

THE EVOLUTION OF THE GERMAN STANCE TOWARDS EUROPEAN
SECURITY

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

BY

DENİZ ÇİYAN

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN THE DEPARTMENT OF
EUROPEAN STUDIES

SEPTEMBER 2012

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Meliha Altunışık
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Galip Yalman
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 Master of Science.

Prof. Dr. Mustafa Türkeş
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Mustafa Türkeş (METU, IR) _____
Prof. Dr. Hüseyin Bağcı (METU, IR) _____
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Galip Yalman (METU, ADM) _____

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: Deniz Çiyan

Signature:

ABSTRACT

THE EVOLUTION OF THE GERMAN STANCE TOWARDS EUROPEAN SECURITY

Çiyan, Deniz

M.Sc., Department of European Studies

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Mustafa Türkeş

September 2012, 96 pages

This thesis seeks to depict the German stance towards European security in the post-Cold War era. It attempts to portray the continuity and change in Germany's policies towards the maintenance of European security first, by specifying the differences between the Cold War and the post-Cold War era, and second, within the years after the reunification of the two German states. This is examined in the light of the main developments in the international level, the European Union (EU) level and the German domestic level. These include on the international level the War in Kosovo, the Afghanistan intervention and the Iraq War; on the European Union level the EU treaties up until the Treaty of Lisbon and the developments on the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP); and lastly on the German domestic level the 1994 and 2006 *Weißbuch* (White Paper), which are official documents published by the German Ministry of Defence. This thesis indicates the change in Germany's European security perception after the reunification towards a new and different sort of assertiveness. It is argued that this assertiveness invigorates within a European Germany.

Keywords: Germany, European security, EU, NATO, ESDP, Assertiveness

ÖZ

ALMANYA’NIN AVRUPA GÜVENLİĞİNE DAİR TUTUMUNUN GELİŞİMİ

Çiyan, Deniz

Yüksek Lisans, Avrupa Çalışmaları Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Mustafa Türkeş

Eylül 2012, 96 sayfa

Bu tez Almanya’nın Soğuk Savaş sonrasındaki dönemde Avrupa güvenliğine dair tutumunu değerlendirmeyi amaçlamaktadır. Almanya’nın Avrupa güvenliğinin sağlanmasına yönelik politikalarındaki devamlılık ve değişimleri, ilk olarak Soğuk Savaş ve Soğuk Savaş sonrasındaki dönem arasındaki değişiklikler, ikinci olarak da Almanya’nın birleşmesinden sonra gelen yıllardaki değişiklikler vasıtasıyla ortaya koymayı hedeflemektedir. Bunu, uluslararası düzeydeki, Avrupa Birliği (AB) düzeyindeki ve Alman yerel düzeyindeki ana gelişmeler eşliğinde incelemektedir. Bu gelişmeler, uluslararası düzeyde Kosova Savaşı, Afganistan’a müdahale ve Irak Savaşı’nı; Avrupa Birliği düzeyinde Lizbon Antlaşması’na kadar olan AB antlaşmalarını ve Avrupa Güvenlik ve Savunma Politikası (AGSP)’ndeki gelişmeleri ve Alman yerel düzeyinde de Alman Savunma Bakanlığı tarafından yayınlanan 1994 ve 2006 *Weißbuch* (Beyaz Kitap) resmi belgelerini içermektedir. Bu çalışma, Almanya’nın Avrupa güvenlik algısının birleşmeden sonra yeni ve farklı anlamda bir iddialılığa doğru değiştiğini göstermekte ve bahsi geçen iddialılığın Avrupalı bir Almanya içinde hayat bulduğunu öne sürmektedir.

Anahtar kelimeler: Almanya, Avrupa güvenliği, AB, NATO, AGSP, İddialılık

To my loving grandmother
Nimet Özçelikkale

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my advisor Prof. Dr. Mustafa Türkeş who has been a true and considerate advisor to me. His guidance, academic and intellectual support, and criticism have helped me to look at the right direction and also to find the determination I needed to go on. I would also like to thank Prof. Dr. Hüseyin Bağcı and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Galip Yalman for their precious guidance throughout the whole process and also their constructive criticism during the jury.

My dear family, I could not thank you enough to show my gratitude for the support, guidance and love you have given me all through my life and especially my thesis. You are the reason why I am alive and the person I have become today. You have shown me that everything is possible with courage, hard work, faith in one's self and being surrounded by loving people. Mom, dad and my one-and-only-sis, I am grateful to have you.

It is a fact that I would not have managed to finalize my thesis if it was not for my grandmother Nimet, who is an angel sent from above. Her enduring love, support and patience were the things that kept me going on. My grandmother Nihal, who is holding onto life with her joy to live and who I know has prayed for me every single day, has showed me that life is always worth living. Thank you to you both and to my late grandfathers for showing me what family really means. A big fat thanks goes to my aunt Meral who is a round-the-clock thesis-supporter not only for me but also for my family.

I send my deepest gratitude to my “25/2 Family” and my “Library Gang”, without whose moral support I would not have been able to live through this experience. My special thanks go to Aynur Mutlu, Burcu Öztürk and Berkay Gülen who have not spared their support for me all through my thesis and always been on the other

side of the phone whenever I felt the need for a supportive talk. I would like to send a handful of thanks to my dear library fellow Aslı Mustanođlu Alten, with whom we collected lots of library memories towards the end of our theses that I will cherish for long years. There were times that we thought our theses would never end but like every good thing they have come to an end too.

I have a lot of people to thank and I do not want to miss anyone out but I know that I could not mention every single person that has helped me on the process of my thesis. You know who you are and you should also know that every contribution you have made has meant a world to me. I thank you with all my heart.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZ.....	v
DEDICATION.....	vi
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	ix
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	xii
CHAPTER	
1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
2: HISTORICAL BACKGROUND.....	6
2.1 Introduction.....	6
2.2 German Foreign Policy in the Second Reich and World War I.....	6
2.2.1 Bismarck (1871-1890): Consolidation in continental Europe.....	7
2.2.2 Wilhelm II (1890-1914): A clear shift in German foreign policy.....	9
2.2.3 World War I (1914-1918): High hopes, a sharp fall.....	11
2.3 German Foreign Policy in the Interwar Years and World War II.....	12
2.3.1 Weimar Republic (1918-1933): Recovery through a peaceful and negotiated revision.....	13
2.3.2 Third Reich and World War II (1933-1945): From coercive revision to ‘World Power’.....	15
2.4 Post-World War II Allied-Occupied Germany (1945-1949): Occupation and division.....	18
2.5 Federal Republic of Germany (1949-1990): Germany in the Western Camp.....	20
2.5.1 North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).....	23
2.5.2 <i>Ostpolitik</i>	24
2.5.3 Conference for Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE).....	27

2.5.4 European Political Cooperation (EPC).....	28
2.6 Conclusion.....	29
3: THE GERMAN STANCE TOWARDS THE FORMATION OF THE ESDI/ESDP.....	32
3.1 Introduction.....	32
3.2 The Reunification of Germany.....	32
3.3 Architectural Debate for European Security: Four Proposals on the European Level.....	36
3.4 Germany's Perception of European Security at National Level: <i>Weißbuch</i> 1994 and the Legitimacy Problem of the Deployment of <i>Bundeswehr</i> in Out- of-Area Operations.....	42
3.5 Milestones of European Security and Germany's Stance.....	48
3.5.1 Berlin Summit (NATO Ministerial Meeting), 3-4 June 1996.....	48
3.5.2 Treaty of Amsterdam, 2 October 1997.....	49
3.5.3 St.Malo Declaration, 4 December 1998.....	50
3.6 Conclusion.....	51
4: A EUROPEAN GERMANY AS A GLOBAL PLAYER: GROWING ASSERTIVENESS OF GERMANY.....	53
4.1 Introduction.....	53
4.2 The Kosovo War and NATO Military Operation, 1999.....	53
4.3 The Milestones of ESDP and Germany's Stance.....	56
4.3.1 The Cologne European Council, 3-4 June 1999.....	57
4.3.2 The Helsinki European Council, 10-11 December 1999.....	58
4.3.3 The Treaty of Nice, 26 February 2001.....	60
4.3.4 The Berlin Plus Agreement, 16 December 2002.....	61
4.3.5 Headline Goal 2010.....	62
4.4 Afghanistan: Operation Enduring Freedom and ISAF, 2001.....	63
4.5 Iraq Intervention: Old vs. New Europe, 2003.....	67

