any country, and that they seek ‘change’ only by peaceful negotiation.

In the 1950s Chancellor Adenauer enunciated West Germany’s trio of vital interests as: (1) the security of West Germany; (2) the maintenance of the (existing) political, legal and economic ties between Berlin and West Germany; and (3) the achievement of reunification, together with non-recognition of the East German regime and settlement of frontier questions in a peace treaty with an all-German government. The Adenauer Government also laid down most of the basic objectives of West Germany as follows; principles of national identity and respectability, European integration, international cooperation, trade development, Franco-German rapprochement and self-determination (in order to reflect Berlin and reunification issues as internal problems)[145]. Thus, it can be argued that in the 1950s, the West German government tended to conceive of West German policy from the focal point of the ‘national security/reunification/Berlin’ relationship, and, tried to do so through aligning itself with the Western powers. However, in the 1960s, the focus shifted so that the policy complex was more accurately depictable as a “national security / German reunification / European unity / power-prestige / détente” configuration.

---

[144] Ibid., p.258

[145] Ibid., p.262

In addition to the above-mentioned foreign policy objectives, in terms of general principles, in defining security policy, the West German administrations insisted West German independence and territorial integrity (together with that of West Berlin) had to be inviolable. West Germany based its security largely on two principles, namely, alliance with the North Atlantic powers and balanced East-West arms limitation. Fundamentally, West German alliance policy consisted of acquiring and contributing to credible and guaranteed collective deterrent vis-à-vis potential aggressors and possessing reliable nuclear protection without becoming a nuclear power. From this point, defense by means of a western coalition, with the crucial participation of the US, was the most preferred option of West Germany because, it appeared to be the least expensive and trustworthy arrangement for effective security assurance and military deterrence. Thus, the NATO Alliance and the enthusiastic participation of the US (for European security against the Soviet expansionism) were the main pillars of the West German security policy.

West Germany, emerging from occupation in 1949, had more restrictions on its foreign and defense policy making than it would normally be the case. It, therefore, began with less freedom of choice. However, in order to take full advantage of policy flexibility, West German foreign and security policy-makers tried to project all potential policy options and establish both the optimal and the minimally acceptable priorities respecting their desirability and feasibility. Thus, to turn the foreign and security policy formulation process into a process of widening alternatives became the prior objective of the West German policy-makers. In order to achieve this objective, West Germany signed treaties with its Western allies in the early 1950s and with its Eastern neighbours in the early 1970s. Whereas the first enabled West Germany to operate as an “independent” state in the West, latter enabled it to operate as an “independent” state in the East. West Germany wanted its Western neighbours and allies to be as concerned as possible about the European question, while at the same time settling the German question into the centre of the European one. However, it should be mentioned that although the 1970 treaties were

the elements of *modus vivendi*, they were in no sense part of any would-be final, legally binding peace settlement for Germany.

During the Cold War, West German administrations were confronted with East-West antagonism as the dominating conflict in Europe. The Soviet Union was regarded as the main challenger. However, although West Germany was still a front-state, even under the conditions of strategic parity economic leverage was increasing in value. In addition to this, following the mid-1980s, another view evolved among the government parties: security was begun to be seen as a "broad term". That is to say, the traditional understanding of threat as consisting of clearly defined antagonists with hostile intentions and a capacity for attack was slowly giving way to a risk assessment based on emerging challenges and instabilities in the Euro-Atlantic region and the global architecture. Thus, traditional worst case thinking was replaced by scenarios of the worst *probable* cases and security turned into a "wholistic approach of protecting and shaping". As the former Defense Minister V. Rühe reached the conclusion, in his defense guidelines, a broad concept of security had to incorporate aspects of domestic stability as well as transnational dimensions[146].

To conclude, this chapter gave a historical background of West German foreign and security policy, under the light of the conceptual framework provided in Chapter 2, in order to understand and explain: The new political culture of the country that was based on cooperation rather than competition, on pursuit of wealth rather than pure military power, on integration within the European and Atlantic Community rather than pursuing a 'go it alone' policy, a political system based on liberal democratic polity and a foreign and security policy on civilian and multilateral orientation; The structural conditions (a divide between the two blocs and a rigid bipolar international structure) that necessitated the integration of West Germany into the western bloc (for both West Germany and the western bloc), the

[146] Gutjahr, Lothar, "Stability, Integration and Global Responsibility: Germany's Changing Perspectives on National Interests", *Review of International Studies*, Vol.21, No.3, July 1995, p.313

parameters of West German foreign and security policy shaped not only by the new political culture but also by the international structure and the mechanisms (international institutions such as the UN, NATO, EC and the OSCE) the international setting provided for Germany to pursue its national interests; The West German interests during the Cold War that were defined to be keeping the security of the country and well-being of its citizens, economic welfare and achieving reunification as the strategic objective of the country.

In the above-mentioned sense this chapter set forth the way international setting (neorealist considerations) shaped West German foreign and security policy and Germany's interests through the constraints of the international structure and mechanisms provided by the international institutions for Germany to address its foreign and security policy concerns and its national interests. In addition, the chapter implied the way the new political culture and internalized values of the country (constructivist considerations) shaped West German foreign and security policy. It was/is argued that the German Question was also on the agenda of the international and European community following the World War I. The way to solve it was perceived to punish Germany through the Versailles. The German Question was on the agenda once again after World War II, but this time the existence of a Soviet threat made West Germany a country to be integrated into the western bloc (for the western community). Thus, the bipolar structural framework created positive attitude in West Germany towards the western (and international) community and vice versa, and in this way, contributed to the consolidation of liberal-democratic polity in West Germany. Moreover, the existence of neorealist and constructivist factors did not mean the non-existence of realist factors and some generic interests (the security and well-being of West German territory and its citizens and the goal of reunification) in West German foreign and security policy.

The historical background, for the studies dealing with the issue of continuity and change in foreign and security policy, enables the identification of parameters of policy and provides the base for the study to test what has remained the same and

what has changed with regard to the political orientation of the country and the policy line. Thus, under the light of the conceptual framework, policy-making process and the historical background, the following chapter will deal with the German foreign and security policy in the post-Cold War era and the use of force issue.

CHAPTER 5

GERMAN FOREIGN AND SECURITY POLICY IN THE POST-COLD WAR ERA AND THE USE OF FORCE

This chapter is going to deal with the issue of German foreign and security policy in the post-Cold War era and German policy vis a vis the use of force. The concern of this study is whether Germany has sustained its civilian and multilateral orientation or has it shifted from this orientation following the reunification of the country and the end of the bipolar international structure. This chapter will analyze the post-Cold War German foreign and security policy parameters and practices, especially with regard to the use of force in order to identify whether there is a fundamental change in Germany's political orientation parallel to the structural change in the international system. The conceptual framework will guide this part of the study and as pointed out in previous parts of the study, it will be reflected and argued that the coexistence of the realist, neorealist and constructivist factors continue in the post-Cold War era: The generic national interests of Germany (security and well-being of the German territory and people and economic welfare of the country) continue to exist. Besides this, constructivist considerations and factors (political culture and national institutions) continue to shape German foreign and security policy. Moreover, the neorealist framework constrains German foreign and security policy (through international structure) and provides mechanisms for Germany (international institutions) to pursue its national interests. Under the light

of these factors, it will be set forth that Germany has made small modifications in its foreign and security policy in order to meet the new forms of risks and challenges of the post-Cold War structure and demands from its partners to take more responsibility. The chapter will then deal with conceptual clarification. Here, I will try to provide a framework for the concept of civilian power (how it is defined by various analysts and which definitions are more sustainable for Germany when the complexity of international system and uniqueness of German foreign and security policy are taken into account) in order to reflect how and to what extent German foreign and security policy fits civilian power-type based on the practices with regard to the use of force (especially the Kosovo War). The chapter will end with the issue of German multilateralism (that is presented as a guarantee for Germany and the international community) and Germany's attempts to coordinate and overlap its affiliations and responsibilities in various international organizations.

5.1 German Foreign and Security Policy in an Era of Uncertainties

Within a wider context, it is no doubt that internal and external developments in Germany have been directly or indirectly influenced by the direct or indirect consequences of the events that occured in 1989. Although it had been unthinkable, or not usually thinkable, for many decades, the collapse of the Communist sphere of power paved the way for a democratic and free future for many people, and for German people as well. Meanwhile, the existence of wide economic and social differences between the West and the East of Europe, and the often conflicting claims of various nationalities to self-determination, have caused serious risks to stablity in Europe. Although the international community has not faced a global

nuclear threat, it has been called upon to provide humanitarian assistance and in many cases to make a military contribution, more than ever, to restore peace, due to acts of aggression by individual states, old and new conflicts between states and numerous internal conflicts[147]. The collapse of the Communist Bloc (and the rigid structure within the international system) paved the way for a new international system with new issues on the agenda and new actors in play. German foreign and security policy is constructed to tackle with new issues in an international system that is characterized by uncertainty and unsustainablity.

The above-mentioned concern on the new international system, new forms of threats to peace and stability and the way for Germany to master these challenges was pointed out in the 1994 White Paper of the Federal Ministry of Defense. Within the Paper, it was perceived that changed circumstances necessitate a broader understanding of security[148]. Thus, although the Warsaw Treaty Organization became defunct and a part of history by 1992, Germany remained (and still remains) a front-state in one sense: it was/is still on the border of a region, in which ethnic, national and religious strife was/is continuing. Economic difficulties and social dislocation with its particular symptoms such as migration to the West replaced Germany's former enemy perception. Due to the (and further increasing) masses of immigrants from Eastern and Southern Europe, on 2 October 1992 the former Foreign Minister Klaus Kinkel stated that ''our domestic stability is beginning to rock''[149]. This made Germany pursue a foreign and security policy strategy that called for "neighborhood stability" and the strategic concerns focused on "security in and for Europe". Chancellor Kohl stated the necessity of ''A preventive security policy…includes economic and social stability''[150].

---

[147] *Questions on German History: Paths to Parliamentary Democracy* (1998), op. cit., pp.438-439

[148] Eberwein, Wolf-Dieter and Kaiser, Karl (2001), op. cit., p.8

[149] Gutjahr, Lothar (1995), op. cit., p.314

[150] Ibid., pp.314-315

The above-mentioned concerns of the 1994 White Paper, the former Foreign Minister Kinkel and the former Chancellor Kohl were again claimed in the White Paper 2006 on German Security Policy and the Future of the Bundeswehr, issued by the Federal Ministry of Defence, which states that

> Twelfe years have passed since the publication of the last White Paper on the Security of the Federal Republic of Germany and the Situation of the Bundeswehr. During that time, the international environment has changed dramatically. Globalization has opened up new opportunities for Germany, too. At the same time, the radical changes in the security environment have created new risks and threats that are not only having a destabilizing effect on Germany's immediate surroundings but also impact on the security of the international community as a whole. A successful response to these new challenges requires the application of a wide range of foreign, security, defense, and development policy instruments in order to identify, prevent, and resolve conflicts at an early stage[151].

The Federal Chancellor Dr. Angela Merkel states that "Germany and Europe currently face significant new security challenges. We have to meet the threats posed by international terrorism, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, regional conflicts and organized crime. This is in our own national, as well as European and transatlantic interest." Following the identification of the problem, Chancellor Merkel continues with the necessity of strengthening the alliances: "We act jointly with our partners and allies, because we cannot deal with the security risks on our own.[152]„

As the statement of Chancellor Merkel sets forth, following the end of the Cold War, traditional issues may not have disappeared from the foreign and security policy agenda of the states and international community, but increasingly problems requiring cooperation between state and non-state actors and approaches which go

[151] White Paper (2006), op. cit., p.9

[152] Ibid., p.2

far beyond the confines of nation state have come forefront. Nuclear and energy security, preventive crisis management, sustainable economic growth, protection of environment, fight against international terrorism-crime-illegal migration, and prevention of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (wmd) have become critical issues in the conduct of inter-state relations. Although the central task of foreign relations is that of maintaining peace by preventing political instability and military conflicts, the post-Cold War international structure and the international developments necessitated the concept of security to be understood in a much broader sense[153].

The new security agenda is identified by the White Paper 2006 as

> International terrorism presents a fundamental challenge and threat to freedom and security. Increasingly, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and of the means of their delivery has become a potential threat to Germany as well as other nations. In addition, Germany has been confronted with the aftermath of intrastate and regional conflicts, the destabilization, and the internal disintegration of states as well as its frequent by-product – the privatization of force. Strategies that were previously effective in warding off external dangers are no longer adequate against the current, asymmetric threats. Today's security policy must address new and increasingly complex challenges. Effective security provisions require preventive, efficient, and coherent cooperation at both the national and international levels, to include an effective fight against the root causes. It is imperative that we take preventive action against any risks and threats to our security and that we address them in a timely manner and at their sources[154].

As the new foreign and security policy agenda is determined in this way, the core values, interests and goals of German policy to tackle with these problems and pursue German interests are clarified in the White Paper. The White Paper refers to the Basic Law that lays down Germany's commitment to the preservation of peace,

[153] Von Ploetz, Hans-Friedrich (2001), op. cit., p.70

[154] White Paper (2006), op. cit., p.9

the unification of Europe, the observance and strengthening of international law, the peaceful settlement of disputes and integration into a system of mutual collective security. The Basic Law guides the goal of safeguarding German interests through:

preserving justice and freedom, democracy, security and prosperity for the citizens of Germany and protecting them from dangers;

ensuring the sovereignty and integrity of German territory;

preventing regional crises and conflicts that may affect Germany's security, wherever possible, and helping to control crises;

confronting global challenges, above all the threat posed by international terrorism and the proliferation of WMD;

helping to uphold human rights and strengthen the international order on the basis of international law;

promoting free and unhindered world trade as a basis for Germany's prosperity thereby helping to overcome the divide between poor and rich regions of the world[155].

It is a clear fact that German foreign and security policy can be visualized in its historical depth since its systemic regularities have been functionalized by a long differentiation in periodic cycles and also the periodic occasional transformation. The German state has acted in accordance with a "fundamental goal" and "policy line" relevant to the intenally and externally changing circumstances and position of the state. Flexible policy adaptation, designed on pragmatic approaches in accordance with the changing international situation, is the major instrument for the optimization of state "zones of action". Socio-cultural, socio-political and socio-

[155] White Paper (2006), op. cit., p.28

economic dynamics of the internal structures from both European and German sides have become effective in formation of foreign and security policies.

The White Paper describes one of the basic characteristics of German foreign and security policy as taking into account the general long-term conditions as well as changing interests. The constants of German policy-making are mentioned to be Germany's geographical location at the heart of Europe and the experience gained from German and European history, Germany's worldwide integration as a trading and industrialized nation, and international obligations of Germany arising particularly from Germany's membership of the United Nations, the European Union and NATO. As another concern of foreign and security policy, it is also stated in the White Paper that German policy-making mechanism has to take into account all developments in geographically remote regions, insofar as they affect German interests. These are considered to be not static, but contingent on international constellations and developments in the sense that in the age of globalization, interests of any country can no longer be defined solely in geographical terms[156].

The introduction part of the North Atlantic Treaty, signed on 4 April 1949, states

> The parties to this Treaty reaffirm their faith in the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and their desire to live in peace with all peoples and all governments.
>
> They are determined to safeguard the freedom, comman heritage and civilization of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law.
>
> They seek to promote stability and well-being in the North Atlantic area.
>
> They are resolved to unite their efforts for collective defense and for the preservation of peace and security[157].

[156] White Paper (2006), op. cit., p.28

[157] *Documents on Germany 1944-1985* (1985), op. cit., p.209

Parallel to the aims, structure and opportunities set forth by the North Atlantic Treaty, the White Paper defines the central goal of German foreign and security policy as to shape the transatlantic partnership in the Alliance with the future in mind, and to cultivate the close and trusting relationship with the US. It is clearly stated that in the present era and in the future, security in Europe can be provided if only the issues are addressed together with the US. A further overriding goal of German foreign and security policy is claimed to be to strengthen the European area of stability through consolidation and expansion of European integration and through a proactive neighbourhood policy of the European Union with the states of Eastern Europe, Southern Caucasus, Central Asia and the Mediterranean region. Meanwhile it is stated that Germany is striving to develop and deepen a lasting and durable security partnership with Russia[158].

As Germany is member of various international institutions, German foreign and security policy is multilateral in character. Together with the other member states of the European Union, the White Paper clearly mentions, Germany is committed to active multilateralism. It is a fact that no state in the world in the meantime is able to ensure its security on its own. In this sense, it is no surprise that Germany safeguards its foreign and security policy interests primarily in international and supranational institutions and plays an active role in contributing to and shaping their policies[159].

As has been mentioned earlier repeatedly, changing conditions in the international system and new forms of threat coming about with these developments have considerable implications on threat perception of states, and thus, foreign and security policy understanding and making of states. Within this framework, the two prominent characteristics of German policy-making can be stated as: Firstly,

[158] White Paper (2006), op. cit., p.28

[159] Ibid., p.29

German security policy is to be regarded as forward-looking. The new risks and threats to Germany and Europe are perceived to have their origin in regional and global developments, and often far beyond the European area of peace and stability. These threats are considered to be multifarious and dynamic, and likely to spread if not addressed promptly. This necessitates a preventive security framework that can be guaranteed most effectively through early warning and pre-emptive action, and must incorporate the entire range of security policy instruments.

Secondly, German security policy is based on a comprehensive security understanding. Through this, threats and risks posed to German, European, transatlantic and global security, in larger context, must be addressed with a suitably matched range of instruments; those include diplomatic, economic, development policy and policing measures as well as military means and, where called for, also armed operations. Although there is not a categorical rejection of armed operations, no doubt within a multilateral context, the White Paper makes a strong reference to the civilian character of German foreign and security policy and claims that armed operations entail dangers to life and limb and can have far-reaching political consequences. In this sense it is clearly stated that the Federal Government will continue in future to examine in each individual case whether German values and interests require the operational involvement of the Bundeswehr[160].

Since the scope of this study makes the point that (that is also strongly mentioned in the White Paper, repeatedly stated by German policy-makers and can be noticed through an analytic analysis of German policy record, since the end of the World War II) using civilian means in the pursuit of German national interests and German foreign and security policy, and realizing foreign policy objectives within a multilateral context are the two basic and most prominent characteristics German political rhetoric is established on. The following part of the study deals with the issue of Germany and the use of military force with an initial conceptual

[160] White Paper (2006), op. cit., p.29

clarification, in order to clarify how far the practice meets the conceptual framework and definition regarding the German policy record.

5.2 Conceptual Clarification: Civilian Power

Dealing with the concepts and vesting meanings to them is not an easy task due to the subjective nature of the issue and difficulty, if not impossibility, of meeting the practice with the theory, depending on the objectives and understanding of the analyst. As this study aims to analyze whether Germany has shifted from its civilian and multilateral orientation of foreign and security policy during the post-Cold War era, and Germany's history-making policy decisions and acts (for Europe and international community) since the end of World War II (West German governments during the Cold War), there becomes the necessity of some sort of conceptual clarification to identify and explain how the concept of civilian power is contextualized. It is fair to argue that the concept of civilian power operates as a macro-theory byproduct rooted in constructivism, but also strongly connected to realism and neorealism in a way to reverse their focus of the use of military power in inter-state relations. The basic focus of civilian power is on the nature of the role concept, identity, moral convictions and historical memories those are in play during foreign and security policy-making. The value of civilian power concept stems from its capability to analyze and explain specific policy processes and outcomes and providing a conceptual framework for political processes in connection with constructivism and realism.

K. J. Holsti has mentioned six ways an international actor may prefer to use to influence other international actors: using persuasion (eliciting a favourable response without explicitly holding out the possibility of punishments); offering rewards; granting rewards; threatening punishment; inflicting non-violent punishment; or using force[161]. Christopher Hill mentions the features of an international actor as: to be delimited from its external environment, to be autonomous in making its laws, taking decisions and carrying a legal international personality[162] and sets forth two categories and four methods international actors use to exercise power and influence over other international actors: An actor can *compel* another actor to do something, using force (the stick) or deterrence (the threat of the use of force). Or it can *sway* another actor's decisions, using persuasion (the carrot) and deference (latent influence)[163]. In a similar vein, Joseph S. Nye defines "soft power" as an actor that co-opts rather than coerces other actors. For Nye, a country may obtain the outcomes it wants in world politics due to the fact that other countries admire its values, emulate its example, aspire to its level of prosperity and openness. Nye calls this as command power that is essentially the power of attraction, distinguishing it from coercion and inducement[164].

The mainstream studies regarding the civilian power concept, as seen above, deal with the foreign policy instruments. As Karen E. Smith correctly points out, foreign policy instruments can be used in various ways: the 'stick' is not just military, nor is the 'carrot' solely economic. Economic instruments encompass the promise of aid, sanctions and other alternatives; within the same manner, military instruments differ from the actual use of force to compel or deter an enemy to training and aiding military forces in other countries in order to ensure defense of the

[161] Holsti, K. J., *International Politics: A Framework for Analysis* 7th Edition, Englewood Cliffs, NG: Prentice Hall, 1995, pp.125-126

[162] Hill, C., "The Capability-Expectations Gap, or Conceptualizing Europe's International Role", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol.31 No.3, 1993, p.309

[163] Hill, Christopher, *The Changing Politics of Foreign Policy*, Houndmills: Palgrave, 2003, p.137

[164] Nye, Joseph S. (2004), op. cit., p.5

national territory against a military threat. Within this context, if an actor has only civilian instruments, this does not mean it will only use these instruments to sway others; in contrast, civilian instruments can also be used coercively[165]. In response to this issue, Christopher Hill mentions that "civilian models" rely on persuasion and negotiation in dealing with the third countries. In this sense and according to Hill's definition, civilian powers rely on soft power, on persuasion and attraction, on economic and diplomatic capabilities in pursuit of their goals, rather than on coercion, sticks and carrots[166].

Another crucial peculiarity attributed to civilian power definition is related to policy-making process. Christopher Hill mentions that civilian actors are willing to envisage open diplomacy and to encourage a more sophisticated public discussion of foreign policy matters[167]. The democratic control over foreign policy-making, an open and visible foreign policy discourse are crucial elements in characterizing and defining civilian power concept[168].

Both the instruments used in implementation of foreign and security policy and process of foreign and security policy-making necessitate a clarification between exercising civilian power and being a civilian power, as Karen Smith correctly points out. For Smith, civilian is non-military and includes economic, diplomatic and cultural policy instruments; military involves the use of armed forces. However, drawing a clear-cut line between civilian and military power is not easy, for example, peacekeeping forces are generally considered to be a 'civilian foreign

---

[165] Smith, Karen E., "Still 'Civilian Power EU?'", A Paper Presented at the CIDEL Workshop "From Civilian to Military Power: The European Union at a Crossroads?", 22-23 October 2004, Oslo, Norway, p.4

[166] Hill, Christopher, "European Foreign Policy: Power Bloc, Civilian Model – or Flop?", in Rummel, Reinhardt (ed.), *The Evolution of an International Actor*, Boulder: Westview Pres, 1990, pp.42-44

[167] Ibid., p.44

[168] Stavridis, Stelios, "Why the 'Militarising' of the European Union is Strengthening the Concept of a '*Civilian Power Europe*'", Robert Schuman Centre Working Paper No. 2001/17, Florence: European University Institute, 2001, p.9; Smith, Hazel, *European Union Foreign Policy: What It Is and What It Does*, London: Pluto Pres, 2002, p.271

policy instrument'. According to Smith, this situation necessitates the maintenance of a distinction between civilian power strictly speaking, and anything that involves the use of the military power. Peacekeeping forces may or may not be armed, but these are still troops trained to kill. Besides this, the 1990s have witnessed the trend through which the UN or ad hoc operations have departed from traditional peacekeeping principles and allowed for the use of more 'robust' forms of intervention. From this perspective, on the one hand, there is a range of instruments with pure civilian power, with completely civilian means; and on the other hand there is military power, with military means. While there are numerous instruments between these ends, the point to be mentioned here is, there is a clear line between civilian and non-civilian instruments of foreign and security policy, as Smith argues.[169]

When it comes to *being* a civilian power, Smith mentions that this concept has been most frequently defined to entail not just the means that an actor uses, but also the ends that it pursues to reach its foreign and security policy goals; and less frequently has been defined to mention the way these means are used, and the process by which foreign policy is made. Smith sets forth four elements to being a civilian power: means; ends; use of persuasion; and civilian control over foreign and security policy-making. From these four, the properties determining what forms civilian and what does not is difficult to identify in the last three. Within this framework, besides skipping the difficulties of establishing what civilian might mean beyond the realm of policy instruments, Smith defines an 'ideal type' as: a civilian power is an actor which uses civilian means for persuasion, to pursue civilian ends, and whose foreign policy-making process is subject to democratic control or public scrutiny[170].

When Karen Smith puts on one end of the continuum civilian power (with civilian means, civilian ends, persuasion/soft power and democratic control) and

[169] Smith, Karen E. (2004), op. cit., p.2

[170] Ibid., pp.2-5

military power (with military means, military ends, coercion/hard power and no democratic control) she mentions North Korea, Saddam's Iraq, Hitler's Germany as ideal-type military powers. For Smith, ideal-type civilian powers are much harder to find. Europe's neutral states Austria, Finland, Ireland, Sweden and Switzerland come *closest* to pure civilian power, but they cannot be claimed as pure civilian powers due to the fact that they all have military powers (although with a defensive posture for national territory), have participated in UN operations around the world and first four participate in the development of the EU's security and defense policy[171]. In her analysis, Smith seems to follow David Mitrany's logic who mentions that if the problem (of war) is the existence of self-interested sovereign states, then effectively creating a larger version of a "sovereign state", an armed "superpower" of sorts, is not the answer, and in fact just makes the problem bigger[172].

For Smith the existence of military power, by any state even with a completely defensive posture, hinders that state to be an ideal-type civilian power. Smith's perspective is definitely bold and helps for conceptual clarification. However, for most analysts, the rules of the jungle are far from this 'ideal-type' conceptualization.

Gareth Evans, who was Foreign Minister of Australia between 1988 and 1996 and best known internationally for his roles in helping to develop the UN peace plan for Cambodia, bringing to a conclusion the international Chemical Weapons Convention, finding the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) forum and ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF), and initiating the Canberra Commission on the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons, mentioned in December 1988 that Australia aimed to contribute to the cause of 'good international citizenship'[173]. Andrew Linklater

[171] Ibid., p.6

[172] Mitrany, David, "The Prospect of Integration: Federal or Functional?", in Nye, Joseph S.,Jr. (ed.), *International Regionalism*, Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1968, p.viii

follows this logic and takes this perspective further within a theoretical framework: For Linklater, liberal-cum-social democratic states "are obliged not only to comply with their basic moral and political principles by placing real constraints on self-interest; they are also obliged to promote, where circumstances permit, liberal-cum-social democratic principles in other societies and in the conduct of international relations more generally". Linklater argues this does create "the risk of cultural imperialism and excessive interference and intervention" but this risk can be reduced if "the emphasis is placed on proceeding where there is international consensus and if the exponents of good international citizenship are sensitive to issues of unwarranted exclusion"[174].

Parallel to Linklater's perspective, Tim Dunne and Nick Wheeler mention that "states that are good citizens not only have to place order [the rules of international society] before the pursuit of narrow commercial and political advantage, they are also required to forsake these advantages when they conflict with human rights". For Dunne and Wheeler, good international citizens, states, pursue "the following goals: strengthening international support for universal human rights standards; obeying the rules of international society; acting multilaterally and with UN authorisation where possible; and recognising that a sustainable ethical foreign policy requires the deepening of civil rights and constitutional reform 'at home'". These claims of Dunne and Wheeler do not seem to be so problematic, but they go further and argue that "good international citizens are morally required to use force in exceptional cases where it is judged that all credible peaceful alternatives have been exhausted, where delay in acting will lead to large numbers of civilians being killed, and where there is a reasonable prospect of success"[175]. The

---

[173] Keal, Paul, "Can Foreign Policy Be Ethical?", in Keal, Paul (ed.), *Ethics and Foreign Policy*, Canberra: Allen and Unwin, 1992, pp.12-13

[174] Linklater, Andrew, "What is a Good International Citizen", in Keal, Paul (ed.), *Ethics and Foreign Policy*, Canberra: Allen and Unwin, 1992, pp.38-39

[175] Wheeler, Nicholas J. and Dunne, Tim, "Blair's Britain: A Force for Good in the World?", in Smith, Karen E. and Light, Margot (eds.), Ethics and Foreign Policy, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001, pp.171-183

logical outcome from this claim could be that regarding the issue of humanitarian intervention, UN Security Council authorisation is desirable but not required. Thus, the Kosovo War (as will be analysed in the following parts of this study) was justifiable for good international citizens.

As seen from explanations of civilian power concept, it is highly contested. Hanns Maull has been the first analyst to apply the concept to Germany and argued that Germany had become a new type of international power. Maull's emphasis has been on how the construction of German role identity in foreign policy has been shaped by historical memories, the memories that focus on the catastrophic defeat and moral ruin following from a previous 'great power' role identity resting on belief in a German *Sonderweg* ('special way') and on exploiting Germany's *Mittellage* ('central position') in Europe.

Distinguishing post-World War II German foreign and security policy from Hobbesian and Lockeian notions, Maull gives a Kantian content to German policy record. Maull correctly identifies that German foreign and security policy is based on the moral conviction that cooperation best serves its interests rather than regarding multilateralism as a convenience. This stance reflects historical experience and learning about the value of strong international institutions providing and promoting multilateral action[176].

Rhetorically, civilian power model is grounded in respect for law, social justice and sustainable development and non-violent conflict resolution. For Maull, civilian power is a particular foreign policy identity which promotes multilateralism, institution-building and supranational integration and tries to constrain the use of force in international relations through national and international norms[177]. In this sense, civilian power concept has three main pillars:

[176] Maull, Hanns, "German Foreign Policy Post-Kosovo: Still a Civilian Power?", Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Association for the Study of German Politics, London, 27-28 April 2001

acceptance of the necessity of cooperation with other states in the pursuit of international objectives;

a willingness to develop international structures to address critical issues of international management;

concentration on non-military, primarily economic, means to secure national goals, with military power left as a residual instrument serving essentially to safeguard other means of international action[178].

Within the context drawn above, it is fair to argue that West German foreign and security policy was settled into the mould of a civilian power and this foreign policy role concept and orientation has survived beyond reunification. The foreign policy rhetoric of West Germany, and Germany following reunification, was/is shaped by Germany's traumatic past and Germany's "never agains", emanating from Germany's history that led to deep scepticism vis a vis use of military force; a fierce decisiveness never again to allow German militarism and nationalism to threaten peace and stability in Europe; a desire never again to break or harm relations with Western democracies; and a strong commitment to project universal values (democracy, respect for international law and human rights) in the conduct of foreign and security policy[179].

A strong determination or commitment to civilian power foreign policy role concept would not mean Germany shall pursue an illusionary foreign and security policy course. With the dissolution of the Soviet Union the threat emanating from Soviet military power disappeared. The political and military division between two

[177] Maull, Hanns W., "Germany and the Use of Force: Still a 'Civilian Power'?", *Survival*, Vol.42 No.2, Summer 2000, p.56

[178] Maull, Hanns W., "Germany and Japan: The New Civilian Powers", Foreign Affairs, Vol.69 No.5, 1990/91, pp.91-93

[179] Maull, Hanns W. (2000a) op. cit., p.56

antagonistic camps in Europe, and in Germany ended. Although this was regarded as the end of a conventional threat to Germany, religious and ethno-nationalist conflicts erupted in Europe, posing asymmetric threat to Western Europe, and to Germany more seriously. Germany became home for nearly 750.000 former Yugoslavs in the early 1990s due to large-scale violence in Yugoslavia's disintegration process, and in addition to these challenges new demands on German foreign and security policy from inside the country and from Germany's allies have made it inevitable for German policy-makers to adopt to new security environment. The new security posture has created the need for Germany to recast its stance vis a vis the German participation in military operations outside the traditional NATO context of collective defence.

There are different views in considering the new security environment and German adaptation to new security posture that has been in play since the end of the Cold War and German reunification. The debates have focused on the issue of assertiveness and main question, regarding the course of German foreign and security policy during the 1990s, have been whether this course is a new phase of assertiveness. Thus, Germany's power became the focus of numerous studies, but the description of Germany has been problematic: Germany as a *Zentralmacht* ('central power'), as a *Weltmacht wider Willen* ('world power against its will') or as a *Zivilmacht* ('civilian power'). Chancellor Schröder himself did not shy away from referring to Germany as an important power, a *Grosse Macht* ('big power') but he avoided the word *Grossmacht* ('great power'), a word laden with past history[180].

Germans themselves speak of being more *selbstbewusst*, a term that is difficult to translate, but implies an assertive self-confidence based on self-awareness. Germans often describe Germany as a "motor" of European integration. However, they are sensitive about the notion of 'leadership' which is translated into Führer, in German. George Bush's May 1989 call for a "partnership in leadership"

[180] Le Gloannec,Anne-Marie, "Germany's Power and the Weakening of States in a Globalised World: Deconstructing a Paradox", *German Politics*, Vol.10 No.1, April2001, p.117

between Germany and the United States of America left Bonn awkward and Bonn's European partners wary. Still, it signalled a pronounced American desire to see Germany assuming a larger role in Europe. The US Deputy Secretary of State, Strobe Talbott, speaking in Bonn shortly before the Kosovo War, echoed this objective, stating: ''We recognize and welcome the role of the Federal Republic at the epicentre of these processes-expansion and integration, broadening and deepening.''[181] This call from Germany's partners to assume larger role in the new security posture and in responding new forms of challenges has made it legitimate for Germany to seek greater influence, in return for contributions (economic and logitics contributions to its allies within the institutional structures - EU and NATO, and in their military operations like in the Gulf War, IFOR and SFOR; as will be studied in the following parts).

Hüseyin Bağcı has underlined three important shifts in German foreign policy motives, brought about by the reunification: The first aspect is that reunification started a re-Germanization process in foreign policy. Whereas Germany was determining its foreign policy orientation and objectives within the institutional framework (through NATO and Community principles) in the pre-unification period, the 'universal leadership' aim began to come to surface. The second point to be underlined is that Germany did not give up its policy and objective of European integration but it wants to be the determinator of foreign and security policies as the greatest economy of the Union (and major contributor of the Union budget). Thirdly, Germany's domestic political expectations and problems began to have a priority on foreign policy formulation and this gave way to interest-based policy[182].