4.6 Germany's Perception of European Security at National Level:	
<i>Weißbuch</i> 2006.....	72
4.7 The Treaty of Lisbon, 13 December 2007.....	75
4.8 Conclusion.....	78
5: CONCLUSION.....	80
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	84
APPENDIX: Tez Fotokopi İzin Formu.....	96

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CEE	Central and Eastern Europe
CFSP	Common Foreign and Security Policy
CSDP	Common Security and Defense Policy
CSCE	Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe
EC / EEC	European Community / European Economic Community
ECSC	European Coal and Steel Community
EDC	European Defence Community
ERRF	European Rapid Reaction Force
ESDP	European Security and Defense Policy
EU	European Union
FRG	Federal Republic of Germany
G-8	Group of Eight
GDR	German Democratic Republic
HG2010	Headline Goal 2010
HHG	Helsinki Headline Goal
IFOR	Implementation Force in Bosnia and Herzegovina
ISAF	International Stabilization and Assistance Force
KFOR	Kosovo Force
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
OEF	Operation Enduring Freedom
OIF	Operation Iraqi Freedom
OSCE	Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe
SEA	Single European Act
SFOR	Stabilization Force in Bosnia and Herzegovina
TEU	Treaty on European Union
ToA	Treaty of Amsterdam
ToL	Treaty of Lisbon

ToN	Treaty of Nice
UK	United Kingdom
UN	United Nations
UNSC	United Nations Security Council
USSR	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
US	United States of America
WEU	Western European Union
WWI	World War I
WWII	World War II

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 and the unification of East and West Germany in 1990 formed a new state of affairs. The dissolution of the Soviet Union and the termination of the Cold War, reaching an end at around the same time as the German unification, created a new international context. As a result, Germany's perceptions on security in the world and at the European level changed. Germany's new structure and its security perception dominated international debate immediately after the end of the Cold War in the same way as it had dominated the international community after WWII.

At a time when the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)'s presence was being questioned due to the annihilation of the Soviet threat and when the German question was still at hand, Europe found itself in the middle of a debate on the architectural form of its security structure in the nascent international context. Four proposals were being debated: the French-Belgian, the British-American, the Russian and the German-Czech proposals. The French-Belgian proposal supported a Western European security structure which would be expanded to the whole continent with the EU enlargement. The proposal aimed at building European security on the promotion of the Western European Union (WEU) by making use of NATO assets.¹ The British-American proposal stressed the preservation of NATO with no fundamental change with regards to its structure to cope with new needs in the post-Cold War period. They aimed at securing the existence of NATO

¹ Stuart Croft, "The EU, NATO and Europeanisation: The Return of Architectural Debate", *European Security*, 9/3, 2000, p. 6

in Germany and Western Europe.² Russia's proposal was a rather revised version of the concept of the 'Concert of Europe' from the nineteenth century in the sense of an institutionalized form of cooperation between the major European powers in a European security council, which aimed to decouple the US from the European security architecture.³ Lastly, the German-Czech proposal was based on a pan-European security structure which promoted the formation of collective security within the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe/Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE/OSCE) that would incorporate not only NATO countries but also Russia, Ukraine, former Eastern Bloc members and the Central Asian Republics. The German-Czech proposal appeared to function in an enlarged space that would be called Eurasia.⁴

Among the four proposals only an uneven amalgamation of the British-American and the French-Belgian proposals was triumphant in the debates, which made them compete and coexist at the same time. As to Germany's stance, because her proposal could not find enough supporters and be one of the triumphant proposals, she adopted a stance between the Anglo-American and the French-Belgian proposals, thus being Atlanticist and Europeanist at the same time. Germany's vital role in the formation of the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) and participation in ESDP missions show her growing willingness to play a larger role in European security. In addition, it shows how Germany perceives European security and what her security policies are. These actions can be taken as a sign on Germany's emancipation from Cold War restrictions and thus, is analyzed as rather a new kind of 'assertiveness' that holds "a desire to not only be a part of the West but also to define what 'the West' is."⁵ Taking into account Germany's geographical position lying in the middle of Europe and thus neighboring both the 'West' and the 'East', her more central power and growing effectiveness within

² Frank Costigliola, "An 'Arm Around the Shoulder': The United States, NATO and German Reunification, 1989-90", *Contemporary European History*, 3/1, 1994, p.87

³ Stuart Croft, "The EU, NATO and Europeanisation", pp. 6-7

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 5

⁵ Tuomas Forsberg, "German Foreign Policy and the War on Iraq: Anti-Americanism, Pacifism or Emancipation?", *Security Dialogue*, 36/2, 2005, pp.214-215

the European Union (EU), and her participation in NATO- and EU-led operations, it is important to focus on Germany's policies and her stance towards European security.

This thesis attempts to explore Germany's stance towards European security in the post-Cold War years up until the Treaty of Lisbon. Whether there is continuity or change in Germany's policies is also to be looked into. Furthermore, special attention will be devoted to the question raised on the relationship between the growing effectiveness of Germany within the EU and her European security policies. This thesis will further examine the question whether Germany's expanding dominance within the EU has an effect on her assertiveness regarding European security policies.

In order to make a comprehensive research on the German stance towards European security, published books and articles as secondary sources, reviews, speeches of important political figures and published official documents have been made use of. The published official documents include agreements, declarations, treaties of the Federal Republic of Germany, the EU, the NATO and the UN, and also the resolutions of the German Parliament, the rulings of the German Federal Constitutional Court, the conclusions of the EU Councils, the conclusions of the NATO Ministerial Meetings, and the resolutions of the UN Security Council. All of the abovementioned official documents have been taken from primary sources. The 1994 and 2006 *Weißbuch* (White Paper), which are published by the German Ministry of Defense in order to set the agenda of the German security and defense policy and the German Armed Forces, will be examined. The fundamentals of the German security environment and Germany's position towards European security will be specified. The White Papers will serve as guiding documents, and examining through these documents, change or continuity will be pointed out.

In this thesis, following the introduction, Chapter 2 will focus on the historical background of the German stance towards European security. The chapter will begin with the unification of the German city states in 1871 and bring it up until the reunification of the two German states in 1990. A historical timeline

perspective will be implemented while putting forth the stances of the German Empire (1871-1918), the Weimar Republic (1918-1933), the Nazi Germany (1933-1945) and the Federal Republic of Germany/West Germany (1949-1990), including WWI and WWII. All of these states will be looked into separately and the chapter will aim to provide a basis for the following chapters.

Chapter 3 will commence with the reunification of the German states in 1990 and proceed with the analysis of the international context after the end of the Cold War through the architectural debates on European security. Germany's position in these debates, what she has proposed and supported will be looked into. Also Germany's response to the Gulf War in 1990-1991 that took place during Germany's unification process and the implications of the Maastricht Treaty on the European security will be touched upon. The *Weißbuch* (White Paper) published in 1994 will be examined in order to put forward the post-Cold War security environment perception of Germany and to analyze what her stance was regarding European security. The Federal Constitutional Court's ruling on the deployment of the *Bundeswehr* (German Armed Forces) in out-of-area missions will be presented and evaluated. After having analyzed the national perception of European security, the chapter will move on to the EU and NATO level, where the conclusions of the Berlin NATO Ministerial Meeting, the Treaty of Amsterdam, and lastly the St. Malo Declaration will be analyzed. The road to the formation of the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) will be looked into.

Chapter 4 will begin with an analysis of the Kosovo War and NATO's military intervention, in which Germany, for the first time since the end of WWII, engaged in an active combat mission. The reasons for the German participation and the role she played will be put forth. The chapter will then proceed with the establishment of the ESDP and the developments that have come afterwards. The EU Councils of Cologne and Helsinki, the Treaty of Nice, the Berlin Plus Agreement, which are a series of agreements between the EU and the NATO in order to make use of NATO military assets for the EU, and the Headline Goal 2010 of the EU all fall under this category. The terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 and the military

intervention in Afghanistan will be examined. Operating in both the military intervention in Afghanistan and in the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF), Germany's ambitions and motives to join in these missions will be scrutinized. Also the underlying reasons for Germany to refuse to participate in the Iraq military intervention in 2003 and the events that led up this intervention will be put forth. Turning once again to the national level, the *Weißbuch* (White Paper) of 2006 will be analyzed and comparisons with the 1994 White Paper will be conducted. Additionally, the present and future prospects of European security will be specified. Lastly, the Treaty of Lisbon and its effects on European security will be analyzed and Germany's stance after the Treaty of Lisbon will be identified.