Germany's new assertiveness has often been discussed with regard to Germany's early insistence on recognizing Croatia and Slovenia in 1991, when most

---

[181] Denison,Andrew, "German Foreign Policy and Transatlantic Relations Since Unification", *German Politics*, Vol.10 No.1, April 2001, p.160

[182] Bağcı, Hüseyin, *Balkanlar (1991-1993)*, Foreign Policy Institute, Ankara, 1994, s.51-52

of the European powers (France and the United Kingdom) wanted to slow down the process. This issue became the test case in which Germany tried its new role, in which German Foreign Minister Hans Dietrich Genscher played an active role. Although his colleagues in Brussels (the EC members and the US) stated that recognition would make the situation worse, Genscher said (on 27 November 1991) that his country would announce recognition of Croatia and Slovenia on 19 December 1991. Due to strong pressure from Germany, the EC members stated that they would recognize the former Yugoslav Republics on January 15th, under conditions of respect for democracy and minority rights and acceptance of UN-EC peace efforts. The member states stated the necessity of waiting the final decision of an expert panel working on the issue, the Badinter Commission (sent by the EC to the region under the presidency of French jurist Robert Badinter). However, Germany rejected this proposal, and announced recognition of Slovenia and Croatia on 23 December 1991[183]. Moreover, although the report consisted of negative aspects of recognition, other EU members followed 'the German path' and recognized former Yugoslav Republics.

All the same, from EMU to NATO and EU enlargement, from the G8 plan to the stability pacts, German leaders have demonstrated their belief that "German models and concepts for order can contribute to European solutions". They have also sought a greater role in other international institutions, such as a seat at the UN Security Council or their man (a German) at the head of the International Monetary Fund. Germans are thinking harder about ways to shape their environment, in order to protect the common interests. Thus, "'international civil-military relations' are becoming the key to foreign policy", according to the Bosnian trouble-shooter and former minister in Kohl's government, Christian Schwarz-Schilling[184]. In sum, Germany has become more assertive, but it has largely done so within the framework of multilateral institutions, the so-called, "assertive multilateralism". As

[183] Maull, Hanns W., "Germany in the Yugoslav Crisis", *Survival*, Vol.37 No.4,Winter 1995-96, pp.100-105

[184] Denison, Andrew (2001), op. cit., p.161

this is the case, many studies come to the conclusion that Germany still fits the "civilian power" model. The next part of the study deals with German foreign and security policy during the 1990s, especially Germany's involvement in military operations, in order to understand to what extent the discourse of German foreign and security policy meets civilian power role and whether this discourse shall be defined as departure from policy orientation or adaptation to the new security environment and new forms of challenges to security.

5.3 German Practices of the Use of Force: From the Gulf War to the Kosovo War

Unlike the Nazis that declared "total war" to the world, West German Genscherists declared total peace at the time of reunification. While Germans were still almost totally absent from the scene of military action during the Gulf War of 1991, they found themselves at centre-stage only eight years later in NATO's war in Kosovo. There are three perspectives on German participation in military interventions:

The first one is the "culture of restraint" view. According to this view, a stable anti-militarist political culture has evolved in Germany (culture of restraint) after Germany's loss of the World War II and the breakdown of the Third Reich (which had enormous impact on Germany)[185]. Public attitudes and the political discourse on participation in military interventions reflect Germany's political culture and shape the room for manoeuvre for political decision-makers. It is argued

[185] Baumann, Rainer and Hellmann, Gunther (2001), pp.62-63

that with regard to the role of a civilian power, there is comparatively little change to be identified since reunification as well as expected for the future. While Germany may be pressed by its partners to give up its exceptionalism on the use of force, Germany's domestic social structures slow down or even prevent substantial changes of the German position. Thus, the undeniable change in German policy from remaining absent in the Gulf War to fully participating in the Kosovo War, is to be seen as a reluctant adaptation to a changing international environment, and Germany seems far from making major changes regarding the use of force in the foreseeable future.

The second view is "the salami tactics" or the socializing effects of political action. According to this view, Germany's policy, with regard to the use of military force, has changed as a central element of a remilitarization of German foreign and security policy. They reflect the evolving German readiness to participate in military interventions as the result of a deliberate strategy of German decision-makers who wanted the use of force to become an accepted means of German foreign and security policy. German decision-makers expanded the scope of Germany's contributions to out-of-area operations step by step, utilising what can be called "salami tactics"[186]. So that, the pressure of Germany's western partners is to be seen less as causes of German policy changes, but more as to welcome opportunities for the proponents of re-militarization to legitimize their course.

The third view is the gradual change and the quest for normality view. They argue that structural as well as actional factors shape each other. This is to say, Germany is in the process of "coming of age", becoming more "self-confident" and assertive, feeling less inhibited by its pre-World War II legacy. In the eyes of the abnormalization critics, in contrast, Germany is again "militarizing" its foreign policy, thereby returning to the dubious past of "power politics" ('*Machtpolitik*') and "a security policy of reconfrontation"[187].

[186] Ibid., pp.63-64

The above-mentioned theoretical views posit different approaches on the use of force (by Germany), and aim to question whether the German military participation in international fora is a process of remilitarization or the way it uses fits the civilian power role. The following part analyzes Germany's participation in military operations with concrete examples.

a) The German Position before Reunification

Before reunification, Germany had been keenly reluctant to contemplate any use of force outside traditional NATO missions of collective defense. Use of force, even in concert with the allies, was not perceived to be an acceptable instrument of foreign and security policy for Germany. Thus, while there had repeatedly been requests for German participation in Western out-of-area operations, and for German contributions to UN peacekeeping operations, the Federal Republic had refrained from actual deployment of Bundeswehr units in such operations.

Explanation to the above-mentioned self-restraint can be made through reference to the defining concepts in Germany's foreign and security policy vocabulary before the reunification, namely, multilateralism ('never again go it alone'); European integration with an emphasis on regaining recognition, trust and economic wealth; and anti-militarizm with regard to culture of restraint and civilian power role.

The problem of out-of-area operations was discussed in NATO and the question of deploying troops attracted only limited attention in West Germany. In 1982, the West German government's Security Council (*Bundessicherheitsrat*) stressed that the Basic Law (of West Germany) prohibited any deployments of

[187] Ibid., pp.64-66

Bundeswehr troops out-of-area[188]. In 1987, some politicians began to question the issue. US forces engaged in a number of skirmishes with Iran, in order to secure the passage of Kuwaiti oil tankers in the Persian Gulf. In July 1987, the US called upon its European allies to provide military assistance in this conflict. The US administration asked the German government to send ships to the Persian Gulf. In turn, Germans pointed to their constitutional restrictions and limited their support to sending a few ships to the Mediterranean. However, the German Ministry of Defense took a position that deviated from the decision of 1982. It maintained that it was constitutional to deploy Bundeswehr forces to protect German merchant ships in the high seas[189].

b) Germany in the Gulf War

Iraq's invasion of Kuwait and the Gulf War of 1991 became a challenge to the German insistence on military restraint. During that time, the political rhetoric was filled with 'Genscherist' terminology: On the one hand, multilateralism and European integration continued to be guiding concepts. On the other hand, the reunified Germany carried significantly more European and global responsibilty and the conduct of 'a policy of the good example' or 'a policy of responsibility' were imperative under the new conditions. In August 1990 the US administration had asked the Kohl government whether West Germany could send troops to the Gulf. However, without domestic support and at a time when the "Two-plus-Four Treaty" (requiring the Soviet approval) had not yet been ratified, it would be unwise to make such a departure. Also, the West German constitution would not allow for a deployment of Bundeswehr soldiers.

[188] Kreile, Michael, "Will Germany Assume a Leadership Role in the European Union?", in Heurlin, Bertel (ed.), *Germany in Europe in the Ninetees*, London: Macmillan Press LTD, 1996, p.128

[189] Baumann, Rainer and Hellmann, Gunther (2001), op. cit., p.69

The only difference this time was that Christian Democrats portrayed constitutional limit as an obstacle to be overcome rather than a fundamental constraint to be dealt with. As a reaction to this, ‘‘Germany must not lag behind anybody in its efforts for peace’’ Brandt said because war, in his view, was “the ultima irratio of politics”[190]. Meanwhile, Germany supported its allies with substantial financial contributions amounting to DM 18 billion. Also, with NATO’s Defense Planning Committee decision in January 1991, Allied Mobile Force’s air components were sent to bases in south-eastern Turkey, with 200 *Bundeswehr* soliders and 18 German fighter jets. Thus, Genscher’s hopes for “a new culture of international co-existence” with Germany as “a policy of the good example” were likely to be realized[191].

c) German Military Deployments in the Early 1990s and the Out-Of-Area Debate

In the early years of reunified Germany, representatives of the Kohl administration argued that Germany was expected, by its partners, to take over more responsibility by contributing to international military operations. In the following period, there became a clear rise in the scope of the German contributions to these operations: From medical troops to the UN peace-keeping operation, UNAMIC, in Cambodia (in 1991/92) and to the naval forces of the WEU’s Operation Sharp Guard monitoring the embargo against Yugoslavia in the Adriatic (from 1992 to

[190] Joffe, Josef, “Once More: the German Question”, *Survival*, Vol.32 No.2, March/April 1990, p.136

[191] Haftendorn, Helga, “Gulliver in the Centre of Europe: International Involvement and National Capabilities for Action”, in Heurlin, Bertel (ed.), *Germany in Europe in the Ninetees*, London: Macmillan Press LTD, 1996, pp.112-115

1996), as well as to the dispatch of supply and transport units of the *Bundeswehr* to Somalia (in 1993/94) as part of UNOSOM II[192].

Although not covered by the Basic Law and at a time when the debate on the issue of out-of-area operations had not been resolved, the former Foreign Minister Klaus Kinkel approved the Airborne Warning and Control Systems (AWACS) deployment in the Mediterranean, after the NATO decision of monitoring the no-fly zone over Bosnia-Hercegovina on 12 April 1993. In the course of the next year, NATO deployed its AWACS to the Mediterranean. In February 1994, NATO fighter jets shot down four Serbian fighters after repeated Serbian intrusions into the no-fly zone and in April 1994 NATO planes even attacked Serbian ground forces in order to stop the onslaught on the UN-procted area of Goradze. While Germany did not take part in NATO's airstrikes, German air force personnel participated in the surveillance and monitoring operations of AWACS[193].

Actually, the out-of-area debate should not, solely, be evaluated on legal terms: The heart of the problem has never been only juridical but also historical and political. Historically, it should not come as a surprise that a nation which failed disastrously in two world wars and thereafter succeeded brilliantly in peace should remain chained to the habits of a 'civilian power'.

Article 24 of the Basic Law states that

> (1) The Federation may, by legislation, transfer sovereign powers to international institutions.
>
> (2) For the maintenance of peace, the Federation may join a system of mutual collective security; in doing so it will consent to those limitations of its sovereign powers which will bring about and secure

[192] Baumann, Rainer and Hellmann,Gunther, (2001), op. cit., p.72

[193] Meiers, Franz-Josef, "Germany: the Reluctant Power", *Survival*, Vol.37 No.3, Autumn 1995, pp.83-92

> a peaceful and lasting order, in Europe and among the nations of the world.
>
> (3) For the settlement of disputes between nations, the Federation will accede to conventions concerning a general, comprehensive obligatory system of international arbitration[194].

In this sense, although the Article 24 of the Basic Law authorized participation in systems of collective security (let the FRG to become NATO and WEU member) and by becoming UN member in 1973 the FRG had accepted all obligations under the charter, the German administrations regarded the out-of-area ban as a 'holy constitutional writ'. This was the outcome of a historical burden. However, with the end of the Cold War and changing international environment, the new responsibilities and roles of Germany in the international community, was begun to be discussed.

The Gulf War had triggered an agonising debate in the SPD about the use of force[195]. This debate had split the party – and its leadership – into three camps: a pacifist left which rejected any deployment of the Bundeswehr outside the traditional NATO mission of collective defense; a centrist majority which accepted Bundeswehr participation in UN peacekeeping operations, but rejected any role in peace-enforcement, even this operation was mandated by the UN Security Council; and a small but politically influential minority in the leadership that supported German participation in both peacekeeping and peace-enforcement, as long as there was a clear Security Council mandate. The party was unable to reconcile these differences between the party members and efforts by the party leadership to secure party support for Bundewehr participation at least in 'robust' peacekeeping operations failed at party congress in 1991 and 1992. Thus, the SPD decision to

---

[194] Documents on Germany 1944-1985 (1985), op. cit., pp.226-227

[195] Philippi, Nina, *Bundeswehr-Auslandseinsatze als aussen- und sicherheitspolitisches Problem des geeinten Deutschlands*, Frankfurt: Lang, 1997, pp.112-127

bring the issue before the Constitutional Court was probably motivated by a desire by the party leadership to break the deadlock in party[196], and also in country.

The Greens, as a political grouping which had its West German roots in the peace movement, contained a strong and principled pacifist wing and thus rejected any use of force, demanded the dismantling of the Bundeswehr and the substitution of NATO with effective collective security arrangements within (the then) OSCE and the UN. In addition, West German Greens rejected any German participation in UN peacekeeping missions. However, the East German party Bündnis 90 that merged with its West German counterpart in June 1993, took a moderate view regarding the issue. The party expressed in a draft text for a change of the Constitution that would have enabled Germany to participate in UN peacekeeping missions.

Developments in the former Yugoslavia acted as catalyst in changing the attitude of the Greens towards the use of force, the Bundeswehr and NATO. Like the SPD, Greens were divided in three different factions of about equal political weight: the radical pacifists on the left, the 'Realos' around Joschka Fischer, and a middle group led by Ludger Volmer who tried to reconcile the differences in the party through compromise positions. During the mid-1992, some Greens openly reflected their support to the use of force in order to disband the concentration camps in Bosnia. This intra-party debate and different tendencies of German political parties challenged pacifist convictions (that argued any use of force could only escalate death and suffering) vis a vis the use of force and posited the need for military intervention to prevent mass murder, under certain circumstances. This change was reflected by the former Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer when he addressed the Bundestag in late 1995 and said that Germany was in a conflict between its value of the renunciation of the use of force on the one hand, and the only way to stop human

[196] Maull, Hanns W. (2000a) op. cit., pp.61-62

suffering through military force (as a last resort) on the other hand[197]. In this regard, Germany was facing different responsibilities, but responsibilities not adding up to a coherent whole. However, dilemma expressed by Fischer in 1995, and facing German policy-makers had been on the agenda for sometime.

Before the SPD-Green government (under Gerhard Schroder and Joschka Fischer) came to power in 1998, the former coalition of CDU/CSU and FDP had moved towards support for German participation in peacekeeping and peaceenforcement following the Gulf War. However, they differed on the interpretation of legal and constitutional rules and norms governing this process and the missions, with the FDP strongly insisting on constitutional clarification. Between 1991 and 1994 CDU pushed hard for a revision of Germany's foreign and security policy regarding out-of-area operations and missions. Volker Rühe, the Defense Minister of Germany between 1 April 1992 and 27 October 1998, pursued a strategy to push Germany outward against the constraints on the use of the Bundeswehr through providing involvement in various UN peacekeeping missions. Rühe himself called this strategy as "salami tactics"[198].

As the tendencies of German political parties were in this way, Foreign Minister Klaus Kinkel, from 18 May 1992 to 26 October 1998, stated that due to the sensitivity of the issue, they had to oppose policies which they generally considered right. Due to this sensitivity the political actors in Germany could not solve the problem and left the solution of out-of-area question to the Federal Constitutional Court. On 12 July 1994, the Court decided the issue in the affirmative: the *Bundeswehr* may take part in an out-of-area operation if the *Bundestag* gives its authorization and if this operation is conducted within the framework of a system of collective security and for humanitarian reasons. Also, the Constitutional Court

[197] Ibid., p.63

[198] Ibid., p.63

supported the contention that NATO could/can be seen as a system of collective security[199].

The Constitutional Court's decision was not only the solution of juridical question. It signalled and defined the new role of the reunified Germany in the international system. The government stated that its policies towards the use of force would continue to be governed by a 'culture of restraint'. However, 30 June 1995 became a watershed date in post-war Germany, on which the Germans broke through the 40-year-old cocoon and the *Bundestag* authorized the government to project force out-of-area into the former Yugoslavia[200]. The following part will deal with the issue of the deployment of German troops in the Balkans under IFOR and SFOR that has been possible with the decision of the German Constitutional Court.

d) German Troops in the Balkans: Participation in IFOR and SFOR

In the light of Srebrenica, the German political elite accepted that the legacy of German history should not only be to call for 'No more Wars!' ('*Nie wieder Krieg*!') but also for 'No more Auschwitz!'. NATO request in February 1995, for sending a large NATO force to the Balkans to secure the retreat of the unsuccessful UNPROFOR, made the latter argument more visible. The operation was not materialized but Bonn responded positively to NATO's request and declared its readiness to contribute a contingent of 1,800 soliders.

---

[199] Joffe, Josef, "No Threats, No Temptations: German Grand Strategy After the Cold War", in Heurlin, Bertel (ed.), *Germany in Europe in the Ninetees*, London: Macmillan Press LTD, 1996, p.261

[200] Ibid., p.259

In December 1995, the Balkans Contact Group managed to broker the Dayton Peace Accord. The German government had already indicated in October that it would contribute several *Bundeswehr* soliders, mainly from logistics and transport units to the NATO-led force, which was to police the agreement. When the Dayton Accord was signed, the Bundestag authorized the German participation in IFOR, by which, 3.000 German troops mainly provided medical and logistical assistance to French soldiers. SFOR took over the functions of IFOR in 1996 and Germany's SFOR contingent included combat forces and the *Bundeswehr* troops were regularly stationed in Bosnia-Hercegovina[201].

5.4 German Participation in the Kosovo War

The most intense military involvement of German soldiers took place in the former Yugoslavia. German soldiers first became involved from July 1993 in supervising and enforcement of economic sanctions within the framework of NATO and WEU operations. Bundeswehr participation constituted nearly one third of the fully integrated NATO AWACs units which were assigned the task of monitoring and enforcing a no-fly-zone over Bosnia. As mentioned above, during the final stages of the Bosnia War in 1995, Bonn first reluctantly accepted the need for German participation in an eventual NATO operation to extract UNPROFOR

[201] Meiers, Franz-Josef (1995), op. cit., p.91

personnel. This was followed by Germany's agreement to participation of German Tornados in NATO's aerial attacks against the Bosnian Serbs[202].

5.4.1 On the Way to the Kosovo War

As it is today, following the declaration of independence of the young Republic of Kosovo by its Prime Minister Hashim Thaci, Kosovo has always been at the epicentre of the wars taking place in the process of the dissolution of the former Yugoslavia. The events started to escalate with the bloody suppression of Kosovo's autonomy by Belgrade administration in February 1989 that was a strong message to the non-Serb republics. The Albanian opposition in Kosovo was led by President Rugova, who had been chosen through unofficial elections that Belgrade had not recognised but tolerated. President Rugova's attempts to force Belgrade change its policies through a campaign of resistance, were not successful due to lack of international support for Rugova. In spring 1996, the Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA) made its first appearence, and with the fall of the Communist regime in Albania (that emptied the arsenals of Albania and caused a free-fall in prices for small arms) the KLA had access to huge quantities of military equipment. In the winter of 1997/98, the KLA launched attacks against Serbian military units in Kosovo, and Serbian forces tried to crush in February 1998. Therefore, the war between KLA and Serbian security forces began in February 1998. The tactically wrong step of the KLA, to go on a premature offensive, was crushed by Serbian forces equipped with heavy weapons. The Serbian forces went on the offensive in July and by mid-August, the fighting had stopped with 1,600 people killed, about

[202] Maull, Hanns W. (2000a) op. cit., p.58

100,000 Albanians had fled to Kosovo and 200,000 caught as refugees inside the province[203].

The Contact Group (the US, Russia, the UK, France, Italy and Germany) had expressed its concern over the issue in early 1997. France and Germany undertook a diplomatic initiative in November 1997 that aimed to entice Belgrade to give concessions in return for the removal of sanctions[204]. In March 1998, the UNSC passed the Resolution 1160 and stated that:

> The Security Council,
>
> …
>
> Calls upon the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia immediatly to take the further necessary steps to achieve a political solution to the issue of Kosovo through dialogue and to implement the actions indicated in the Contact Group statements of 9 and 25 March 1998;
>
> …
>
> Calls upon the authorities in Belgrade and the leadership of the Kosovar Albanian community urgently to enter without preconditions into a meaningful dialogue on political status issues, and notes the readiness of the Contact Group to facilitate such a dialogue;
>
> Agrees, without prejudging the outcome of that dialogue, with the proposal in the Contact Group statements of 9 and 25 March 1998 that the principles for a solution of the Kosovo problem should be based on the territorial integrity of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and should be in accordance with OSCE standards, including those set out in the Helsinki Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe of 1975, and the Charter of the United Nations, and that such a solution must also take into account

[203]Maull, Hanns W., "German Foreign Policy, Post-Kosovo: Still a 'Civilian Power?'", *German Politics*, Vol.9 Issue.2, August 2000, p.2

[204] Meyer, Berthol and Schlotter, Peter, *Die Kosovo-Kriege 1998/99, Die Internationalen Interventionen und ihre Folgen*, HSFK Report 1/2000, Frankfurt, 2000, p.13

> the rights of the Kosovar Albanians and all who live in Kosovo, and expresses its support for an enhanced status for Kosovo which would include a substantially greater degree of autonomy and meaningful self-administration[205];

This was followed by the Resolution 1199, but neither could be based on Chapter VII, that is on Action with Respect to Threats to the Peace, Breaches of the Peace, and Acts of Aggression, due to Russia and China's unwillingness to contemplate use of force against Belgrade. The diplomatic pressure of the Contact Group on Belgrade administration to stop ethnic cleansing was not responded affirmatively. By October, NATO was ready to move towards air strikes against the former Yugoslavia, meanwhile on 27 September 1998 the German electorate voted for the new coalition government between Gerhard Schröder's SPD and Joschka Fischer's Green Party[206].

Schröder and Fischer, who were in Washington in 1998 as members of a government-elect, were urged by the White House not to veto any NATO action. After turning back to Bonn, they were confronted with a revised White House request which asked them to raise the pressure on Milosevic by having the Germans to commit to full *Bundeswehr* participation in the operation, at least in NATO staffs, on NATO's AWACS and in other indirect forms of combat. With the deployment of the OSCE observers in Kosovo, the coalition was given a limited time.

Since Russia and China refused to contemplate a UN Security Council resolution invoking Chapter VII of the UN Charter for the use of force against former Yugoslavia, NATO action would be made without UN Security Council mandate. On 12 October 1998 Schröder and Fischer had to act within a few minutes. The position of the government to meet expectations of its NATO allies, and mainly the US, was supported by a vote in Bundestag. The decision of support was given by

[205] http://daccessdds.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N98/090/23/PDF/N9809023.pdf?OpenElement

[206] Maull, Hanns W. (2000a),op. cit., p.58

five hundred members who voted in favour; eighteen members of Bundestag abstained; where sixty two members voted against, most of them from the former East German Communist party, the PDS, which was the only party firmly to reject Bundeswehr deployment[207].

Richard Holbrooke, the US Ambassodor to Germany between 1993 and 1994 and Leader of the American team negotiating the Bosnian Peace Accords at Dayton, signed an agreement with Serb President Slobodan Milosevic that brokered an informal armistice in Kosovo, on 12 October 1998. With this agreement: Serbia promised to retain 15.000 soldiers and 10.000 police forces and withdraw rest of its military presence from Kosovo, a political dialogue between Belgrade and Albanians was to resume and this armistice was to be supervised by 2.000 unarmed OSCE observers. This mission was to be protected with an additional NATO military force that was stationed in Macedonia, the force which Germany decided to participate. The failure of the agreement was obvious from the fact that such a mission was out of depth of the OSCE and its capability[208].

Holbrooke's diplomatic efforts managed to stop air attacks for sometime, but not more than this. The compromise he negotiated with Milosevic fell apart, but fight on the ground intensified with gruesome massacre in the village of Racak. The massacre of 45 Albanians near Racak on 15 January 1999 shifted the mood in Western capitals and in Berlin as well. Washington came to the point to favour air strikes, while Berlin tried to keep its attempts for a political solution through the Contact Group. The result was the Rambouillet Agreement, but it was a door to nowhere. The Rambouillet was the name of a proposed peace agreement between Yugoslavia and a delegation that represented the ethnic-Albanian majority population of Kosovo. It was drafted by NATO and named for Chateau Rambouillet, where it was initially proposed. Henry Kissinger's comment on the Rambouillet

---

[207] Ibid., p.58

[208] Maull, Hanns W. (2000b), op. cit., p.3

reflected how the situation was disappointing: "The Rambouillet text, which called on Serbia to admit NATO troops throughout Yugoslavia, was a provocation, an excuse to start bombing. Rambouillet is not a document that an angelic Serb could have accepted. It was a terrible diplomatic document that should never have been presented in that form"[209]. The significance of the Agreement lies in the fact that Yugoslavia refused to accept it, which NATO used as justification to start the Kosovo War.

Following this, in March 1999, Schröder, Fischer, and Scharping had to address the challenge of keeping the German people behind the participation in NATO's air war. Actually, there were certain constraints, such as opposition to real war fighting through ground troops, those remained/remain entrenched; and German public opinion by that time was deeply divided between West and East Germany, where the East Germans took a more restrictive and sceptical view on NATO and on missions of Bundeswehr. However, the support for Bundeswehr participation not only in peacekeeping but also in humanitarian intervention and peace enforcement, was growing. This attitude was shaped in the course of time from the Gulf War of 1991 to the wars of succession in the former Yugoslavia. The support for German participation in UN peacekeeping operations rose from 24 per cent in February 1991 to 72 per cent in January 1993. The support for German involvement in peace enforcement operations was 8 per cent in early 1991 and it became one-third in March 1994. By mid-1996, opposition to the use of Bundeswehr in out-of-area missions fell to 14 per cent in West Germany. Although the opposition per cent was decreasing, a clear majority of the East Germans were opposing to Bundeswehr participation in these missions[210]. As the data above reflect, it was not so so hard for German governments to succeed in winning praise in both internal and external domain.

---

[209] Kissinger, Henry, Daily Telegraph, 28 June 1999 [on http://www.telegraph.co.uk/portal/main.jhtml?view=ARCHIVE&grid=A1NoGoogle&menuId=-1&menuItemId=-1]

[210] Noelle-Neumann, Elisabeth and Köcher, Renate (eds.), Allensbacher Jahrbuch der Demoskopie, Munich: K. G. Saur, 1997, Band 10, p.1147

On 24 March 1999, four German ECR-Tornados took off from their base in Piacenza to participate in NATO's operation, for bombing targets in the former Yugoslav Federation[211]. The German contribution to operation was rather limited: it supplied some 14 Tornado aircraft, of which 10 were equipped for electronic reconnaissance and countermeasures against enemy air defenses, and four for optical reconnaissance. In addition, the Bundeswehr played a major part in humanitarian actions to relieve the plight of Albanian refugees: it organised refugee camps in Macedonia and Albania, and airlifted some 2.500 tonnes of material in over 250 transport flights[212].

Although the German contribution was relatively limited, for the first time since 1945 German forces took part in offensive combat mission against a sovereign state. The most striking part was that it took place under a Red-Green coalition (who were traditionally anti-militarist) and without a UN mandate. German participation in Operation Deliberate Force raised a number of questions about this large and influential country's future role in Europe, its self- perception as a civilian power and in addition, the Kosovo tragedy erupted mid-way through the German presidency of the EU and the WEU, and its chairmanship of the G8.

During a prominent transatlantic conference in Munich, in February 1999, Schröder himself was at pains to emphasise in all clarity that Germany would "remain a reliable partner". Moreover, in contrast to past attitudes according to which Germany's historical legacy prohibited any deployment of German troops out-of-area, the Chancellor emphasized that Germany's historical responsibility made it imperative "to prevent mass-murder with all the necessary means". In his

---

[211] Hyde-Price, Adrian, "Germany and the Kosovo War: Still a Civilian Power?" , *German Politics*, Vol.10 No.1, April 2001, p.19

[212] Maull, Hanns W (2000a),op. cit., p.59

view, Germany had come of age as a full member of NATO, now being ready "without any reservations" to assume responsibility as a normal ally[213].

Besides the Chancellor, after the war started on March 24, the key figures of the German government were constantly referring to unacceptable Serbian terror against the Albanian people, describing the overarching goal of the use of military means to be a halt to continuing serious and systematic violations of human rights as well as the prevention of a humanitarian catastrophe. The leading Green 'Realo', Fischer, played a pivotal role in changing attitudes on the German Left, declaring in 1995 after a visit to Bosnia that military force was morally justified in order to stop genocide, and that German troops should participate in such humanitarian intervention[214].

5.4.2 Military Operation under Red-Green Coalition: Moral and Practical Reasons

The Red-Green coalition took Office in October 1998. Theoretically and practically, the government seemed decisive, and also expectations from the government were, to pursue a foreign and security course that was not assertive and non-controversial with the line of foreign and security that had been in play. Although the government was likely to contribute to UN peacekeeping operations, it confined itself to generalities that reflected a strong willingness to emphasize continuity. However, when the Kosovo crisis began, the new coalition agreed to

[213] Baumann, Rainer and Hellmann, Gunther (2001), op. cit., p.76

[214] Hyde-Price, Adrian (2001b) op. cit., p.21

have the German Air Force (*Luftwaffe*) to join NATO operation even without a UN Security Council mandate. German motivations for participating in the bombing campaign were three-fold:

First, a strong sense of responsibility towards its NATO allies was a key motive. In the case of Kosovo, not to have participated in the NATO operation would have fatally undermined the international position of the new German government. The new coalition had to demonstrate its reliability as partner of the Western alliance beyond any doubt. Any suspicion of yet another German *Sonderweg* would have made life extremely difficult for the new and untested coalition. The visit of the coalition partners in October 1998 should have been effective in the new stance of the government.

Second, a strong sense of moral and political responsibility towards the humanitarian suffering in Kosovo was important. The construction of post-World War II German identity around a rejection of its totalitarian past (against the legacy of Hitler and Holocaust) motivated the German policy-makers in the decision of participation in military intervention. Thus, abhorrence with a mixture of guilt (both the Nazi past and failure in Bosnia) provided a strong motive for advocating the use of force.

A third important motive, for German policy-makers, was a serious concern about the stability in Southeastern Europe and possible damages to the credibility and effectiveness of international and European institutions due to failure through leaving the war in Kosovo unchecked, stopping ethnic cleansing and providing peace and stability. On the one hand, following the dissolution of the Soviet Union and disappearence of conventional threat to West European democracies, instability in Europe was perceived to be the primary threat to German security. On the other hand, German foreign and security policy was/is axiomatically multilateralist. Therefore, German foreign and security policy depended/depends on well-functioning international and European institutions more than any other country.

Following the war, Foreign Minister particularly emphasised this aspect of the issue in order to justify Germany's participation in the NATO's air operation. Germany was much too exposed and much too vulnerable to the ripple effects of any further deterioration of the situation in the Balkans, for the country not to get involved in NATO's air battle[215].

There are two further pragmatic factors for German participation in NATO operation. The first one was a worry about a new wave of asylum-seekers and refugees. If Kosovars were unable to turn back their homes, hence the Serbian ethnic cleanising in Kosovo threatened to precipitate large-scale migration into Western Europe, which the German government wished to prevent. Germany was where most of Kosovars would have wanted to go, because most of Kosovars had relatives in Germany and they regarded the country as their destination of choice. Germany had been already burdened with a large refugee population from Bosnia and substantial numbers of Albanians, some of them involved in drug trade. Thus, German authorities were highly sensitive against the possibility of another large influx of refugees.

The other reason was that abstaining from participation in NATO action would have resulted in self-isolation and a loss of influence over NATO policies. Abstention would mean abdication for Germany from future of Europe, international and European institutions. The way to settle the Kosovo conflict would definitely have far-reaching implications for international and European security, peace, stability and order[216].

[215] Maull, Hanns W. (2000a),op. cit., pp.60-61

[216] Ibid., p.61

5.4.3 German Diplomatic Efforts and Major Elements of German Strategy

Given its presidency of EU, Germany played a pivotal role in negotiations to end the war and to bring peace to the region. In early April, Foreign Minister Fischer announced a peace plan. The German EU presidency also took the initiative in developing a 'Stability Pact for Southeast Europe', along with more focused economic and financial aid for Albania and Macedonia. Throughout the bombing campaign, a key concern of German diplomacy was to involve both the UN and the Russians in the search to end the war. In his capacity as the President of the European Council, Chancellor Schröder invited the UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan to attend the informal EU Summit in Brussels on 14 April. The future role of EU in a peace settlement for the Balkans was also discussed during Annan's three-day visit to Germany. The Germans did not want the Kosovo War to undermine a cooperative security relationship with Moscow and so, they tried to 'bring the Russians back in the boat'. In April and May, many German diplomats and political leaders travelled to Moscow to encourage the Russian administration to play a positive role in the conflict. The German government also encouraged the Americans to intensify their dialogue with Moscow. Finally, the G8 was used as a forum for building a political agreement with Russia. The success of this strategy was evident from the positive outcome of the G-8 Summit in Bonn on 5 May, at which a set of 'principles' were agreed on to end the conflict[217].

Germany's search for a diplomatic solution was obviously triggered by NATO's failure to achieve one of its originally defined objectives: to prevent a

[217] Hyde-Price, Adrian (2001b) op. cit., p.28

humanitarian catastrophe. In the plan announced by the European Union, the objectives were redefined: the Union now sought an immediate end to hostilities, the demobilisation or removal of all military forces in Kosovo, an international force to be stationed and sustaining political negotiations on the basis of Rambouillet peace plan. Germany's strategy was based on these major elements:

First, Germany was pursuing a co-operative multilateral approach towards the members of the UN Security Council, especially Russia and China, in order to isolate Serbia. Germany strongly aimed to bring Russia into Western attempts to put pressure on Belgrade for a diplomatic solution and sustainable political dialogue. This was partially succeeded through the G-8 forum and meeting of Foreign Ministers on 6 May.

Second, it was of vital importance for Germany to create international legitimacy through a UN Security Council Resolution to mandate, under Chapter VII, an international force to implement and supervise a diplomatic solution for Kosovo. This was achieved on 10 June 1999, following the bombing of the Chinese Embassy in Belgrade.

Third was a German effort to provide peace and stability in whole South-East Europe through the Stability Pact that was presented by Joschka Fischer on 8 April and formally adopted on 10 June 1999. The Pact reflected/reflects a civilian power's approach to conflict solution in various aspects: The Pact is multilateral and inclusive. It aims co-operation of countries in the region, the EU member states, Russia, the US, Canada and Japan, over 15 international organisations, and NGOs. It also tries to solve both inter- and intra-state conflicts through democratisation, regional co-operation and integration and socio-economic development of the countries. The enlargement of EU and NATO to take in these countries has been the ultimate incentive of the Pact[218].

[218] Maull, Hanns W. (2000b), op.cit., pp.4-5

5.4.4 The Solution of the Dilemma on the Use of Force

The Kosovo tragedy has forced Germany to confront two distinct but closely inter-linked questions: The first concerns the role and utility of military force. The second is whether European order can continue to rest on the traditional principles of the Westphalian states system, namely the sovereignty and the non-intervention into states' domestic affairs.

As the defining concepts in West Germany's foreign and security policy vocabulary before the reunification were multilateralism and anti-militarizm with strong determination to culture of restraint and civilian power role, West Germany had been keenly reluctant to contemplate any use of force outside traditional NATO missions of collective defense. Use of force, even in concert with the allies, was not perceived to be an acceptable instrument of foreign policy for Germany. Thus, West German response to the requests for participation in Western out-of-area operations were negative. However, the reunified Germany carried significantly more European and global responsibilty and the conduct of 'a policy of the good example' or 'a policy of responsibility' were imperative under the new conditions. But to what extent?