Finally, the concluding chapter will explain what Germany's stance towards European security has been in the post-Cold War era and to what extent there is continuity or change in her stance. The relationship between the growing effectiveness of Germany within the EU and Germany's assertiveness regarding the European security policies will be evaluated.

CHAPTER 2

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

2.1 Introduction

Continuity or change in the German stance towards European security after the end of the Cold War may be pointed out by examining the main premises of German foreign policy and thus this chapter will shed light on the German perception of European security in a historical context. The unification of the German states in 1871 is taken as the initial point for a historical analysis that will conclude with the reunification of East and West Germany in 1990. A brief examination of German foreign policy and Germany's European security strategies throughout this period will be presented and continuities and/or changes in these policies will be examined.

2.2 German Foreign Policy in the Second Reich and World War I

From the unification of the German city states and then the proclamation of the German Empire in 1871 until the beginning of WWI the foreign policy orientation of the Reich could be summed up in two parts. During the first part Wilhelm I was the emperor and Otto von Bismarck was the chancellor. In this period Bismarck's delicate alliance system was the driving force in Germany's foreign policy particularly in the continental Europe. The second part, characterized first by Wilhelm II's 'New Course' in foreign policy and then by *Weltpolitik* (World Policy), which was implemented by the then foreign minister Bernhard von Bülow that eventually led to World War I. In regards to the German Reich's foreign policy during World War I, Germany commenced the war with great war aims such as creating *Mitteleuropa* (Central Europe), a 'continuous Central African

colonial empire'⁶ and a foothold in the Middle East but the war ended up in a debacle and the heavy burden of the Treaty of Versailles, which affected the policies of the following era.

2.2.1 Bismarck (1871-1890): Consolidation in continental Europe

Bismarck, having fought three wars between 1862 and 1871 as Prussia's minister-president dealt with diplomatic crises in foreign affairs and faced domestic pressure. Once the German unification was finalized in 1871 he sought stability in Europe. The European picture, when the Second Reich was proclaimed, comprised of five major states: to the east Russia, which was in a rapid industrializing process and supporting her "co-religionists in the Balkans"⁷; to the west an unfriendly France because of the Franco-German War of 1870, in which Germany had annexed Alsace-Lorraine; Britain, in her heyday of being the leading colonial power which saw Germany as a competitor for world markets; Austria-Hungary, which was a weakened power left outside of the German Reich but also a potential ally albeit her defeat at Königgratz in 1866, and finally, Germany, which was a "delicate compromise"⁸ and a newcomer that caused suspicion among the other states due to the way she arrived onto the international scene.⁹ Facing such a picture Bismarck gave priority to persuading the European powers to believe that Germany had no more territorial ambitions and therefore sought peace, stability and a balance amongst them. Diplomatic relations were given importance and Germany became "the nerve center of Europe"¹⁰

Bismarck's foreign policy is described with the term *Realpolitik*, which Raffael Scheck describes as "an unemotional foreign policy strictly focused on reality and

⁶ Fritz Fischer, *Germany's Aims in the First World War*, (New York: W.W. Norton&Company, Inc., 1967), p.103

⁷ William Simpson, *The Second Reich: Germany, 1871-1918*, (Cambridge: New York; Melbourne: Cambridge UP, 1995), p.46

⁸ Imanuel Geiss, *German Foreign Policy, 1871-1914*, (London: Routledge, 1976), p.12

⁹ William Simpson, *Second Reich*, pp.46-47

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p.47

national interest rather than on ideology and morality.”¹¹ In addition to this, *Realpolitik* sought to sustain stability which allowed Bismarck to promote further industrialization. In accordance with this policy Bismarck knew that Germany lay in a geography that was surrounded by other major powers which were utterly unfriendly as she had made room for herself by changing the balance of power in Europe. The feud with France was one that Bismarck wanted especially to avoid and thus he constructed a system of alliances which was delicate and complex. He wanted to isolate France by keeping good relations with Russia, which Bismarck considered to be a potential ally of France. The Three Emperors Agreement (*Dreikaiserabkommen*) of 1873 between Russia, Austria-Hungary and Germany, which in 1881 was renewed as the Three Emperors League (*Dreikaiserbund*), had the aim of keeping Russia and Austria as allies against a potential French attack.¹² Furthermore he aimed at building good relations between Austria and Russia - Austria's main rival - because of their conflict on the Balkans.¹³ He went on and signed separate agreements with these two states. On the one hand, Bismarck tied herself to Austria with a secret Austro-German Dual Alliance in 1879 as she wanted Austria to survive as a great power in the European balance of power system, despite its growing weakness, in order to prevent Russian expansion in the Balkans.¹⁴ On the other hand, the Reinsurance Treaty of 1887, also kept secret, between Russia and Germany assured Russian neutrality in case of an attack by France in exchange for the recognition of Russian claims on the Balkans.¹⁵

Even though Bismarck found the colonies a luxury for a newly unified state like Germany and denied an interest in them, it was during his chancellorship that Germany started obtaining colonies.¹⁶ Colonial policies were pursued not only out of the need for new markets but also for foreign policy accounts. Bismarck

¹¹ Raffael Scheck, *Germany, 1871-1945: A Concise History*, (Oxford; New York: Berg, 2008), p.43

¹² William Simpson, *Second Reich*, p.60

¹³ Raffael Scheck, *Germany, 1871-1945*, p.44

¹⁴ David G. Williamson, *Germany since 1815: A Nation Forged and Renewed*, (Hampshire; New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2005), p.130

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p.136

¹⁶ William Simpson, *Second Reich*, p.64

supported the maintenance of the European balance of power through promoting French colonial ambitions in the 1880s. To divert France's interest away from the Alsace-Lorraine region and to keep her in the colonial race as a reason for conflict among other colonial powers were his real aims.¹⁷

2.2.2 Wilhelm II (1890-1914): A clear shift in German foreign policy

After the death of *Kaiser* (emperor) Wilhelm I in 1888, Friedrich III acceded to the throne but died only three months later because of an illness he had been suffering. It was Wilhelm II, the eldest son of Friedrich, who reigned the German Empire until the end of WWI. Due to a conflict with the new Kaiser on matters that were screened as domestic politics but were in fact differences on foreign policy matters, where Bismarck was more cautious and Wilhelm II was more ambitious to obtain colonies and start a naval arms race with Great Britain, Bismarck resigned in early 1890. Four chancellors succeeded him, Bernhard von Bülow and Bethmann Hollweg being the two most prominent among them.

Wilhelm II, after Bismarck's resignation, implemented a policy known as the 'New Course', which abandoned the peace preserving alliance system of Bismarck and adopted a new type of power seeking policy. It was a policy with the ambition of possessing more colonies and more power, and thus taking the lead in Europe. This was put into words by the German chancellor Bülow in his famous 1897 speech to the *Reichstag* (Imperial Diet) stating "[W]e don't want to put anyone in the shade, but we demand our place in the sun too."¹⁸ It was this speech that reflected the clear shift in German foreign policy to *Weltpolitik* under the chancellorship of Bülow.

The economic situation of Germany from its early years until the beginning of WWI sheds light on this policy change. In the early 1870's with the newly formed German unification there was a short term economic boost which then entered into

¹⁷ Raffael Scheck, *Germany, 1871-1945*, p.44

¹⁸ Ian Porter and Ian D. Armour, *Imperial Germany: 1890-1918*, (London: Longman, 1991), pp.94-5, quoted in William Simpson, *The Second Reich: Germany, 1871-1918*, (Cambridge: New York; Melbourne: Cambridge UP, 1995), p.93

a recession in 1873 and later from 1896 onwards a new wave of boom in German exports occurred.¹⁹ The growth of German industrial product led the German government to enter into further competition with her main competitor, Britain, in the overseas trade. The Wilhelm II period also witnessed severe competition with Britain over naval power. All these would be reflected in the change of German foreign policy from Bismarck's equilibrating alliance system to Wilhelm II's more assertive *Weltpolitik*, which sought to find new markets in Africa and the Middle East.

The main premises of *Weltpolitik* was to obtain more colonial land, form economic influence in places that were not directly under Germany's colonial possession, and extend her power in Europe.²⁰ To carry out these ambitious goals the German government put a premium on the armament of the Germany navy, which meant the construction of a great battle fleet. This led to the distrust of Britain, which underwent a naval change itself, and as a result an arms race between Britain and Germany emerged.²¹ Other consequences of the pursuance of *Weltpolitik* and naval armament were the major crises between Germany and other European powers, namely Britain, France and Russia, which emerged in Africa, Europe and the Balkans.²²

Among others, two crises that Germany underwent are of importance to understand the Second Reich's European security policies. The first of these, the Bosnian Crisis of 1908-09, started off with the annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina in early October 1908 by the Austro-Hungarian Empire, which caused a great disturbance in Russia and Serbia. Germany, aiming at forcing Russia to back off and avoid a war, gave full support to Austria. This unconditional support served the purpose and Russia pulled her backing from Serbia, thus avoiding a war with

¹⁹ Koppel S. Pinson, *Modern Germany: Its History and Civilization*, (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1954), p.229; David G. Williamson, *Germany since 1815*, p.92

²⁰ William Simpson, *Second Reich*, p.91

²¹ Raffael Scheck, *Germany, 1871-1945*, pp.67-68

²² David G. Williamson, *Germany since 1815*, pp.141-143

Austria and Germany. Whilst worsening relations with Russia, Germany's policy to support Austria in a war against Russia showed her will to preserve Austria-Hungary as a great power and to avoid Russia enlarging her influence in the Balkans.²³ The second crisis occurred with the outbreak of war in the Balkans in 1912 by the Balkan states against the Ottoman Empire. The defeat of the Ottoman Empire caused a deep concern among the European powers. Facing a strengthened Serbia, Austria asked for support from Germany. The Kaiser decided once again that it was for Germany's benefit to keep Austria as a great power under her guidance and declared that if Russia attacked Austria, Germany would go to war beside Austria.²⁴

Amongst other reasons, it was the ill-tempered policies of the German government that led to the onset of WWI. It is stated by Karl Max Fürst von Lichnowsky, German ambassador in London from 1912 to 1914, in his Lichnowsky Memorandum that "On our side nothing, absolutely nothing, was done to preserve peace..."²⁵

2.2.3 World War I (1914-1918): High hopes, a sharp fall

Kaiser Wilhelm II's words "I no longer recognize parties, I recognize only Germans"²⁶ in August 1914 and Chancellor Bethmann Hollweg's speech to the *Reichstag* explaining that Germany was fighting a defensive war because she was drawn into it due to her enemies' hostile attitudes²⁷ brought about a feeling of togetherness to the German nation and they felt sure to win at the beginning of the war.

²³ *Ibid.*, pp.140-141

²⁴ William Simpson, *Second Reich*, pp.103-104

²⁵ John C.G. Röhl, *1914: Delusion or Design: The testimony of two German diplomats*, (London: Elek, 1973), p.104

²⁶ Gordon A. Craig, *Germany, 1866-1945*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978), p.340

²⁷ Louis Leo Snyder (ed.), *Documents of German History*, (Rutgers: Rutgers University Press, 1958), p.338

The German government's main war aim, stated in Chancellor Hollweg's September Programme, which was Hollweg's written plan that was not put into official practice but is considered to be one of the motives for war, was "security for the German Reich in west and east for all imaginable time."²⁸ Thus to achieve this end, weakening France, repulsing Russia away from Germany's east borders, and forming a 'central European economic association' (*Mitteleuropa*) and the 'continuous Central African colonial empire' were the main points to be acted upon.²⁹ These aims were extensions of *Weltpolitik* and were goals to be achieved in order to elevate Germany as a world power.

Even though there were phases during the war that looked as though the Central Powers (German Empire, Austro-Hungarian Empire, Ottoman Empire, and Kingdom of Bulgaria) would be triumphant, the Great War ended in a victory for the Entente Powers (United Kingdom, France, Russian Empire, Italy and the United States). A heavy defeat led to harsh peace treaty conditions for the Central Powers and Germany had to underwrite the Treaty of Versailles.

2.3 German Foreign Policy in the Interwar Years and World War II

A defeat leading to be obliged to sign an armistice with the Entente Powers on their own terms, and the Entente Powers taking advantage of Germany's vulnerable situation and imposing a harsh treaty as the Treaty of Versailles, which confiscated land from Germany, occupied German territories, disarmed almost all of the German army and set reparations as high as 269 billion gold marks³⁰, led to a strong feeling of humiliation and resentment. Thus, the main aim of the Weimar Republic and the Third Reich was to revise Versailles. By revising the Treaty and gaining more space to act, along with the rigid policy pursuance of the Third Reich to raise Germany to a world power, eventually led to World War II, which was

²⁸ Fritz Fischer, *Germany's Aims*, p.103

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p.104

³⁰ Karl Hardach, *The Political Economy of Germany in the Twentieth Century*, (Berkeley; Los Angeles; London: University of California Press, 1980), p.24

even more disastrous and destructive than the first, not only for Germany but for the world.

2.3.1 Weimar Republic (1918-1933): Recovery through a peaceful and negotiated revision

From 1918 until 1945 the main aim of the state was to revise Versailles. By revising the peace treaty it was targeted to make enough elbowroom for Germany to establish hegemony in Europe, an aim that lay in the premises of *Realpolitik*, *Weltpolitik* and Nazi foreign policy too. This continuous policy aim differed in its tools when it came to the Weimar Republic. Unlike the policies that caused the onset of WWI by Wilhelm II and the policies of Hitler that led to WWII, the parliamentary government of Weimar sought to attain this ultimate aim through peaceful tools: maintaining diplomatic relations with the West as well as the East and playing both sides against the middle for her own interest. The appendices to be revised included the reduction of reparations, evacuation of the occupied territories and redefinition of Germany's eastern boundaries.

As Cyril Black stated “[I]n the 1920’s, the European search for security through traditional political and military alliances intensified.”³¹ The Weimar Republic held on to Bismarck’s habit of building alliances and established good relations with Soviet Russia, in an attempt to play East against West and to gain benefits for herself. When in 1922 the German and Russian delegations were not accepted to the World Economic Conference in Genoa, these two states signed the Rapallo Treaty instead. Mutual recognition, renouncement of financial claims, setting up diplomatic and consular relations, and economic cooperation were the treaty’s main points. Great Britain and the US feared that if they did not hold back the French claims to set up even harsher clauses on Germany to contain her, Germany would turn to communism, which was an undesired result. This did not happen but

³¹ Cyril E. Black et al., *Rebirth: A History of Europe Since World War II*, (Boulder; Oxford: Westview Press, 1992), p.31

Germany got what she wanted. Rapallo enabled Germany to revise Versailles and so came the Locarno Treaties.³²

The Locarno Treaties of 1925, which guaranteed the French and Belgium borderlines of Versailles, acted as a driving force for Russia to tie another treaty with Germany, that being the Berlin Treaty of 1926. According to the treaty provisions, Germany would remain neutral in case of Russia going into war with a third party – namely Poland - only if Russia were not the aggressor. This time the Berlin Treaty acted as a new Rapallo for Germany. As a result, the occupied Cologne Zone was evacuated in January 1926 and with all of these improvements, Germany was accepted to the League of Nations in September 1926.³³ Even though Germany was willing to agree on her western border as defined by the Treaty of Versailles, she did not want to sign an agreement with her eastern border neighbours Poland and Czechoslovakia. Germany had the aim of gaining back the lost eastern German territories during WWI and thus abstained from signing any agreement with these neighbours. This attitude was observed as reluctance to preserve the Versailles borders and also a will to expand.³⁴

The economic circumstances after WWI were not pleasant. A sharp fall in industrial production after the war, the great inflation period between 1919 and 1923, and the process of stabilizing the Mark that started at the end of November 1923³⁵ all had devastating effects and left the German economy weak. It was not until 1927 that industrial production reached the level of 1913³⁶ and the German economy started to recover. Added to this were the payments of reparations, which were set at 269 billion gold marks but revised through the Dawes Plan in 1926 and

³² Imanuel Geiss, "German foreign policy in the Weimar Republic and the Third Reich, 1919-1945", p.142, in *Weimar and Nazi Germany: Continuities and Discontinuities*, edited by Panikos Panayi, (Essex: Pearson Education, 2001)

³³ David G. Williamson, *Germany since 1815*, p.188

³⁴ Imanuel Geiss, "German foreign policy", p.148

³⁵ David G. Williamson, *Germany since 1815*, p.189

³⁶ Knut Borchardt, *Perspectives on Modern German Economic History and Policy*, (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991), p.172

the Young Plan in 1929, that reduced the amount to be paid, extended the period of payment and arranged American loans for Germany to reconstruct her industrial productivity and thus pay the reparations.³⁷ The Young Plan also made the evacuation of the Rhineland possible in 1930, five years before the due date according to the Versailles, as this was the clause Britain and France accepted in return for the acceptance of the Young Plan.³⁸

The economic situation changed with the Great Depression in late 1929. In Germany home-made deflation and growing unemployment were the indicators of the bad economic situation and it came clear that Germany would not be able to pay her reparations fully and on time. With the International Conference on Reparations in Lausanne in 1932, “Germany theoretically achieved the end of reparations.”³⁹ This was a triumph for Germany as she omitted one of the most important clauses of the Versailles Treaty that avoided her from gaining elbowroom for manoeuvre. Another effect of the bad economic conditions was the shift to the political right among German citizens and thereby the rise of Hitler to power in 1933.