With regard to the Germany's role in the Kosovo War: Has Germany remained a 'civilian power' or has it returned to power politics within which use of military force is a regular mean of conduct in inter-state relations? Has Germany acted within a multilateral framework or pursued a 'go it alone policy'? These are the questions still discussed within the International Relations academic community. However, based on the facts this study sets forth (Germany's structural and institutional considerations settled in the international setting; and Germany's identity, political culture and domestic political structure settled in the domestic setting), German involvement in the Kosovo War and the policy adjustments made

vis a vis the use of force is far from power considerations of a traditional *Machtpolitik.* Rather, Germany has remained faithful to its institutional commitments and multilateral orientation, has acted with its partners in a sense of responsibility, has used the diplomatic measures for a political solution, and has agreed (with its partners) on the use of force as the last resort to stop human suffering. As Chancellor Schröder quoted the Albanian writer Ismail Kandare, in his speech to the opening session in the *Reichstag* building in Berlin, on 19 April 1999,: ''With its intervention in the Balkans, atlantic Europe has opened a new page in world history. It is not about material interests, but about principles: the defense of legality and of the poorest people on the continent. This is a founding act.''[219]

As mentioned in the part dealing with conceptual clarification, dealing with concepts and vesting meanings to them, with a practical base, is not easy. The 'civilian power' concept is no exception. Theoretically, the concept of 'civilian power' is somewhat vague and loosely defined. However, as Hanns Maull points out, it is not equated with a pacifist renunciation of the use of military force under any circumstances. From this point of view, many international relations academics argue, with which this study agrees, that Germany remains a 'civilian power' because of the German attempts to stop human suffering, building and running refugee camps in Macedonia and Albania, its efforts to reach a negotiated settlement and the use of force as a last resort, within a multilateral framework (NATO alliance). German multilateralism and civilian power-type foreign and security policy is a crucial determinant in providing and sustaining peace and stability in Europe and in the international system. Thus, German multilateralism and civilian power-type foreign and security policy is a guarantee for Germany and the international community, an issue which the following part of the study will deal with.

[219] Hyde-Price, Adrian (2001b) op. cit., p.30

5.5 German Multilateralism: A Guarantee for Germany and the International Community

Following the World War II, it was perceived as the most critical problem, and not possible, to envisage West Germany gaining full sovereignty without clear-cut assurances for its European neighbours against a possible revival of German military expansionism. Thus, the limits on Germany's military capabilities were regarded as necessary for assuring the international community and supported by the German political and academic elite. However, the equation was not that easy. While the spirit of the time necessitated powerful constraints on German power, the Cold War divide demanded, for the West, a militarily powerful Germany closely aligned with the West. This situation created mutual dependence: As Germany was constrained, it was to receive protection from the US; and the precondition for the US to protect West Europe from Soviet expansionism was to protect Germany[220].

The paradoxical situation, the necessity to keep Germany both strong and weak, could be realized through the double containment strategy of the US: In 1951, West Germany was integrated as an equal partner to the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) that was designed to put member states' coal and steel industries, and thus their military capacities, under control of a supranational body. On the other hand, in 1955, West Germany placed all active West German forces under the direct command of NATO[221]. Since then, strong commitment to institutional affiliations, institutions to which Germany is a party, has become a basic characteristic of West German, and then German, foreign and security policy. Since the neorealist conceptual framework points out a reciprocal influence on foreign and security policy (constraining national interests through international structure and providing mechanisms through international institutions to pursue

[220] Maull, Hanns W. (2000a),op. cit., p.67

[221] Hanrieder, Wolfram F., *Germany, America, Europe: Forty Years of German Foreign Policy*, London: Yale University Press, 1989, pp.152-155

these interests), in practice, multilateralism realized this premise and started to have a double function on German foreign and security policy: To keep Germany a perceivable and controllable power with a discourse of civilian foreign and security policy. It also paved the way for a strong correlation between German interests and well-functioning of these organisations, hence German interests were/are to be met through these organisations. However, Germany's multilateralism cannot simply be understood in terms of clear-cut choices and distinct strategies, but rather as a series of policy dilemmas revolving around NATO, EU and the OSCE, and Washington, Paris and Moscow axis. The task facing Germany is now, as was during the 1990s, to manage its foreign and security policy in ways which contribute to the consolidation of the European integration process and lessening of tensions and conflicts in Europe. In short, it is expected to lay the foundations for a Europe 'whole and free'.

As mentioned above, the ground for the existing multidimensional foreign policy was prepared during the Cold War period. Post-World War II West German security policy was built on three key flanks: First, a transatlantic alliance with Washington and integration into NATO was the primary objective. The FRG joined NATO in 1955 and since then the alliance has provided the bedrock of German security. Second one was a West European alliance with Paris and integration into the European Economic Community (EEC) and the WEU. The Franco-German axis was institutionalized with the 1963 Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation and these two states have coordinated their *Europapolitik* in order to further their commitment to the European integration. Third one was the detente policy towards the East Europe. This policy became the most pronounced one with the adoption of *Ostpolitik* and was pursued in a coordinated manner with the CSCE.

One of the basic aims of the German foreign and security policy has become to create institutional mechanisms to foster political dialogue and improve diplomatic relations in order to prevent rather than fight a war. As Peter Stratman argued during the Cold War:

> ‘‘The Federal Republic can expect to be secure only if war is entirely prevented. Confronted with the conventional and nuclear offensive and destructive potential of the SU, it would be meaningless for this tiny, densely populated and highly-industrialized country, which might be the potential battlefield, to seek security in the capability for successful defence...’’[222].

This amilitary strategic culture and strong commitment to multilateralism, which contradicts with pre-1945 aggressive strategy of Germany that was ‘going it alone’, has reflected far-reaching changes in German politics and continues to exert a profound influence on contemporary German foreign and security policy-thinking. In short, amilitary strategic culture colours Germany’s approach to the post-Cold War security agenda in Europe and the wider international system.

The emergence of a ‘pluralist security community’, as Karl Deutsch has called, embracing the North Americans and the West Europeans, determined the evolution of German foreign and security policy. An international society has developed within the transatlantic states system in which cooperation and sociability between states has largely superseded traditional *Realpolitik* instincts. This has tremendous significance for Germany’s place in the post-Cold War Europe. During the pre-1945 period, the issue of how to incorporate a country as large and dynamic as Germany into the established European states system (“the German problem”) was an insoluble problem for European security. The power of Germany had been fatally destabilizing the European balance of power. The end of Cold War bipolarity and the reunification of Germany brought about the rebirth of these questions and

[222] Hyde-Price, Adrian, “Germany’s Security Policy Dilemmas: NATO, the WEU and the OSCE”, in Larres, Klaus (ed.), *Germany Since Unification: The Domestic and External Consequences*, London: Macmillan Press LTD, 1998, p.208

fears. However, the high level of complex interdependence, economic globalization, institutionalized multilateral cooperation and the consolidation of stable liberal democracies have transformed the nature of classical state power. This has affected the nature of German power in four significant ways:

First of all, the power of reunified Germany will not be concentrated in the hands of a centralized government. The substantial state functions and responsibilities have been devolved to the Lander and local government level.

Secondly, the membership of Germany in EU and NATO reflects that some power has been devolved upwards, through the institutional framework.

Thirdly, the rise of transnational corporations, strategic corporate alliances and cross-border economic activities have broken the state monopoly on economic interactions.

Finally, the political culture and social structure of contemporary Germany is fundamentally different from what it was before 1945, with democratic and liberal ethos[223].

[223] Ibid., p.211

5.6 The Policy Dilemmas and the Solution: Give up 'All or Nothing', Uphold 'But Also'

The fundamental change has not solely been in the German policy-making process. The post-Cold War transformation has also changed the geographical context within which German foreign and security policy is formulated. Germany's traditional geopolitical dilemmas arose from its central geographical location within a European balance of power between the great powers of the continent. However, today the dilemmas of Germany's *Sicherheitspolitik* derive from the country's position on the eastern edge of the transatlantic security community: Germany is an integral member of this community, but with borders on the zone of incipent conflict and instability in the east. It is the new geopolitical land-scape which has produced the current foreign and security dilemmas of the German administration. Thus, although Germany is no longer confronted by any identifiable enemies or direct security threats, it nonetheless has to address a security agenda constituted by a series of diffuse and multifaceted security "risks" and "challenges":

The first of these comes from the residual military arsenal of the former Soviet Union. The Russian Federation itself remains a major military superpower with substantial conventional and non-conventional military assets. This coupled with the continuing political instability of many post-Soviet republics and the dangers of nuclear proliferation. The second risk comes with the problems generated by the resurgence of ethno-national conflicts in much of the East Europe and the Balkans. The collapse of Communism and the socio-economic costs created in transforming authoritarian communist systems into democratic market structures,

created animosities and new patterns of ethnic, religious and national conflict. The third category of risks arises from developments in the wider international system. Germany is a major trading country and concerned about potential threats to supplies of vital raw materials, markets and maritime trade routes. With technological developments, the spread of ballistic missiles, chemical, biological and nuclear weapons; problems of international terrorism; immigration from North Africa, the East Mediterranean and the instability generated by the appalling levels of poverty and underdevelopment in many countries, are other risks affecting German foreign and security policy formulation.

As Germany continues to work out its response to the above-mentioned new forms of threats, demands and responsibilities, it is doing so within a firmly multilateral framework. This post-Cold War *Sicherheitspolitik* is being pursued within a dense institutional structure consisting of a series of regional, European and international organizations. This approach was summed up by Chancellor Kohl when he declared on 31 May 1991: ‘‘In the security field I am against ‘all or nothing’, I am in favour of ‘but also’!’’[224].

The speech of the former German Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer in the year 2000 reflected the fact that the German foreign and security policy strategy aims to keep options open, rather than making strict choices. With regard to the North Atlantic alliance, Fischer stated that

> ‘‘The Alliance is still the guarantor of collective defense and security in the North Atlantic area and will keep this role in the twenty–first century. For Germany in particular, transatlantic partnership and the U.S. political and military presence in Europe remain the key to peace and security on our continent. Four times in this century the United States has intervened militarily in Europe, most recently in Kosovo, because we Europeans believed ourselves incapable of acting on our own. That is a lesson we must heed for the future, too.

[224] Ibid., pp.216-217

> And given its geopolitical position, even a Europe that is one day united will still need transatlantic safeguards"[225].

For Fischer, the process of European integration and improvement within the field of foreign and security policy is not a challenge to transatlantic alliance. Rather, the growing responsibility and capability of European states to safeguard peace in Europe and tackle with the global challenges will strengthen the alliance. According to Fischer, the United States is an indispensable partner for European Union and by supporting the European Union to become stronger, an effective and coherent actor in international system, the United States can gain an indispensable and faithful partner in international politics. Fischer stated this as:

> "A strong Europe will also make for stronger transatlantic relations across the board–in the political, economic, and military domains. In a globalized world, only a European Union that can act effectively–not just on economic and financial issues, but also in the area of foreign and security policy–will be able to safeguard peace in Europe and rise to the global challenges on today's agenda. It is clearly true that the United States is the "indispensable nation" in that its contribution is essential to resolving international issues. It is up to Europe to develop and become the "indispensable partner" to the United States, while it is up to the United States to accept and support this process. This is the challenge–but also the transatlantic opportunity–of a European security and defense policy."[226]

The following part of this study deals with Germany's commitment to and its role in NATO, EU and the OSCE.

---

[225] Fischer, Joshchka, "The Indispensable Partner", *Georgetown Journal of International Affairs*, Vol.1 No.1, Winter/Spring 2000 [in http://www.internationalaffairs.com]

[226] Ibid.

5.7 Germany in NATO

Following the World War II and the partition of Germany, the threat of Soviet expansionism made the FRG to rely on the transatlantic alliance for its security and territorial integrity. After becoming a NATO member in 1955, the *Bundesrepublik* played an important role in the alliance both as a base for forward-deployed NATO forces and as a major contributor to the conventional military strength of the organization. Although Germany cooperates with France on the development of ESDI and has been keen to see a more cooperative OSCE, Germany's commitment to NATO has not yet weakened in any significant way. The NATO alliance remains the bedrock of German security policy. As the former Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer stated:

> "The United States is vital to Europe's security, whether internal or external. In this age of globalization and increasingly shared interests and challenges, however, one thing is also more obvious than ever: Europe is crucial to America's security. This nexus is reinforced by the new challenges that both the United States and Europe face, ranging from proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, to terrorism and organized crime, to environmental threats. In a globalized world, there can be no security and prosperity on either side of the Atlantic unless that security and prosperity are shared. After all the blood spilled in what the British historian Eric Hobsbawm has aptly called an "age of extremes," this is a lesson hopefully both the United States and Europe will never forget. The two components of this transatlantic bridge–Europe's importance to America's security and America's role in European security–together constitute the strong and solid foundation of shared interests on which we have to build a transatlantic security partnership adapted to the new environment.
>
> The crisis in Kosovo confronted NATO with a severe test. It passed the test with flying colors, demonstrating extraordinary cohesion and the capacity to act. The Alliance proved it had successfully realigned

> itself, as agreed at the Washington summit, to respond to the new strategic environment in Europe and assume an important role in conflict prevention and management. As in Bosnia, NATO placed its military capabilities at the service of the international community, aiding the search for a political solution to restore peace and respect for human rights. NATO's intervention halted rampant nationalism, violence, and expulsion in Kosovo, paving the way for the long–term stabilization of Southeastern Europe"[227].

There are four main reasons behind this strong commitment:

Firstly, NATO provides an invaluable security guarantee against a resurgent and revanchist Russia. It also provides an insurance policy in the event of instability in the former Soviet Union.

Secondly, German participation in NATO's integrated military command provides a very visible demonstration of its continuing *Westintegration* and its commitment to multilateral defence cooperation.

Thirdly, the German government enjoys a close relationship with the US within the context of "partnership in leadership"[228]. Also, the German administration remains convinced that a strong US military commitment to Europe is crucial for the continent's peace and security.

Finally, NATO is perceived as a tested alliance based on democratic principles and makes vital contribution to peace and stability in Europe.

The significance of NATO has not declined for Germany. However, since the end of the Cold War, there is broad consensus in Germany and other members of the alliance that NATO must reform its structure and functions, parallel to changing

[227] Ibid.

[228] Asmus, Ronald D., "Germany and America: Partners in Leadership?", *Survival*,Vol.33 No.6, November/December 1991, p.546

security environment. The belief that the Europeans need to assume a greater responsibility for their own security is widely held on both sides of the Atlantic. As Fischer stated:

> "Another remarkable outcome of the war in Kosovo was the way the Europeans demonstrated a will to assume unprecedented political and military responsibility within the Alliance–not only in terms of their military contributions, but also through the political initiatives of the German EU Presidency and the final breakthrough achieved by the EU intermediary, Finnish President Ahtisaari, and Russian special envoy Victor Chernomyrdin. The Stability Pact for Southeastern Europe also highlights the fact that Europeans are now more willing than ever to shoulder political responsibility and its consequences"[229].

Also, the idea of making NATO a more European organization and strengthening 'European pillar', finds great support in Germany and Joschka Fischer reflected this view as:

> "It was at the Washington NATO Summit that the common challenge was first outlined: to enhance the vitality of the transatlantic bond by developing a balanced partnership in the field of security and defense policy. A self–confident, emancipated Europe can no longer assume that the United States is going to become involved in European crises at all times and under any circumstance. We have come to realize that the end of the East–West conflict not only opened up exciting prospects for building a comprehensive order for peace in Europe, but also introduced new risks to security and stability on our continent. Bosnia and Kosovo underscored the need for Europe to improve both its political and its military effectiveness. Precisely because we cannot always call on our North American partners for help, the European Union must develop its own military management capabilities so that it has the ability to act whenever such action is judged necessary.
>
> That, however, means the Europeans must first learn to speak with one voice. In that respect Europe has made considerable headway with the appointment of Javier Solana as High Representative for Common Foreign and Security Policy. Clearly, a true common foreign and security policy is still a long way off, but it is essential

[229] Fischer, Joshchka (2000), op. cit.

> that we stay the course and develop political and military instruments that will give us the capacity to act on our own in the area of conflict prevention and crisis management"[230].

NATO's relations with the countries of the former Warsaw Pact is the second set of changes championed by Germany. The Bonn government was a prime mover behind NATO's London Declaration of July 1990 which offered to extend the hand of friendship to its former enemies. Also, in October 1991, Foreign Minister Genscher and his American counterpart James Baker proposed the creation of an institutionalized forum for regular high level consultation and discussion between NATO, the USSR, the three Baltic states, and the countries of East Europe. The Genscher-Baker initiative was formally endorsed by the NATO's Rome Summit in November 1991, which agreed to establish a 'North Atlantic Cooperation Council.' NATO's military strategy and force structure have been the third set of changes, sought by Germany. Germany played an important role in shaping NATO's far-reaching 'strategic review' which was adopted at the November 1991 Rome Summit[231]. This advocated a greater reliance or reinforcements in the event of war and smaller, more mobile stationed forces configured in multinational corps.

In sum, although Germany has sought reform in structure and functions of NATO, the alliance has remained the bedrock of German security. Alliance with the US has primary importance for Germany, both for its security in particular and European security in general. Thus, the end of the Cold War and the removal of the threat of Soviet expansionism have not brought about lessening of Germany's commitment to NATO.

---

[230] Ibid.