2.3.2 Third Reich and World War II (1933-1945): From coercive revision to ‘World Power’

Hitler, who is considered to be the cause of World War II, was chosen chancellor in January 1933 and in August 1934 he became the head of state, which made him formally *Führer und Reichskanzler* (leader and chancellor of the Reich). Hitler’s foreign policy had one main aim: to make Germany a World Power.⁴⁰ This was a continuation of a foreign policy objective from the Second to the Third Reich, as Kaiser Wilhelm II with his *Weltpolitik* had had the same aim. Hitler, as a fascist, wanted to establish the *Großgermanisches Reich Deutscher Nation* (The Greater Germanic Reich) which meant expanding its territories to all of Germanic Europe.

³⁷ Imanuel Geiss, “German foreign policy”, pp.147-148

³⁸ David G. Williamson, *Germany since 1815*, p.188

³⁹ Imanuel Geiss, “German foreign policy”, p.151

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p.156

Thus, Hitler sought to achieve *Lebensraum* (living space), more land for the expansion of the German population, especially towards the east of Germany. Hitler in explaining this need states in his book *Mein Kampf* the following:

Then, without consideration of ‘traditions’ and prejudices, it [the National Socialist movement] must find the courage to gather our people and their strength for an advance along the road that will lead this people from its present restricted living space to new land and soil, and hence also free it from the danger of vanishing from the earth or of serving others as a slave nation. The National Socialist movement must strive to eliminate the disproportion between our population and our area – viewing this latter as a source of food as well as a basis for power politics – between our historical past and the hopelessness of our present impotence.⁴¹

To achieve this end, Hitler’s road map for Germany was to “absorb all or most of its smaller neighbours and the minor powers, and to crush both the middling powers (Poland) and the great ones (France, Soviet Russia).”⁴² Thus, this was how he proceeded. To gain some time, he started off with Poland on peaceful terms by signing a non-aggression and friendship treaty in January 1934, aiming at avoiding any alliance between France and Poland. Then with the plebiscite for Saarland in January 1935, which resulted in the joining of Saarland to the Third Reich, Hitler came one step closer to his aim. In March 1936 Hitler infringed the Treaty of Versailles by occupying and remilitarizing the Rhineland, which was the first time Germany had set foot on the left bank of the Rhine since the end of WWI. The annexation of Austria in March 1938, known in history as the *Anschluss*, was the biggest step for Hitler in achieving the Greater Germanic Reich. The occupation of the Sudetenland in October 1938 was the prelude to occupying the rest of Czechoslovakia and Prague in March 1939 and creating an independent Slovakian state as a satellite state to Germany. The annexation of Memelland from Lithuania was the “last ‘peaceful’ territorial gain before outright war”.⁴³

⁴¹ Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, translated by Ralph Manheim, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1943), p.646

⁴² Imanuel Geiss, “German foreign policy”, p.157

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p.165

In 1933, when Hitler was appointed chancellor, the economic situation was not bright. As the effects of the Great Slump in 1929, industrial production had declined sharply, unemployment rates were sky-high and German trade had sunk deeply. By 1939, just before WWII started, the economy had recovered largely, industrial production had risen and unemployment had declined to almost the level of full employment, all thanks to the Nazi economic programs.⁴⁴ The Third Reich was ready to go to war.

Events in the international world and the great powers' attitudes towards these events have also paved the way for war. The Munich Agreement of 1938, which was a conference held among Great Britain, France, Italy and Germany on the future of the Sudetenland due to Hitler's nationalistic demands, allowed the German troops to occupy Sudetenland.⁴⁵ Two points were important in this agreement. Firstly, the fact that USSR was not invited to the conference, thus disregarding Russia as a great power in Europe, and secondly, the appeasement policy of the Great Britain and France towards Nazi Germany reaching a peak. It was the appeasement policy that allowed Hitler to have a free hand and acquire the territorial gains in a 'peaceful' manner in such a short time between 1933 and 1939. On the other hand, disregarding the USSR led the Russians to sign the Nazi-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact in August 1939, which guaranteed the neutrality of both of the states in case of entering into war with a third party.⁴⁶ A secret protocol was signed in conjunction with the Pact, in which USSR and the Reich shared Poland and the Baltic area with the aim of turning them into their own satellites.⁴⁷ With this Pact, Hitler aimed at Russia's neutrality during a potential attack on Poland, which was his further territorial aim after Memelland.

⁴⁴ David G. Williamson, *Germany since 1815*, pp.231-235

⁴⁵ Imanuel Geiss, "German foreign policy", p.164

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p.166

⁴⁷ Research Institute for Military History (ed.), *Germany and the Second World War: The Build-up of German Aggression, Vol.1*, translated by P.S. Falla, Dean S. Mc Murry, Ewald Osers, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp.708-709

By invading Poland on 1 September 1939, Hitler initiated World War II. As continuity to the pre-war Third Reich foreign policy, the *Führer* sought to gain a living space (*Lebensraum*) throughout the war. By mid-1942 Germany had defeated Poland, put Northern France and Belgium under military control, drove the British out of the continent, started ruling Denmark, Norway and Holland through the existing administrative systems, and had attacked her ally Russia in June 1941, infringing the Nazi-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact.⁴⁸ Even though these successes, Germany was to be defeated by the Russians in Stalingrad and this defeat defined the end of the war.

When the Allied forces advanced into Germany in April 1945 and it became obvious that the Third Reich had lost the war, Hitler committed suicide at the end of the month, after appointing a new president, chancellor and party minister. The appointees' attempts to keep the Reich alive failed. On 8 May 1945, Nazi Germany surrendered unconditionally and on June 5 Germany formally became the suzerain of the Allies.⁴⁹

2.4 Post-World War II Allied-Occupied Germany (1945-1949): Occupation and division

The Allies – US, Great Britain, France and USSR – occupied Germany and divided the country and the city of Berlin into four military occupation zones in 1945, agreeing to rule their zones according to the guidelines of the Potsdam Conference of 1945, where it was decided to keep “a united but decentralized Germany”.⁵⁰ In order to achieve this administrative system the Allied Control Council, made up of the four commanders in chief of the four zones, was set up and the “[s]upreme authority regarding all matters affecting Germany was granted to... the Control Council.”⁵¹ Though the Allied Control Council was responsible for all of Germany, the separate Allied military governments were responsible in

⁴⁸ David G. Williamson, *Germany since 1815*, pp.252-253

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, pp.262-264

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p.275

⁵¹ Cyril E. Black et al., *Rebirth*, p.61

the governance of their own zones. Other topics that were defined at Potsdam were Germany's eastern borders, in which land east of the Oder and Neisse Rivers was passed on to Poland, and the demilitarization of the *Wehrmacht* (Armed Forces of Nazi Germany). Apart from this basic consensus, the Allies had different aims and thus could not decide on a common future for Germany, as the question of who would control Germany could not be agreed upon. Controlling Germany, located in the heart of Europe, meant controlling Central Europe and neither party was willing to give up this opportunity.

According to the Potsdam Agreement, Germany was to be treated as one economic unit but this was in real terms not realized. Especially after the formation of the Bizonia in January 1947, the economic merger between the US and UK zones that turned into Trizonia by mid-1948 with the inclusion of the French zone, and the introduction of the new currency – the *Deutsche Mark* (German Mark) in June 1948 replacing the devalued *Reichsmark* (Imperial Mark) of the Third Reich, which was introduced only in the Trizonia– Germany was economically separated into two sections: the US – UK-led capitalist West and the Russian-led socialist East. The response of USSR to the formation of Bizonia was to establish the German Economic Commission in June 1947, in order to make an economic plan and implement it within her own zone. USSR's response to the currency reform was to introduce the new *Ostmark* (East German Mark) within the Soviet-occupied zone and to make a blockade on West Berlin, the Berlin Blockade, on the ground of avoiding the devalued *Reichsmark* (Imperial Mark) entering into the Soviet zone. The real aim of the Blockade was to drive the Western Allies out and establish full control over Berlin but the Western Allies chose not to give in and performed the so-called *Luftbrücke* (Berlin Airlift), providing West Berlin with the necessary supplies from June 1948 until May 1949, when the Blockade became unsuccessful.⁵²

⁵² Simon, Green, Dan Hough, Alistair Miskimmon and Graham Timmins, *The Politics of the New Germany*, (Oxon; New York: Routledge, 2008), pp.22-23

All of these developments led to the division of Germany and the formation of legally two different German states. The Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) was established in May 1949, after the Parliamentary Council – on the invitation of the Western Allied powers – founded the constitution of the new state, the *Grundgesetz* (Basic Law), and the German Democratic Republic (GDR) was established in October 1949 by the Soviet occupier, as a repercussion to the formation of a separate German state. Until the establishment of the two German states, Allied-occupied Germany had no foreign policy objectives of her own because the state was under occupation rule by the Allied Control Council and a central German government was not allowed to be formed according to the Potsdam accords.⁵³ A central government ruled by the Germans was not something the Western Allies envisaged. This situation has been described by Gustav Schmidt as “[a]fter the Second World War Germany lost the ability to control its own destiny.”⁵⁴

The foreign policy analysis starting from the establishment of the two separate German states in 1949 until the reunification of these states in 1990 will focus only on the FRG as the reunified German state is considered to be the continuity of the FRG.

2.5 Federal Republic of Germany (1949-1990): Germany in the Western Camp

The FRG, consisting of the US, UK and French zones, was built upon a constitution that, in the Preamble, stated “[i]nspired by the determination to promote world peace as an equal partner in a united Europe, the German people, in the exercise of their constituent power, have adopted this Basic Law.”⁵⁵ After experiencing two world wars and being the propellant power of these wars, working towards the unity of Europe through peaceful means was the foreign

⁵³ David G. Williamson, *Germany since 1815*, p.275

⁵⁴ Gustav Schmidt, “Europe and the World”, *Contemporary European History*, 9/3, 2000, p.363

⁵⁵ German Bundestag, “Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany”, <https://www.btg-bestellservice.de/pdf/80201000.pdf> (accessed on 13.07.2012)

policy objective of West Germany. However, this clause should not be attributed to the German people alone, as the Basic Law also allowed the Western Allies to maintain their administrative power over necessary policies, like foreign policy and security issues, thus making West Germany a “semi-sovereign democratic country”⁵⁶ and her foreign policy objectives not solely the German state’s objectives.

Konrad Adenauer, FRG’s first chancellor, saw that West Germany’s recovery from the results and bad memories of WW II, and the revision of the occupation status and the rearmament issue laid in the integration of Germany into the Western political and economic system. He pursued a policy called *Westintegration* (Western integration or also called the *Westpolitik*), which revealed itself in the signing of the Petersberg Agreement in 1949, the European Coal and Steel Community in 1951, the European Defence Community Treaty in 1952, and the *Deutschlandvertrag* (German Treaty or General Treaty) in May 1952, that ended the occupation. European integration was a way for Germany to “return to international respectability”.⁵⁷

The first modification to the occupation status was done with the Petersberg Agreement in 1949, where Konrad Adenauer secured the entrance of FRG into the Council of Europe and the Organization for European Economic Cooperation as an independent state. Through this agreement, West Germany was back in the international world. The Petersberg Agreement also gave a seat to FRG on the board of the International Authority for the Ruhr, an international body to control the coal and steel industry in the Ruhr Area, which later turned into the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) in 1951. The ECSC, established among France, West Germany, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg, eventually led to the signing of the Rome Treaty in 1957, creating the European Economic Community (EEC), later to be named the European Community (EC).

⁵⁶ Manfred G. Schmidt, *Political Institutions in the Federal Republic of Germany*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), p.11

⁵⁷ Simon Green, *Politics of the New Germany*, p.26

The will for European integration in political and economic matters were realized in these attempts.

The insistence of the US on attaching West Germany to the Western European security structures, especially after the outbreak of the Korean War in 1950, and for that matter the remilitarization of West Germany led to a proposal for a European army being put forth. As a result, after discussions and negotiations, the European Defence Community (EDC) Treaty was signed in 1952 between the same six countries as the ECSC. Though it started as a French initiative and later gained US' support, the French parliament rejected to ratify the treaty in 1954 and EDC became an unsuccessful attempt in organizing the situation of the German military forces.⁵⁸ Along with this attempt, another initiative was pursued by the Western powers. In 1954 West Germany signed, together with the states forming the EDC plus the United Kingdom, an agreement which turned the 1948 Brussels Treaty into the Western European Union (WEU) and brought the Federal Republic into the organization.

The *Deutschlandvertrag* (German Treaty or General Treaty), which gave Germany most of her rights as a sovereign state, was signed in 1952 between the Western Allies and West Germany. The rearmament clause of the treaty was built on the EDC as this was the proposed way in which West German rearmament was to be accomplished. Once the EDC initiative failed to live, a problem occurred on how to remilitarize the Federal Republic within the western security structures. This was solved through the signing of an agreement that accepted FRG into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) as a full and equal member, though restrictions were put on the rearmament issue. It was concluded that FRG would be rearmed under both NATO and WEU.⁵⁹ These actions were efforts to safely integrate FRG in the Western security system, as it was feared that uncontrolled

⁵⁸ Renata Dwan, "Jean Monnet and the European Defence Community, 1950-1954", *Cold War History*, 1/3, 2001, pp.141-142

⁵⁹ Hans F. Sennholz, *How Can Europe Survive*, (New York; Toronto; London: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1955), p.271; For more detail on WEU history, see <http://www.weu.int/> (accessed on 17.07.2012)

rearmament of West Germany could lead to a probable reunification with East Germany and, contingently, a variation of the Third Reich. West Germany's NATO membership was to define Germany's stance all through Cold War.

Germany gained most of her rights as a sovereign state with the coming into force of the General Treaty on May 5, 1955 through formally ending her status as an occupied state. Though stated full sovereign internally and externally, the Allied powers preserved some of their rights, especially regarding issues on the unification of the two Germanies and a peace treaty between Germany and the Allied Powers that would come up in the future.⁶⁰

2.5.1 North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)

The rearmament problem of the Federal republic was solved with her entry into NATO on May 9, 1955. It was one of the fruits of Adenauer's Western integration policy that eventually led Germany to remilitarize for the first time since the end of WW II, though this remilitarization had strict restrictions. The *Bundeswehr* (German Armed Forces), which were to be clearly distinguished from the Nazi *Wehrmacht* (Armed Forces), was to be set up. It was to operate under the guidance of NATO and could only be used for the defence of the German land and of the NATO territorial area.⁶¹ It was also required that Germany renounce any attempt to produce atomic, biological and nuclear weapons.⁶² The main aim was to build an alliance of collective defence that would operate against the threats from the East. This aim was to be summarized by the famous words of Lord Ismay, the first NATO Secretary General, as "to keep the Russians out, the Americans in and the Germans down".⁶³

⁶⁰ Manfred G. Schmidt, *Political Institutions*, p.12

⁶¹ Simon Green, *Politics of the New Germany*, p.26

⁶² Helga Haftendorn, "Germany's Accession into NATO: 50 years on", *NATO Review*, 1 June 2005, <http://www.nato.int/docu/review/2005/Peace-Building/Germany-accession-NATO/EN/index.htm> (accessed on 17.07.2012)

⁶³ Peter Hennessy, *Whitehall*, (London: Secker and Warburg, 1989), p.412, quoted in *The Origins of the Cold War in Europe: international perspectives*, edited by David Reynolds, (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1994), p.13

West Germany's membership to the Atlantic Alliance and the strengthening of NATO through this entrance, made the Soviet Union take action against it. Hence forth, USSR and seven Soviet-oriented countries, including the GDR, signed the Warsaw Pact in May 1955. This was the consolidation of the bi-polarity of the Cold War: the Soviet-led Eastern and the US-led Western camps.