[231] Kamp, Karl-Heinz, "NATO Entrapped:Debating the Next Enlargement Round", *Survival*, Vol.40 No.3, Autumn 1998, p.173

5.8 Germany in EU

With respect to European policy, some commentators in Germany have alluded to a so-called "Britishization" of German European policy, implying that in future this policy will be less committed to integration, more sceptical towards new integration proposals, more doubtful about common policies and less supportive of common institutions, that is to say, closer to the views formulated in London up to 1997. State Secretary von Ploetz, from the Bonn Foreign Office, stated openly the view that German European policy had become "more British": ''The Germans asked themselves increasingly what benefits forfeiting sovereignty in (European) integration issue area would bring and whether it would not be better to stick to loose cooperation...''. '' I'm not pro-integrationist'' added Kohl's European policy adviser Joachim Bitterhich thus making clear what Kohl had suggested on earlier occasions, for the federal government, and continued, ''The expansion of EU competences (*Vergemeinschaftung*) is no longer an article of faith and if better results can be achieved by the normal method of loose cooperation outside of the rules of EU, then there is no reason to go further along the course of integration...''[232]. It is clear therefore that the Germans are asking more than ever about the costs and benefits of European integration process.

A more active role of the European powers in the field of Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and EU's capacity to act in the sphere of these fields, has made rapid advances in the late 1990s. As Fischer stated:

> "Galvanized by the war in Kosovo, Europe has already made significant progress in this area. In their Joint Declaration in St. Malo, France and Great Britain laid the groundwork for the creation of a

[232] Kranz, Jerzy, "Germany, Quo Vadis? Aview from Poland", *German Politics*, Vol.10 No.1, April 2001, p.153

> European security and defense union. During its dual EU and WEU Presidency, Germany made the most of this new dynamism, paving the way for groundbreaking decisions at the 1999 Cologne European Council on the establishment of permanent political–military structures. In concrete terms, it is envisaged that the European Union should be able to plan, politically endorse, and carry out international crisis response operations, with the necessary institutional framework in place by the end of the year 2000.
>
> EU member states have committed themselves to further developing their military assets and capabilities for deployment in European–led operations. That includes transport and reconnaissance capabilities as well as improved command and information systems. The Eurocorps is to become a European crisis response force available for deployment in NATO and EU operations. Another important aspect is enhanced cooperation within the European defense industry and closer coordination in planning and procurement of defense equipment"[233].

The United States' growing reluctance to carry the main burden for security provision for its European allies means that Europe can no longer afford not to act as one in its security requirements. The stationing of Allied troops on German soil and, more importantly, the extension of American guarantees to provide a nuclear shield against the Soviet Union's nuclear threat were important and the Washington Treaty, signed in 1949, had laid down the commitment of the Allied powers to safeguard the security of Western Europe. However, the replacement of the Europe-first foreign policy of the US by an Asia-first policy, made the US to demand greater West European involvement in European regional security.

[233] Fischer, Joshchka (2000), op. cit.

5.8.1 Germany and the Development of European Security Policy

Stanley Hoffmann contends that Germany has not departed from its reliance on multilateralism, but this reliance is now founded on a more assertive Germany, less inhibited by its past and the international enviroment. This shift has had a major impact on the development of EU security structures in which Germany seeks to play a leading role. There are three main reasons for German policy-makers to consider the development of a European foreign policy to be in the best interests of Germany: First, Germany's support for the European Political Cooperation (EPC) and CFSP process was a means to counteract the deficiencies in German foreign policy. Second, the confrontational aspect of the Cold War during the late 1970s and early 1980s necessitated the development of a distinctive European voice in the international system. Subsequently, the post-Cold War European system has seen 'a collapse of illusions' regarding the future role and interests of the US in European regional security concerns. Finally, Germany has viwed the extention of cooperation in foreign and security policy among EU member states as furtherance of the integration process. CFSP can be viewed as an area of the European integration process where Germany continues to play the role of *Musterknabe* ("the best pupil in the class")[234].

Whereas the function of NATO, with regard to the area of foreign and security policy, was limited in the field of diplomacy, EPC provided an invaluable opportunity for the pursuit of Germany's foreign policy objectives. Membership of EPC provided an outlet for German diplomacy through multilateralizing the foreign policy, in order to prevent any suspicions of a German *Sonderweg* arising. Germany actively pursued the process of European integration, most notably in the Genscher-Colombo proposals of 12 November 1981, to deepen integration and bring EPC into

[234] Miskimmon, Alister J., "Recasting the Security Bargains: Germany, European Security Policy and Transatlantic Relationship", *German Politics*, Vol.10 No.1, April 2001, p.85

the EC process, with the aim of developing a common defence. EPC provided West Germany with an important 'alibi function' which served as a "means of deflecting external pressure, and cover for shifts in national policy"[235]. NATO could not be used as a forum for expressing Germany's singular foreign policy interests because of the sensitive nature of the Cold War and the sensitivity not to upset the close transatlantic relationship. On the other hand, Germany scored a number of diplomatic sucesses through the CSCE and Chancellor Schmidt's successful efforts to include INFs negotiations into the NATO agenda in the late 1970s. Chancellor Kohl pushed for foreign and security policy integration at Maastricht very much as a way of deepening Germany's commitment to the European integration process. However, German attempts to move forward foreign and security policy integration were not considered to be an open challenge to American involvement, in Europe, as the common defense was considered a (very) long-term process.

The inclusion of the Petersberg Tasks, agreed by the WEU in June 1992, into the Treaty of Amsterdam, marked an important step forward in European security policy. The inclusion of Article J. 7(2) to include 'humanitarian and rescue tasks, peacekeeping tasks and tasks of combat forces in crisis management, including peacemaking' was a bold step which clarified to some extent the relationship between the WEU and EU, without suggesting a fusion[236]. However, this has also placed much greater demands and expectations on CFSP. Hence, the Bremen Declaration of the WEU Council of Ministers that took place on 10 and 11 May 1999, expressed the willingness of the European nations to strengthen European operational capabilities, as had been determined by the Petersberg Tasks. This was based on appropriate decision-making bodies and effective military means, within NATO or national and multinational means, outside the NATO framework.

The inclusion of the Petersberg Tasks into the CFSP presents Germany, France and the UK with major commitments spanning a wide range of military

[235] Ibid., p.85

[236] Ibid., p.87

operations. The decisions made at the Cologne Summit in June 1999 and at Helsinki in December 1999 represent positive strides to meet these commitments[237]. For Germany, in particular, the inclusion of the Petersberg Tasks demands a more interventionist German style within the CFSP and means that Germany is no longer able to shirk responsibility in military operations.

Germany has aimed for Qualified Majority Voting (QMV) to be partially extended to questions concerning the CFSP. Opportunities for the use of QMV procedures were stated in the Treaty of Amsterdam, in an attempt to facilitate CFSP decisions and to create the option of "coalitions of the willing", conducting missions under EU auspices and leaving room for "constructive abstention". Germany, also, pressed for the appointment of a High Representative for CFSP, at Amsterdam, to give EU a more visible face and point of contact in world affairs. It is argued that "the internalization of a European dimension of foreign policy is the most advanced and explicit in Germany, where it forms part of the overall strategy of reflexive multilateralism"[238].

The development of a multilateral approach to foreign and security issues, and the gradual development of an operational European military capability, have been primary policy objectives for EU members. This was reflected in the Maastricht Treaty which announced the formation of a "common foreign and security policy" (CFSP). The Treaty also recognized the WEU as an integral part of the development of the EU, which could ask the WEU "to elaborate and implement the Union's decisions which had defence implications". A declaration on the WEU was attached to the Treaty which noted the member states' intention "to build up the WEU in stages as the defence component of the Union". Also, Germany, in tandem

---

[237] Bağcı, Hüseyin, "Türkiye ve AGSK: Beklentiler, Endişeler", in Bal, İdris (ed.), *21.Yüzyılın Eşiğinde Türk Dış Politikası*, İstanbul: Alfa Basım, 2001, p.602

[238] Miskimmon, Alister J. (2001), op. cit., p.87

with France, became the driving force behind the Eurocorps which is a multinational force (by 35.000 soldiers) and became operational in 1995[239].

The "europeanist" initiatives have caused unease in Washington, London and other "pro-atlanticist" capitals. Chancellor Kohl regularly stated that the Eurocorps is not a threat for or rival to NATO and he believed that Atlanticist-Europeanist tensions could be finessed through the medium of the WEU, which he envisaged as the bridge between NATO and the EU. For this reason, Germans welcomed the NATO decision of January 1994, to create "combined joint task forces" (CJTF). These forces are command and control structures within NATO's integrated military command structure which are "separable but not separate". It was planned to place CJTF under a WEU operational command in order to allow the WEU to conduct humanitarian and peace-keeping operations, in accordance with the principles of the Petersberg Tasks defined by the June 1992 WEU Petersberg Declaration.

NATO Foreign Ministers decided to create the European Security and Defence Identity (ESDI), within the alliance, in 1996 Berlin Summit. The 1997 Amsterdam Treaty took the development of security one step further. The inclusion of the Petersberg Tasks into the Treaty and the implementation of them in May 1999, improved the defense capacity of the alliance. The 1998 St. Malo Declaration of Britain and France underlined the importance of making the alliance that can hold autonomous tasks. Also, the Declaration left open door for European tasks without using NATO capabilities (in out of Atlantic alliance issues). At June 2000 Santa Maria da Feira Meeting of the European Council, European heads of states and governments decided that the right of decision will belong to EU on the issues of crisis management, humanitarian aid, peace-keeping operations and deciding on using the NATO capabilities. It was decided to set up four EU working groups, to provide cooperation with NATO. At November 2000 WEU Ministers Summit in Marseilles, WEU was abolished and its power, authority and capabilities were

[239] Menon, Anand, Forster, Anthony and Wallace, William, "A common European Defence?", *Survival*, Vol.34 No.3, Autumn 1992, pp.110-122

transferred to ESDI. The Pesidential Declaration of the Nice Summit on 9 December 2000 claimed that ESDI would be autonomous on the issues and operations where NATO was not involved. This Declaration increased the tension between the NATO's European Union and non-European Union members[240].

The problems of ESDI's roles and functions and its relations with NATO's functions and capabilities, have not been solved yet. Germany is pursuing a balance policy and does not want to be in a situation within which it will have to make a choice between Washington and Paris. German politicians do not (want to) see the case as a "zero-sum game", rather Germany wants a solution between Atlanticism and Europeanism. Thus, Germany wants a European pillar without alienating Washington's and NATO's other non-EU members' interests. As Fischer stated:

> "At the same time, however, one thing is certain: In relations with United States, "hegemony" in the field of foreign or security policy or a duplication of efforts is not our goal. Quite the contrary, we remain committed to the closest possible cooperation within NATO, and particularly with the United States. A self–confident Europe is not a denial of the transatlantic partnership. Obviously, a new form of burden–sharing within the Alliance, with the Europeans making a bigger contribution, is also in the American interest, for even the United States as the sole remaining superpower is neither willing nor able to take care of all crises in all parts of the world–especially not when they happen on Europe's doorstep.
>
> A Europe that is able to act effectively can, together with the United States, make a notable contribution to global stability. The world of the twenty–first century needs multilateral institutions and shared rules. The UN was a magnificent and historic idea of one of America's greatest presidents, Franklin D. Roosevelt. We need a global platform for common action in order to be able to meet effectively the challenges of the future. Moreover, history shows that unilateral action by major powers invites the imitation or even the formation of opposing powers, and thus ultimately has a destabilizing effect. There is a lesson here for both sides: Europe must develop in order to be a valuable partner and to remain credible, while the United States must be wise enough–as it has been so often before–to

[240] Bağcı, Hüseyin (2001), op. cit., pp.599-604

> choose the arduous process of transatlantic coordination over the tempting but dangerous option "go it alone" "[241].

In the above-mentioned sense, a Europe that is able to effectively contribute to global stability and multilateral structures for common action among the associated countries, without hindering the transatlantic partnership and duplication of efforts of NATO alliance, is necessary for German foreign and security policy-making. To this end, Germany aims the creation of multilateral structures within the EU to enable the Europeans take care of crises on Europe's doorstep. However, this is not an easy goal to reach. The following part deals with the current issues and problems facing German policy-makers in the process of creating European foreign and security policy structures.

5.8.2 Current Issues Facing German Policy-Makers in CFSP

The Kosovo conflict, in 1999, provided an important impetus for greater European cooperation in CFSP. The commitment of Germany to strengthen EU machinery within the field of foreign and security policy was emphasised by Chancellor Schröder during the conflict, in order to secure public support for German involvement in the bombing of Serbia: ‘‘ The integration of Germany into

[241] Fischer, Joshchka (2000), op. cit.

the Western community of states is part of the *German Staatsrason*. We do not want a *German Sonderweg*.'' However, the new German government's stance has changed subtly. According to Schröder, ''the new German foreign policy will not be unhistorical. But I believe we have shown in the past 50 years that there is no reason to tie down the Germans, out of fear of the furum teutonicus...My generation and those following are Europeans because we want to be not because we must be. That makes us freer in dealing with others.''[242]

The development of the CESDP, since the Cologne European Council Summit in June 1999, leaves German policy-makers with two important choices: The first relates to the direction in which Germany wants EU's foreign policy to develop and the extent of the constraints on this policy. Second, Germany must decide what the EU's future role should be. Germany has been described as a *zivilmacht*, relying on military means only as a last resort. Germany appears reluctant to commit to further military involvement in multilateral task forces, while at the same time remaining very aware of its responsibilities as a NATO and EU member. The uneasiness that remains within Germany concerning the deployment of the Bundeswehr for anything other than peace-keeping operations may result in Germany's efforts to convince its main EU partners of the merits of a minimalist foreign and security policy in terms of the use of military force. Foreign Minister Fischer has been vocal in expressing his continuing view of EU as a *zivilmacht*. For Fischer, the development of a European security and defence capability is not about a militarization of EU, rather EU must be made an effective and decisive peaceful power which is able, as was the case in Kosovo, to bolster the rule of law and renounce violence and thereby to consign war as a political tool in Europe. Within the same context, Angelika Beer, the defence spokesperson for Alliance 90/Greens, claimed that the civilian power character of EU should not be lost[243]. In formulating the security policy, the German foreign and security policy-makers face a dilemma: While Germany is committed to the development of the CESDP and to react to

[242] Miskimmon, Alister J. 2001, p.92
[243] Ibid., p.93

American calls to take more responsibility in its own "backyard", the transatlantic link will continue to exert an important gravitational pull. However, a reluctance to develop the CESDP to a further level may lead to frustrations on the part of France and Britain, which feel more comfortable in resorting to armed force.

Another problematic issue has been the US missile shield and the proliferation of nuclear weapons. As Joschka Fischer stated:

> "Combating the proliferation of nuclear weapons should be an area of particular concern. Here, an important task awaits both Americans and Europeans in the years ahead. In this light, the rejection of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty by the U.S. Senate was perceived as a major setback for worldwide efforts to promote nuclear disarmament. The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty is an important cornerstone of global efforts in this field, and without it the whole system of cooperative disarmament and arms control could be jeopardized. This matter depends particularly on the stance of the United States, the world's largest nuclear power. If we embark upon the course in the wrong way, a new, highly dangerous nuclear arms race could begin in crisis regions. Even the U.S. could not control such a development, the result of which could instead be nuclear anarchy. It is vital, therefore, that the Senate's rejection of the treaty last November not be the last word on the subject. We must not place at risk all of the painstaking progress accomplished made in recent decades in the field of disarmament and arms control. The same goes for the ABM Treaty, a crucial pillar of the arms control regime"[244].

Europeans have been very critical of plans for a US missile shield. This issue is relevant for Germany and its security needs because of the non-nuclear character of German defence. "Germany's reliance on the US for a nuclear shield", according to Fischer, "was always based on our trust that the US would protect our interests, and the US as the leading nuclear power, would guarantee some sort of order"[245].

---

[244] Fischer, Joshchka (2000), op. cit.

[245] Miskimmon, Alister J. (2001), op. cit., p.94

5.9 Germany in the OSCE

The CSCE mechanism was initiated in 1975. Since its formation in Helsinki Summit at a time of detente in Europe, the *Bundesrepublik* has been one of the staunchest supporters of this process. For Bonn, the CSCE provided an ideal pan-European framework for regulating the east-west conflict and provided a multilateral forum for pursuing *Ostpolitik*. Genscher was a strong advocate of the CSCE and strongly believed that the CSCE could provide a framework for integrating the communist states into a new and more cooperative security structure. Genscher also saw the CSCE as a provider of stability for the dynamic and sometimes revolutionary developments in East Europe and the Soviet Union. Thus, after the end of the Cold War, Genscher played an important role in providing the institutionalization of the CSCE. At the Paris Summit of November 1990, the CSCE heads of states and governments declared 'Paris charter for a new Europe' and codified a series of principles for the conduct of interstate relations and human rights issues. The CSCE Summit of Helsinki, in the summer of 1992, issued a document called "the challenges of change". Since then, the CSCE has focused primarily on early warning, preventive diplomacy and crisis management. At the Budapest Summit, in December 1994, the CSCE was was institutionalized and became the OSCE[246].

For Germany, the OSCE offers an institutional framework for addressing the legitimate security concerns of Russia and provides a forum for developing new forms of cooperative security. However, Germany is unwilling to realize the Russian

[246] Haftendorn, Helga (1996), op. cit., p.101

plans for establishing a collective security regime which would subject NATO and EU to the OSCE decisions. From German point of view, the OSCE fulfils five key functions: First, it provides a forum for promoting and codifying common standards, values and norms, especially in the fields of human rights and the peaceful resolution of disputes. Second, it offers mechanisms for the monitoring of human rights violations of individuals and national minorities. Third, it acts as a forum for promoting military transparency, arms control, confidence- and security-building measures and so, reducing dangers of armed conflict and misunderstanding or miscalculation of military activities which could give rise to apprehension. Fourth, it provides a framework for pan-European multilateral diplomacy on a range of issues. Finally, it is developing instruments for preventive diplomacy, conflict avoidance and crisis management[247].