The signing of the Rome Treaty by the six member states of the ECSC in 1957 establishing the EEC was another attempt to integrate West Germany into the Western system and also a result of Adenauerian *Westpolitik*. Eric Hobsbawm in his book *Age of Extremes* (1995) tells that the EEC was “created both by and against the USA”. He stated that it was ‘by the USA’ because the Western European states out of war were economically devastated and the US needed strong allies in Europe in the newly defined world where a war with the Soviet Union was possible any second. She needed an economically, militarily and politically strong European front. It was ‘against the USA’ firstly, because apart from the Soviet threat, Germany was still seen as a source of danger for Europe. This fear – especially in the eyes of the French – was not at all irrelevant. Even though the Western integration, Germany had started recovering from the ruins of 1945 and rearming under NATO. A model based on sole European integration for the purpose of tying Germany in such a way that she could never try to do what Hitler did was an important driving force. Secondly, the USA was perceived as being an unreliable partner in the newly defined international world because she could place US interests before that of the Atlantic Alliance.⁶⁴ Western Europe wanted to secure herself against the consequences of unexpected action by the US.

2.5.2 Ostpolitik

The Federal Republic, during the postwar period - both willingly and as the conditions made her do so - found herself involved in various initiatives to integrate into the West and to prove this integration to the West. Chancellor Adenauer's policy called the Hallstein Doctrine from 1955 onwards was a policy

⁶⁴ Eric J. Hobsbawm, *The Age of Extremes: the short twentieth century, 1914-1991*, (London: Abacus, 1995), p. 240

in this sense. He declared that any country, with the exception of the USSR, which recognized the GDR, would be considered to be pursuing an unfriendly act and this would result in the termination of diplomatic relations. The exception of USSR was because it was one of the four Allies of the occupation zones. It was under this exception that the FRG agreed to exchange ambassadors with Russia, which she declared did not mean the recognition of the GDR.

The Berlin Crisis of 1958-1961, during which the Soviet Union warned the Western Allies that if they did not conduct a peace treaty with the two Germanies on the demilitarization of West Berlin, she would conclude a peace treaty with the GDR and recognize GDR's sovereignty over East Berlin alone. Recognizing the GDR's sovereignty over East Berlin was especially desirable, as the bad economic situation in the GDR and the miraculous growth of the FRG's economy led East Germans to migrate to the West, which was something that Russia wanted to halt. The Western Allies did not take the bait and no result came out of the negotiations. For this reason, it was decided to shut down the interaction of East Berlin with the West, and thus the building of the Berlin Wall started in 1961. It was the Berlin Crisis and nevertheless the reluctance of the US and UK to object to the building of the Berlin Wall that showed their will to accept the status quo in the Cold War and the search for an easing of the tense relations between the East and West blocs, the so-called *détente*. This action showed that the GDR would be in existence in the near future and that FRG would eventually have to recognize her.⁶⁵

However, on the West German side, starting from 1966 with Willy Brandt, the then foreign secretary and the future chancellor, a politics of rehabilitating relations with her Eastern counterpart and the Eastern bloc, the *Ostpolitik* (Eastern Policy), was put into practice. It was aimed at the 'normalization' of relations between the eastern bloc, with specific attention given to the GDR, and the FRG.⁶⁶

⁶⁵ David G. Williamson, *Germany since 1815*, pp.299-301

⁶⁶ Timothy Garton Ash, *In Europe's Name: Germany and the Divided Continent*, (New York: Random House, 1993), p.15

To achieve this end, “jettisoning the Hallstein doctrine”⁶⁷ was needed as this doctrine from the Adenauer era rested upon the idea on the repudiation of the GDR. In pursuance of the *Ostpolitik*, FRG signed independent treaties with the GDR, the USSR, Poland and Czechoslovakia. The Moscow Treaty of 1970 with the USSR, the Warsaw Treaty of 1970 with Poland and the Treaty of Prague with Czechoslovakia in 1973 all had the common guideline of accepting the postwar borders. The Quadripartite Agreement on Berlin signed by the four wartime allies in 1971 allowed FRG to represent West Berlin abroad without West Berlin being part of the FRG. The last of the *Ostpolitik* agreements was the Basic Treaty of 1972 between the two German states. Mutual recognition of each other as sovereign states and setting diplomatic relations were the most important features of the treaty. It was after the ratification of the Basic Treaty that both the FRG and GDR were admitted to the United Nations (UN) in 1973.⁶⁸

It was not easy for Chancellor Brandt or for his successors Helmut Schmidt and Helmut Kohl to find equilibrium between *Westpolitik* and *Ostpolitik* but Brandt knew that he had to integrate more in the West in order to achieve success in the East. The phrase “double consensus”⁶⁹ as Scott Erb uses, states the balance that West Germany pursued since the beginning of the *Ostpolitik* until the end of the Cold War, which can be explained in his words as “...West German leaders could cooperate with the West to make a positive contribution to an alliance dedicated to peace while working to develop better relations with the East in order to make that peace more likely.”⁷⁰ As a result, *Ostpolitik* served as a tool such that the “solid fronts of the cold war era suddenly came to be questioned.”⁷¹

⁶⁷ Scott Erb, *German Foreign Policy: Navigating a New Era*, (Colorado; London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2003), p.43

⁶⁸ David G. Williamson, pp.307-308

⁶⁹ For a more detailed explanation of the term, please see: Scott Erb, *German Foreign Policy*, p.43

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, p.73

⁷¹ Peter H. Merkl, “The German Janus: From Westpolitik to Ostpolitik”, *Political Science Quarterly*, 89/4, Winter 1974-1975, p.803

2.5.3 Conference for Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE)

The issue of forming a European security platform where the states of the Eastern and Western bloc could come together to discuss problems regarding European security and measures to improve them had been on the European agenda since the 1950s. It was not until the early 1970s, with the *détente* period of the Cold War and the *Ostpolitik* Brandt implied that this idea was realized. After a series of conferences between 1972 and 1975, finally the Helsinki Final Act was signed in August 1975 by 35 participating states, including the US, Canada and also the GDR, thus forming the Conference for Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE). A dialogue mainly on security issues but also on humanitarian, economic, and science and technological cooperation between the blocs were the main aims of the conference. As a result the established basic principles, also known as “the Decalogue”, were on topics like territorial integrity, sovereign equality, peaceful settlements of disputes, and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms.⁷² This initiative was important for West Germany, as CSCE served as an international stage to keep relations going with the GDR, even if it was on a very loosely manner, and also through this initiative the FRG had obtained a way to influence the GDR – hopefully dissociating her away from the Eastern Bloc and as a result, the German reunification.

In the words of Georges-Henri Soutou, “the Helsinki process was a turning-point in the Cold War and an important moment in establishing a new European order, or more exactly, in the enactment of the order envisioned in 1945.”⁷³ The ‘inviolability of frontiers’ and the ‘territorial integrity of states’ principles were important acquisitions for the USSR and the GDR, as for the first time since the establishment of the FRG and the GDR, the West formally accepted the order set

⁷² Franz Kernic, “European Security in Transition: The European Security Architecture since the End of the Second World War – An Overview”, pp.12-13, in *European Security in Transition*, edited by Gunther Hauser and Franz Kernic, (Hampshire; Burlington: Ashgate, 2006); Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, *OSCE Handbook: 20 Years of the Helsinki Final Act, 1975-1995*, (Vienna: Secretariat of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, 1995), pp.7-8

⁷³ Georges-Henri Soutou, “Was there a European Order in the Twentieth Century? From the Concert of Europe to the End of the Cold War”, *Contemporary European History*, 9/3, 2000, p.347

up after WWII. This was also a sign of the will to sustain détente. Even though the détente between the two camps came to an end with the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in late 1979 and an era called the Second Cold War began, the follow-up meetings of the Helsinki Conference went on into the 1980s.

2.5.4 European Political Cooperation (EPC)

Along with the formation of the CSCE, there evolved another cooperation-oriented approach within the EC. It was also in the early 1970s that the idea of a political cooperation on European foreign policy within the EC was presented to the member states. This idea started off as a set of informal meetings among the member states' presidents, where discussions and consultations were held on each member states' foreign policy. Following the footsteps of the EC as to find solutions for European problems among the member states, this formation, named the European Political Cooperation (EPC), served as a platform for the member states to share their foreign policy and security issues that had a common European basis, with the purpose of trying to find a common ground in solving the problems. This initiative proved to be successful inasmuch as it firstly, for the first time, found itself a place in the EC *acquis communautaire* with the Single European Act (SEA), which was the first treaty that amended the Rome Treaty of 1957, and secondly, later turned into being the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) with the Maastricht Treaty of 1992. The formalizing of EPC in the Single Act was especially important regarding West Germany, as she – together with France and Great Britain, was one of the three member states that initiated the treaty. The closer cooperation of West Germany and France in the 1980's on security matters to try to form a European alternative to the NATO-led security policies of the Second Cold War were particularly effective in these actions. This showed the will of the Western major powers within the EC to cooperate closer on political, foreign policy and security issues.⁷⁴ Even though the EPC did not have a great effect when first established, the inclination of a need for political unity within the supranational institution by the major member states of the Community can be perceived as their will to form a mere European entity.