The transformation of the OSCE has been called as the transformation into a regional equivalent of the United Nations, with a European 'security council'. Thus, the OSCE has played an important role in discussing the security issues of Europe. With regard to the objective of Germany to improve relations with the former communist countries, the OSCE is a key forum for Germany. However, Germany (unlike Russia) does not want the OSCE to become a security regime and to be superior to NATO and EU.

[247] Hyde-Price, Adrian (1998), op. cit., pp.223-224

CONCLUSION

In the last quarter of the 19th century, one of the primary concerns of European political agenda was how to establish balance of power in continent against the rising German potential. The Versailles Treaty was thought to end the German Question by the Entente Powers of World War I, but through a logic of punishing the Central Powers that lost the War. The result was the rise of the Nazis and Hitler and the World War II started by the Third Reich. However, following the World War II, the situation was different. This time reconciliation, confidence-building and integrating West Germany into the western community was the most favourable option due to the existence of a Soviet threat that threatened western values and political systems. West Germany became a part of the western community and its institutional structures with the objectives to link with the world in creation, to achieve economic recovery and democratization and to develop a positive attitude towards integration. This was radically different from the political system and objectives of the Third Reich that was strongly militarist, unilateral and devastating threat for peace and stability.

The World War II and the defeat of the country totally shifted West Germany's foreign and security posture. The new foreign and security logic was built on cooperation instead of competition, on the pursuit of wealth rather than power, on a quest for integration through transfer of sovereignty instead of a vain search for autonomy. West Germany rested on the foundations of a democratic polity and projected the rules of this system onto relations among states, in Europe and the world. The civilian and multilateral orientation of foreign and security policy

discourse became the most striking characteristic of the new West German political system.

In the process of the reconstruction of West German national identity and foreign and security policy orientation, the most important point was not only the rejection of past German *Sonderweg* (its anti-Western orientation, its tendency towards totalitarianism and its military inclinations), but also internalization of new political values and shift towards a pro-Western and pro-democratic orientation. Thus, liberal democracy and respect for human rights, civilian policy-making and implementation and multilateral orientation emerged as powerful core political values in West Germany's foreign and security policy. The civilian impulse implied a strong preference for political solutions and a profound scepticism vis-à-vis the use of force[248]. While this attitude reflected the rejection of militarist and unilateral inclinations, it was also a strong part of West German threat perception that pointed out the peculiar security position of West Germany during the Cold War. Accordingly, any major war between the two blocs was to devastate (whole) Germany, whatever the eventual outcome of that war would be. In this sense, West Germany on the one hand was not to fundamentally shift from its civilian and multilateral orientation and on the other hand to protect its security and foreign policy objectives. Thus, West Germany's constructed values, interests (realist factors) and systemic considerations of bipolar structure had to be hand in hand. Constructed values rested on West Germany's internalized orientation of civilian and multilateral discourse that became the defining characteristic of the new political culture of the country. The realist factors were defined as the objectives of reunification, preserving security of West German territory, its citizens and liberal democratic system through economic recovery. The systemic-structural considerations acted in both ways to realize these interests and to be sensitive to the concerns of international community to keep Germany under control. That was the picture of post-World War II political atmosphere in general terms.

[248] Maull, Hanns W. (2000a),op. cit., pp.65-66

With the sudden and unexpected reunification of Germany and the end of the East-West confrontation that destructed the bipolar structure, concerns about the return of German Question aroused. In theory, the reunified Germany was now free to return to the role of one of Europe's Great Powers and pursue power politics. This was, also, to some extent the result of the way the Cold War ended: It ended with no peace treaty and did not establish a new international institution to define the new structure. Whatever the definition would be (unipolar, multipolar, etc.) uncertainty and unsustainability have become the basic characteristics of the international system. The early expectations were towards a new world order that was coloured with optimism. However, this was falsified soon. What came into being was the new world disorder. Although there was no conventional threat, asymmetric threats such as political and economic instability, ethnic and religious conflicts, international terrorism, weapons of mass destruction and migration became the new security concerns. What would Germany do in this new environment? Wouuld it become militarized and shift from its civilian and multilateral policy orientation? Theoretically, as it was reunified, economically giant and free from the rigid structural constraints of bipolar system, it could do so. However, the reunified country showed no desire to depart fundamentally from its post-war foreign policy orientation. It strongly insisted on continuity in its integration policy into the Western Alliance system, stuck to the civilian power role concept and remained faithful to its multilateral responsibilities.

In his book *Risiko Deutschland*, published in 1995, Joschka Fischer argued that it was certainly not in Germany's national interest to give up the dominant civilian power character of its politics and adopt a more assertive foreign policy[249]. However, Joschka Fischer, the Green realo famous with his military pacifism, became the Foreign Minister of a coalition government that deployed German military forces in combat missions abroad (as in Kosovo without UN Mandate). How can this be explained?

[249] Fischer, Joschka, *Risiko Deutschland: Krise und Zukunft der Deutschen Politik*, Köln: Kiepenheuer und Witsch, 1995, pp.228-229

As mentioned above, the civilian power concept, to which West German foreign policy was settled after the World War II, implied a foreign policy identity which promoted multilateralism, institution-building and supranational integration, and tried to constrain the use of force in international relations through national and international norms. This foreign policy orientation was shaped by Germany's traumatic past. This is to say, the lessons derived from history led to aversion against the use of military power and Germany never again wants to threaten stability in Europe and the international system. With the collapse of the SU, the threat emanating from the Communist Bloc has disappeared, but ethno-nationalist conflicts erupted on Europe's periphery. The new security posture that emerged has forced various international actors to change their structures and policies to adjust to new environment. Inevitably, Germany has shifted to a new security posture to overcome the new threats. However, this new security posture does not constitute a fundamental departure neither from Germany's post-war foreign policy identity as a civilian power nor its multilateral orientation, and Germany manages to reconcile most core values of Germany's post-war foreign policy.

The evolution of German foreign policy in the 1990s and its policy in this period can be identified as one of modified continuity. The starting point of the continuity thesis is the emprical finding that the post-reunification German governments' foreign policy rhetoric continued to stress central themes of the civilian power ideal-type and commitment to multilateral structures. It can be underlined that reunified Germany stuck to its treasured policy of active integration and broad international cooperation. Germany's willingness to further integrate into EU and NATO, its aim to seize autonomy through the renunciation of nuclear weapons and the limitation on the troop strength of the German Armed Forces, reflect the reunified Germany's motives and objectives.

Germany's changing position on out-of-area missions of the *Bundeswehr* can be grounded on two main reasons: First one is, the change in attitudes towards the

utility and legitimacy of military action is due to pressure from Germany's partners, to make Germany take more responsibilities in the international fora. Second, the change is conceptualized as a product of societal socialization. Facing the dilemma that non-military means had not been sufficient to deter Serb forces from slaughtering civilians in the UN-protected areas, Fischer argued that Germany's traditional pacifism could not mean that Germans would stand by idly when genocide happened. In his speech to the Bundestag, in late 1995, he argued:

> ''We are in a real conflict between basic values. On the one hand, there is the renunciation of force as a vision of a world in which conflicts are resolved rationally, through recourse to laws and majority decisions, through the constitutional process and no longer through brute force; a world in which military means are rejected, and in which the aim is to create structures to replace them and make them redundant. On the other hand, there is the bloody dilemma that human beings may be able to survive only with the use of military force. Between solidarity for survival and our commitment to non-violence – that is our dilemma''[250].

During a visit to the German Federal Ministry of Defence, with colleagues from the German Council on Foreign Relations (DGAP), in July 2007, Colonel Dr. Udo Ratenhof pointed out global risks and challenges as: international terrorism, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, regional conflicts, migration and energy security. For Colonel Ratenhof, a comprehensive security understanding is necessary to meet these challenges and comprehensive security can be provided through political, economic, ecological and social stability. Within this context, Colonel mentioned Germany's security interests as: to preserve free and democratic order; to protect German territory; to prevent regional crises and manage conflicts; to confront global challenges; and to promote open and free trade and to reduce poverty. Whereas Colonel Ratenhof defined German foreign and security policy to be comprehensive, multilateral and forward-looking, he mentioned that there are cases which make military intervention necessary for crisis-prevention. However, he

[250] Maull, Hanns W. (2000a),op. cit., p.63

strongly stated that he did not mean military intervention in classical understanding. As human security became one of the new and important concerns of the post-Cold War structure, military intervention, for Colonel Ratenhof, can be in form of military contribution to protect civil elements in crisis regions, military assistance and provision of equipment and technical advice.

Germany's modification in its attitude towards military operations has been part of the structural and institutional change in international and European politics. Following the end of the Cold War, discussions on the future role of NATO and EU started. The idea to turn these two organizations from 'community of prosperity' into 'community of values' gained weight. In addition to this, with the Helsinki process, beginning in 1975, the concepts of democracy and human rights and respect for these values have become important issues in the conduct of inter-state relations. Germany's sensitivity for the non-violation of human rights is a key fact, laden with its traumatic history. Thus, Germany's involvement in use of force (with the precondition of multilateral involvement) to prevent human suffering and to prevent 'genocide' is no surprise. In other words, Germany's involvement in use of force, to keep these values, is to be regarded as a process of adopting international community and acting within the context of the 'policy of responsibility'.

Germany is a member of NATO, EU and the OSCE. To keep cooperative relations with Washington, Paris and Moscow is the primary objective for German foreign policy-makers. However, it is obvious that these options do not add up to a coherent whole and to harmonize political objectives of these organizations is not an easy task: The French connection does not fit with the Atlantic one, and the Central European option clashes with the Russian relationship, as well as with the necessity of keeping EU homogeneous for the purpose of deepening. However, Germany has pursued a policy of diversification, balance and compensation. Thus, German grand strategy will maximize options and minimize hard and fast commitments. It will want to retain a paid-up insurance policy underwritten by the US. It will try to keep its special friendship with France, without forsaking Britain. Germany will seek to

bring East and Central European countries into NATO and EU. However, it will pursue a 'Greater Central European Sphere' with prudence, taking care not to alienate Russia or to stimulate Western suspicions[251].

Within the context of the aim of this study, with regard to the questions asked at the beginning, and through the foreign and security policy record of Germany since the reunification, this study comes to the conclusion that though the 'German Question' has not been totally resolved, it is likely to be less traumatic. It is no surprise that German foreign and security policies have evolved parallel to the international developments and have adopted to the international structure and 'atmosphere' within which these policies are formulated. However, this is not a radical shift from the parameters and orientation of the West German foreign and security policies, settled during the Cold War. Thus, it can be argued that continuity dominates over change in German foreign policy during the 1990s. The objective to protect human security and the pressure from partners to make Germany take more responsibility has made Germany make small modifications in its attitude towards military operations. However, this study has shown that there has been no fundamental shift from civilian and multilateral orientation. Germany has stuck to its role of civilian power. Although it has become more self-confident and has started to take more responsibility, it has remained committed to its multilateral arrangements. Germany's primary goal is to keep its status as an equal and respected member of the international community and this depends on the successful, peaceful and democratic closure of the German Question, which has been the case since the end of the World War II, continued during the 1990s and up to present.

[251] Joffe, Josef (1996), op. cit., pp.270-271

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adler, Emanuel, "Constructivism and International Relations", in W. Carlsnaes (et al), *Handbook of International Relations*, London: Sage Publications, 2002

Adler, Emanuel, "Seizing the Middle Ground: Constructivism in World Politics", *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol.3 No.3, 1997

Allison, Graham T., *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis*, Boston: Little, Brown, 1971

Andreae, Lisette and Kaiser, Karl, "The 'Foreign Policies' of Specialized Ministries", in Eberwein, Wolf-Dieter and Kaiser, Karl (eds.), *Germany's New Foreign Policy*, New York: Palgrave, 2001

Aron, Raymond, "What is a Theory of International Relations?", *Journal of International Affairs*, Vol.21 No.2, 1967

Ash, Timothy G., *In Europe's Name*, New York: Random House, 1993

Asmus, Ronald D., "Germany and America: Partners in Leadership?", *Survival*,Vol.33 No.6, November/December 1991

Bağcı, Hüseyin, "Türkiye ve AGSK: Beklentiler, Endişeler", in Bal, İdris (ed.), *21.Yüzyılın Eşiğinde Türk Dış Politikası*, İstanbul: Alfa Basım, 2001

Bağcı, Hüseyin, *Almanya: Yeni Bir Dünya Gücü?*, Ankara: Dış Politika Enstütüsü, 1992

Bağcı, Hüseyin, *Balkanlar (1991-1993)*, Foreign Policy Institute, Ankara, 1994

Baumann, Rainer and Hellmann, Gunther, "Germany and the Use of Military Force: 'Total War', the 'Culture of Restraint' and the Quest for Normality", *German Politics*, Vol.10 No.1, April 2001

Boulding, K. E., "National Images and International Systems", *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol.3 No.2, June 1956

Burchill, Scott, "Realism and Neo-Realism", in Burchill, Scott (et al), *Theories of International Relations*, New York: Palgrave, 2001

Buzan, Barry and Little, Richard, "The Idea of 'International System'", *International Political Science Review*, Vol.15 No.3, 1994

Buzan, Barry and Waever, Ole, "Slippery? contradictory? sociologically untenable? The Copenhagen school replies", *Review of International Studies*, Vol.23 No.2, April 1999

Carr, E. H., *The Twenty Years' Crisis*, London, 1939

Chafetz, Glenn, Spirtas, Michael and Frankel, Benjamin, "Introduction: Tracing the Influence of Identity on Foreign Policy", *Security Studies*, Vol.8 Issue 2&3, 1998

De Schoutheete, Philippe, "Germany, Quo Vadis? A View From the Diplomatic World", *German Politics*, Vol.10 No.1, April 2001

Denison, Andrew, "German Foreign Policy and Transatlantic Relations Since Unification", *German Politics*, Vol.10 No.1, April2001

Deutsch, Karl (et al.), *Political Community and the North Atlantic Area*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957

Documents on Germany 1944-1985, United States Department of State Publication 9446, 1985

Duffield, John S., *World Power Forsaken*, California: Stanford University Pres, 1998

Ebel, Roland H., Taras, Raymond and Cochrane, James D., *Political Culture and Foreign Policy in Latin America: Case Studies from the Circum-Caribbean*, Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991

Eberwein, Wolf-Dieter and Kaiser, Karl, "Academic Research and Foreign Policy-Making" in Eberwein, Wolf-Dieter and Kaiser, Karl (eds.), *Germany's New Foreign Policy: Decision-Making in an Interdependent World*, New York: Palgrave, 2001

Elkins, David J. and Simeon, Richard E. B., "A Cause in Search of Its Effect, or What Does Political Culture Explain?", *Comparative Politics*, Vol.11 No.2, January 1979

Fischer, Joshchka, "The Indispensable Partner", *Georgetown Journal of International Affairs*, Vol.1 No.1, Winter/Spring 2000 [in http://www.internationalaffairs.com]

Fischer, Joschka, *Risiko Deutschland: Krise und Zukunft der Deutschen Politik*, Köln: Kiepenheuer und Witsch, 1995

Freud, Sigmund, *Civilisation, War and Death*, London: Hogarth Pres, 1939

Fukuyama, Francis, "Is America Ready for a Post-American World?", Address by Francis Fukuyama delivered at the Pardee Rand Graduate Schooli Santa Monica, CA, 21 June 2008

Gartner, Heinz, Hyde-Price, Adrian and Reiter, Erich, *Europe's New Security Challenges*, Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2001

Geertz, Clifford, *The Interpretation of Cultures*, New York: Basic Books, 1973

Geiss, Imanuel, "The Federal Republic of Germany in International Politics Before and After Unification", in Larres, Klaus and Panayi, Panikos (eds.), *The Federal Republic of Germany Since 1949*, New York: Addison Wesley Longman, 1996

George, Alexander L., "The 'Operational Code': A Neglected Approach to the Study of Political Leaders and Decision-Making", *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol.13 No.2, June 1969

Gilpin, Robert, *War and Change in World Politics*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981

Gourevitch, Peter, "The International System and Regime Formation: A Critical Review of Anderson and Wallerstein", *Comparative Politics*, Vol.10 No.3, April 1978

Grewe, Wilhelm G., "Auswartige Gewalt", in Isensee, Josef and Kirchof, Paul, eds., *Handbuch des Staatsrechts der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, Vol.III: Das Handeln des Staates*, Heidelberg: Müller, 1988

Gutjahr, Lothar, "Stability, Integration and Global Responsibility: Germany's Changing Perspectives on National Interests", *Review of International Studies*, Vol.21, No.3, July 1995

Haftendorn, Helga, "Aussenpolitische Prioritaten und Handlungsspielraum: ein Paradigma zur Analyse der Aussenpolitik der Bundesrepublik Deutschland", *Politische Vierteljahresschrift*, Vol.30 No.1, 1989

Haftendorn, Helga, "Gulliver in the Centre of Europe: International Involvement and National Capabilities for Action", in Heurlin, Bertel (ed.), *Germany in Europe in the Ninetees*, London: Macmillan Press LTD, 1996

Hanrieder, Wolfram F., *Germany, America, Europe: Forty Years of German Foreign Policy*, London: Yale University Press, 1989

Harnisch, Sebastian "Change and Continuity in Post-Unification German Freign Policy", *German Politics*, Vol.10 No.1, April 2001

Hawtrey Ralph G., *Economic Aspects of Sovereignty*, London: Longmans, 1952

Herzog, Roman, "Die Globalisierung der deutschen Aussenpolitik ist unvermeidlich", *Bulletin des Presse- und Informationsamts der Bundesregierung*, No.20, 15 March 1995

Hill, C., "The Capability-Expectations Gap, or Conceptualizing Europe's International Role", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol.31 No.3, 1993

Hill, Christopher, "European Foreign Policy: Power Bloc, Civilian Model – or Flop?", in Rummel, Reinhardt (ed.), *The Evolution of an International Actor*, Boulder: Westview Pres, 1990

Hill, Christopher, *The Changing Politics of Foreign Policy*, Houndmills: Palgrave, 2003

Hobbes, Thomas, ed. M. Oakeshott, *Leviathan*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1946

Hoffmann, Stanley, "Reflections on the 'German Question'", *Survival*, Vol.32, No.4, July/August 1990

Holsti, K. J., *International Politics: A Framework for Analysis* 7th Edition, Englewood Cliffs, NG: Prentice Hall, 1995

Holsti, K. J., *The Dividing Discipline*, Boston, MA: Allen and Unwin, 1987

Holsti, K. J., *The Dividing Discipline: Hegemony and Diversity in International Theory*, Boston: Allen and Unwin, 1985

Hopf, Ted, "The Promise of Constructivism in International Relations Theory", *International Security*, Vol.23 No.1, Summer 1998

Hoyer, Werner, "National Decision-Making Structures for German European Policy", in Eberwein, Wolf-Dieter and Kaiser, Karl (eds.), *Germany's New Foreign Policy*, New York: Palgrave, 2001

Hyde-Price, Adrian, "Beware the Jabberwock: Security Studies in the 20th Century", in Heinz Gartner (et al), *Europe's New Security Challenges*, London: Lynne Rienne, 2001(a)

Hyde-Price, Adrian, "Germany and the Kosovo War: Still a Civilian Power?" , *German Politics*, Vol.10 No.1, April 2001(b)

Hyde-Price, Adrian, “Germany’s Security Policy Dilemmas: NATO, the WEU and the OSCE”, in Larres, Klaus (ed.), *Germany Since Unification: The Domestic and External Consequences*, London: Macmillan Press LTD, 1998

Jepperson, R. L., Wendt, A. and Katzenstein, P. J., “Norms, Identity, and Culture in National Security”, in P. J. Katzenstein (ed.) *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politic*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1996

Jervis, Robert, “Cooperation Under the Security Dilemma”, *World Politics*, Vol.30, January 1978

Joffe, Josef, “No Threats, No Temptations: German Grand Strategy After the Cold War”, in Heurlin, Bertel (ed.), *Germany in Europe in the Ninetees*, London: Macmillan Press LTD, 1996

Joffe, Josef, “Once More: the German Question”, *Survival*, Vol.32 No.2, March/April 1990

Kaarbo, Juliet, “Power and Influence in Foreign Policy Decision Making: Coalition Partners in German and Israeli Foreign Policy”, *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol.40 No.4, December 1996

Kagan, Robert, *The Return of History and the End of Dreams*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf Publisher, 2008

Kaiser, Karl, “Transnationale Politik: zu einer Theorie der multinationalen Politik“, in Czempiel, Ernst-Otto (ed.), *Die Anachronistische Souveranitat: zum Verhaltnis von Innen- und Aussenpolitik*, Cologne: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1969

Kamp, Karl-Heinz, “NATO Entrapped:Debating the Next Enlargement Round”, *Survival*, Vol.40 No.3, Autumn 1998

Katzenstein, P. J., “Introduction: Alternative Perspectives on National Security”, in P. J. Katzenstein (ed.) *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politic*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1996(a)

Katzenstein, P. J., *Cultural Norms and National Security: Police and Military in Postwar Japan*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996(b)

Katzenstein, P. J., Keohane, R. O. and Krasner, S. D., "International Organization and the Study of World Politics", *International Organization*, Vol.52 No.4, December 1998

Keal, Paul, "Can Foreign Policy Be Ethical?", in Keal, Paul (ed.), *Ethics and Foreign Policy*, Canberra: Allen and Unwin, 1992

Keohane, R. O., "International Institutions. Two Approaches", *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol.32 No.4, 1988

Keohane, Robert O., Nye, Joseph S. and Hoffmann Stanley (eds.), *After the Cold War: International Relations and State Strategies in Europe, 1989-1991*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993

Keohane, Robert O., Nye, Joseph S., *Power and Interdependence: World Politics in Transition*, Boston: Little, Brown, 1977

Kinkel, Klaus, "Diplomat: ein Beruf ohne Zukunft?", *Die Welt*, 12 November 1997

Kissinger, Henry, *Diplomacy*, New York: Touchstone, 1994

Kissinger, Henry, Daily Telegraph, 28 June 1999 [on http://www.telegraph.co.uk/portal/main.jhtml?view=ARCHIVE&grid=A1NoGoogle&menuId=-1&menuItemId=-1]

Kohl, Helmut, "Rede des Bundeskanzlers vor dem Deutschen Bundestag", *Bulletin*, No.73, 10 September 1993

Koslowski, Rey and Kratochwil, Friedrich, "Understanding Change in International Politics: The Soviet Empire's Demise and the International System", in R. N. Lebow and T. Risse-Kappen (eds.), *International Relations Theory and the End of the Cold War*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1995

Kranz, Jerzy, "Germany, Quo Vadis? Aview from Poland", *German Politics*, Vol.10 No.1 April 2001

Krasner, Stephen, "Realism, Imperialism, and Democracy", *Political Theory*, Vol.20, 1992

Krause, Joachim, "The Role of the Bundestag in German Foreign Policy", in Eberwein, Wolf-Dieter and Kaiser, Karl (eds.), *Germany's New Foreign Policy*, New York: Palgrave, 2001

Krause, Keith, "Critical Theory and Security Studies", *Cooperation and Conflict*, Vol.33 No.3, 1998

Kreile, Michael, "Will Germany Assume a Leadership Role in the European Union?", in Heurlin, Bertel (ed.), *Germany in Europe in the Ninetees*, London: Macmillan Press LTD, 1996

Larres,Klaus, "Germany in 1989: the Development of a Revolution", in Larres, Klaus (ed.), *Germany Since Unification: The Domestic and External Consequences*, London:Macmillan Press LTD, 1998

Larson, Deborah W., "The Role of Belief Systems and Schemas in Foreign Policy Decision Making", *Political Psychology*, Vol.15 No.1, March 1994

Le Gloannec,Anne-Marie, "Germany's Power and the Weakening of States in a Globalised World: Deconstructing a Paradox", *German Politics*, Vol.10 No.1, April 2001

Linklater, Andrew, "Neo-realism in Theory and Practice", in K. Booth and S. Smith (eds.), *International Relations Theory Today*, Cambridge, 1995

Linklater, Andrew, "What is a Good International Citizen", in Keal, Paul (ed.), *Ethics and Foreign Policy*, Canberra: Allen and Unwin, 1992

Machiavelli, Niccolo, *The Prince*, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968

Machiavelli, Niccolo, *The Prince*, London: J. M. Dent, 1928

Maull, Hanns W., "Germany and Japan: The New Civilian Powers", Foreign Affairs, Vol.69 No.5, 1990/91

Maull, Hanns W., "Germany in the Yugoslav Crisis", *Survival*, Vol.37 No.4, Winter 1995-96

Maull, Hanns W., "Germany and the Use of Force: Still a 'Civilian Power'?", *Survival*, Vol.42 No.2, January 2000(a)

Maull, Hanns W., "German Foreign Policy, Post-Kosovo: Still a 'Civilian Power?'", *German Politics*, Vol.9 Issue.2, August 2000(b)

Maull, Hanns, "German Foreign Policy Post-Kosovo: Still a Civilian Power?", Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Association for the Study of German Politics, London, 27-28 April 2001

Maunz, Theodor (et al.), *Grundgesetz Kommentar*, Munich: Beck, Article 65, LFG. 32 October 1984

McNeill, Terry, "The Soviet Union's Policy Towards West Germany, 1945-90", in Larres, Klaus and Panayi, Panikos (eds.), *The Federal Republic of Germany Since 1949*, New York: Addison Wesley Longman, 1996

Mearsheimer, J. L., "'Back to the Future': Instability in Europe After the Cold War", *International Security*, Vol.15 No.4, Summer 1990

Meiers, Franz-Josef, "Germany: the Reluctant Power", *Survival*, Vol.37 No.3, Autumn 1995

Menon, Anand, Forster, Anthony and Wallace, William, "A common European Defence?", *Survival*, Vol.34 No.3, Autumn 1992

Meyer, Berthol and Schlotter, Peter, *Die Kosovo-Kriege 1998/99, Die Internationalen Interventionen und ihre Folgen*, HSFK Report 1/2000, Frankfurt, 2000

Miskimmon, Alister J., "Recasting the Security Bargains: Germany, European Security Policy and Transatlantic Relationship", *German Politics*, Vol.10 No.1, April2001

Mitrany, David, "The Prospect of Integration: Federal or Functional?", in Nye, Joseph S.,Jr. (ed.), *International Regionalism*, Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1968

Moens, Alexander, "American Diplomacy and German Unification", *Survival*, Vol.33 No.6, November/December 1991

Morgenthau, Hans J., *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*, New York: Knopf, 1966

Morgenthau, Hans, "The Intellectual and Political Functions of Theory", in Morgenthau, Hans, *Truth and Power: Essays of a Decade, 1960-1970*, New York: Praeger, 1970

Müller, Harald, "German Foreign Policy After Unification" in Stares, Paul B., ed., *The New Germany and the New Europe*, Washington D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1992

Mundell, Robert A. and Swoboda, Alexander K. (eds.), *Monetary Problems of the International Economy*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969

Nigel,Thomas, *Modern Germany, Politics, Society and Culture*, Peter James (ed.), Routledge, 1998

Noelle-Neumann, Elisabeth and Köcher, Renate (eds.), Allensbacher Jahrbuch der Demoskopie, Munich: K. G. Saur, 1997, Band 10

Northedge, F. S., *The International Political System*, London: Faber and Faber, 1976

Nye, Joseph S., *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*, New York: Public Affairs, 2004

Onuf, Nicholas, *World of Our Making: Rules and Rule in Social Theory and International Relations*, Columbia: University of South Carolina Pres, 1989

Pace, Eric, "Scholars Say Veneer of Nonchalance Masks Worry on German Unification", *New York Times*, 11 November 1989

Pfetsch, P. Frank, *West Germany: Internal Structures and External Relations*, New York: Praeger Publishers, 1988

Philippi, Nina, *Bundeswehr-Auslandseinsatze als aussen- und sicherheitspolitisches Problem des geeinten Deutschlands*, Frankfurt: Lang, 1997

Plautus, Asinaria, Act II. 4. 88, http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/plautus/asinaria.shtml, accessed on 16.10.2008

Plischke, Elmer, *Contemporary Governments of Germany*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1969

Posen, Barry R., *The Sources of Military Doctrine: France, Britain, and Germany Between the World Wars*, New York: Cornell University Press, 1984

Price, Richard and Reus-Smit, Christian, "Dangerous Liaisons? Critical International Theory and Constructivism", *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol.4 No.3, 1998

Pye, Lucian W., "Culture and Political Science: Problems in the Evaluation of the Concept of Political Culture" in Schneider, Louis and Bonjean, Charles M. eds., *The Idea of Culture in the Social Sciences*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973

Questions on German History: Paths to Parliamentary Democracy, German Bundestag Public Relations Division Publication, Bonn, 1998

Reus-Smit, Christian, "Constructivism", in Burchill, Scott(et al), *Theories of International Relations*, New York: Palgrave, 2001

Riding, Alan, "Fear of Germany Is Focus at East European Meeting", *New York Times*, 5 February 1990

Rosenau, J.N., *Turbulence in World Politics: A Theory of Change and Continuity*, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1990

Ross, M. H., *The Culture of Conflict: Interpretations and Interests in Comparative Perspective*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993

Ruggie, J. G., "Territoriality and Beyond: Problematizing Modernity in International Relations", *International Organization*, Vol.47 No.1, 1993

Ruggie, J. G., "Together? Neo-utilitarianism and the Social Constructivist Challenge", *International Organization*, Vol.52 No.4, Autumn 1998

Rühl, Lothar, "Security Policy: National Structures and Multilateral Integration", in Eberwein, Wolf-Dieter and Kaiser, Karl (eds.), *Germany's New Foreign Policy*, New York: Palgrave, 2001

Schlesinger, Arthur M., Jr., "Germany's Fate Will Determine Europe's", *Wall Street Journal*, 21 December 1989

Shimko, Keith L., *Images and Arms Control: Perceptions of the Soviet Union in the Reagan Administration*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1991

Siekmeier, Mathias and Larres, Klaus, "Domestic Political Developments II: 1969-90", in Larres, Klaus and Panayi, Panikos (eds.), *The Federal Republic of Germany Since 1949*, New York: Addison Wesley Longman, 1996

Siwert-Probst, Judith, “Traditional Institutions of Foreign Policy”, in Eberwein, Wolf-Dieter and Kaiser, Karl (eds.), *Germany’s New Foreign Policy*, New York: Palgrave, 2001

Smith, A. D., *National Identity*, London: Penguin Books, 1991

Smith, Hazel, *European Union Foreign Policy: What It Is and What It Does*, London: Pluto Pres, 2002

Smith, Karen E., “Still ‘Civilian Power EU?’”, A Paper Presented at the CIDEL Workshop “From Civilian to Military Power: The European Union at a Crossroads?”, 22-23 October 2004, Oslo, Norway

Smith, Steve, “Foreign Policy is what states make of it: Social construction and International Relations Theory”, in V. Kubalkova (ed.), *Foreign Policy in a Constructed World*, Armonk: M. E. Sharpe, 2001

Stavridis, Stelios, “Why the ‘Militarising’ of the European Union is Strengthening the Concept of a ‘*Civilian Power Europe*’”, Robert Schuman Centre Working Paper No. 2001/17, Florence: European University Institute, 2001

Steininger, Rolf, “The German Qestion, 1945-95”, in Larres, Klaus (ed.), *Germany Since Unification: The Domestic and External Consequences*, London:Macmillan Press LTD, 1998

Swidler, Ann, *Talk of Love: How Culture Matters*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001

Tayfur, M. Fatih, “Systemic-Structural Approaches, World-System Analysis and the Study of Foreign Policy”, *METU Studies in Development*, Vol.27 No.3-4, 2000

Taylor, A. J. P., *Rumours of Wars*, London: Hamish Hamilton, 1952

Thelen, Kathleen and Steinmo, Sven, “Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Politics”, in Steinmo, Sven, Thelen, Kathleen and Longstreth, Frank (eds.),

Structuring *Politics: Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Analysis*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992

Tilly, Charles, *Coercion, Capital, and European States AD 990-1992*, London: Blackwell Publishing, 1990

Ulusoy, Hasan, A Constructivist Analysis of Turkey's Foreign and Security Policy in the Post-Cold War Era, unpublished PhD Thesis, METU, October 2005

Von Ploetz, Hans-Friedrich, "New Challenges for the Foreign Service", in Eberwein, Wolf-Dieter and Kaiser, Karl (eds)., *Germany's New Foreign Policy*, New York: Palgrave, 2001

Waltz, K. N., "The Emerging Structure of International Politics", *International Security*, Vol.18 No.2, 1993

Waltz, K. N., "America as a Model for the World?", *PS: Political Science and Politics*, Vol.24 No.4, 1991

Waltz, K. N., "The Origins of War in Neorealist Theory", *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, Vol.18 No.4, Spring 1988

Waltz, K. N., *Theory of International Politics*, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1979

Waltz, K. N., "Realist Thought and Neorealist Theory", *Journal of International Affairs*, Vol.44 No.1, 1990

Weldes, Jutta and Laffey, Mark et al (eds.), *Cultures of Insecurity*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999

Wendt, Alexander, "Anarchy is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics", *International Organization*, Vol.46 No.2, 1992

Wendt, Alexander, "Collective Identity Formation and the International State", *American Political Science Review*, Vol.88 No.2, 1994

Wendt, Alexander, "Constructing International Politics", *International Security*, Vol.20 No.1, 1995

Wendt, Alexander, *Social Theory of International Politics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999

Wheeler, Nicholas J. and Dunne, Tim, "Blair's Britain: A Force for Good in the World?", in Smith, Karen E. and Light, Margot (eds.), Ethics and Foreign Policy, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001

White Paper 1994 on German Security Policy and the Future of the Bundeswehr, issued by the German Federal Ministry of Defence, 1994

White Paper 2006 on German Security Policy and the Future of the Bundeswehr, issued by the German Federal Ministry of Defence, 2006

Williams, Howard L., *International Relations in Political Theory*, Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1991

Wolfers, Arnold, *Discord and Collaboration: Essays on International Politics*, Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1962

Yanık, Lerna K., Brothers Apart? The Role of Ethnic Affiliation in the Making of Turkish Foreign Relations, Unpublished PhD Thesis, Georgetown University, 4 December 2002

Yurdusev, A. N., "Avrupa Kimliğinin Oluşumu ve Türk Kimliği", in Atila Eralp (ed.), *Türkiye ve Avrupa*, Ankara: İmge Kitabevi, 1997

Yurdusev, A. N., The Concept of Civilization and the Study of International Relations: With Special Reference to the Work of Arnold J. Toynbee, Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Leicester, 1995

http://daccessdds.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N98/090/23/PDF/N9809023.pdf?OpenElement, accessed on 24.09.2008