⁷⁴ Franz Kernic, "European Security in Transition", pp.11-12

2.6 Conclusion

The German perception of European security and her foreign and security policies in the historical context has been varied. Starting with the unification of the German city states in 1871, in which chancellor Bismarck was the person to unite them, it was aimed at maintaining peace and stability in Europe. The way to achieve this was to hold a balance amongst the major European powers through a system of alliances, delicately formed by Bismarck. His foreign policy, called *Realpolitik*, rested on the national interests of the German Reich. After Bismarck's resignation from the chancellorship in 1890, it was the emperor Wilhelm II that took the lead in forming foreign policy. He abandoned the alliance system and replaced it with a power seeking policy. The *Weltpolitik*, as known in history, showed a clear change in the German Reich's foreign policy, which was a shift from a peaceful alliance system to a more assertive policy of wanting to become a world power. Thus, possessing colonial land and giving great importance to naval armament were the practices of the new policy, which actually led to WWI. The war aims of Germany were no different to those of the Wilhelminian Reich but these ambitious goals led to a debacle for Germany, leaving the newly constituted Weimar Republic with the heavy burden of the Treaty of Versailles. The main aim of the Republic was to revise Versailles and once freed from the restrictions, to establish hegemony in Europe but this aim was not implemented through war. A peacefully negotiated diplomatic manner was taken as the tool, recalling Bismarck's alliance system and also showing a change from the previous policies of Wilhelm II. The Third Reich, which derived from the Weimar Republic, had the aim of becoming a world power, a continuity of *Weltpolitik* from the Second Reich. Hitler was not hesitant to go to war for this end which marked the difference between him and his predecessor's foreign policy, the Weimar Republic's peaceful and negotiated revision. It was Hitler's will for more living space (*Lebensraum*) in order to achieve the status of a world power that set off WW II. The war ended in the same way it had for Germany 27 years ago but this time with the unconditional surrender of the state causing for an occupation. The Allied-Occupied Germany between 1945 and 1949 had no foreign policy objective whatsoever as a central government was not allowed to be formed under the

occupation status. It was not until 1949 that two separate Germanys were established, the FRG to the west and the GDR to the east. Thus, thereafter could the two Germanies start pursuing foreign policies. At this point, only the foreign policy analysis of the FRG has been taken into consideration because of common acceptance of the present German state being the continuity of the FRG. Even though holding the status of a separate state since 1949, the FRG gained her sovereignty by signing an agreement with the Western Allies in 1955. West Germany knew that the only way for her to survive and gain back her reputation was through her integration into Western institutions and for that reason pursued a policy of *Westpolitik*. She aspired to work towards western integration and European unity, and thus entered NATO, WEU, ECSC, EC, among other political and economic institutions. It was through the NATO and WEU membership that West Germany was allowed to rearm, though with restrictions but with a defensive (and not offensive) and contained manner. While western integration was the FRG's main foreign policy orientation all throughout the Cold War, there came an addition with the implementation of *Ostpolitik* starting in the late 1960s and pursuing it until the reunification of East and West Germany. This should not be seen as a change but rather an added value to the main foreign policy as *Ostpolitik* did not seek to overthrow *Westpolitik*. It was an attempt to establish and maintain good relations with the GDR, the USSR and the Eastern bloc, whilst integrating deeper in the western institutions. For that matter, the participation of the FRG in the CSCE could be perceived from the same perspective. It aimed at bringing all the states concerned with European security from both of the blocs together to discuss their common security issues in a legally non-binding platform. It was also West Germany's aim to influence the GDR for the better in case of the possibility of reunification. Initiated at around the same time with CSCE, the member states of the EC decided to cooperate closer in political and foreign policy issues on a mere European basis and thus formed the EPC. This should not be seen as a disengagement from NATO and the transatlantic security structure of the Cold War but an alternative to these institutions with the aim of creating a European level for European security. Forming its basis from the foreign policy objectives of

its history, the reunified Germany's foreign policy and her stance towards European security will be examined in the following two chapters.

CHAPTER 3

THE GERMAN STANCE TOWARDS THE FORMATION OF THE ESDI/ESDP

3.1 Introduction

In defining the German stance towards European security after the end of the Cold War, the first part of the main question of this dissertation is examined in this chapter. Starting off with an analysis of the reunification of Germany in 1990 and bringing it up until the Kosovo War and NATO's military intervention in 1999, the debates, Germany's initiatives, the agreements signed and the institutions built up for European security for the given period will be explored.

3.2 The Reunification of Germany

The reunification of East and West Germany has had a profound effect on Germany's foreign policy as well as on her perception of European security. Just as effective as the reunification was the change in the international scene. The gradual ruptures from the Soviet Union, including that of the GDR, led to the inescapable dissolution of the Soviet Union in December 1991. Thus, this was the official end of the Cold War that had dominated the world for more than 40 years, and the beginning of a new era in which the US-led Western Bloc was the triumphant side of the war but it was not sure what the new order would emerge into.

Even though such a sudden and great change in the international scene was not envisioned even in the early months of 1989, the politics of especially the FRG but also of the USSR and the US, starting as early as the 1970's, made change and reunification possible. Namely, these were FRG's policy of *Ostpolitik* (Eastern Policy) towards her Eastern Bloc neighbours and the GDR, the Helsinki Final Act

of 1975, in which through the implications on human rights and fundamental freedoms East met West, the economic downturn USSR and the Soviet Bloc faced, and the implementation of the policies of *glasnost* and *perestroika*, which meant “openness” and “restructuring”⁷⁵ respectively, by the last head of state of the Soviet Union, Mikhail Gorbachev. Encouraged by social and political developments in Poland and Hungary, citizens of the GDR demonstrated for state reform and access to freer travel. Thus, after demonstrating every Monday for a month, on 9 November 1989, it was announced in a press conference that all the GDR citizens could cross the border dividing East and West Germany right away, which in fact was not the real condition of the regulation as it stated that all GDR citizens holding a passport had the right to obtain an exit visa to cross the border and this was to take effect on the next day.⁷⁶ When citizens from both sides of the Wall heard this, they rushed to the Wall and celebrated this long-awaited freedom by bringing it down. This incident carried a symbolic significance as the building of the Berlin Wall in 1961 had approved the status quo of the Cold War on both blocs, the fall of it was symbolizing the end of it.

Shortly after the fall of the Wall, FRG Chancellor Helmut Kohl put forth a 10-point program. It was a cautious program aiming at a confederation with the GDR with the ambition of reaching unification. Kohl changed his policy when he observed the will of the German people from both states to reunite and especially the US’ consent on the issue. On the GDR side, after the fall of the Wall, ‘round table’ talks took place between the government and the opposition groups which ended in the decision to hold democratic elections in March 1990, but it was even before the new government was elected that the GDR and the FRG started negotiations for unity. The GDR was aiming at a “united neutral German

⁷⁵ Cyril E. Black et al., *Rebirth*, pp.232-233

⁷⁶ Helga Haftendorn, “The Unification of Germany, 1985-1991”, in *The Cambridge History of the Cold War, Vol.3 Endings*, edited by Melvyn P. Leffler and Odd Arne Westad, (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010), p.339

federation”⁷⁷ whereas the FRG rejected the idea of a neutral Germany as Chancellor Kohl knew that the FRG needed the support of her Atlantic Allies for reunification.

Additionally, an agreement with the USSR, US, UK and France was needed as they were the victorious Allied states of the Second World War that had occupied Germany. The USSR, US and UK had agreed in the Potsdam Agreement of 1945 upon “...the preparation of a peace settlement for Germany to be accepted by the Government of Germany when a government adequate for the purpose is established.”⁷⁸ France came into the picture by signing a peace treaty with Germany through the *Deutschlandvertrag* (General Treaty) of 1945, which was between the US, UK and France on the one hand and the FRG on the other. Article 2 of the Treaty stated that “The Three Powers retain, in view of the international situation, the rights, heretofore exercised or held by them, relating to... (b) Berlin, and (c) Germany as a whole, including the unification of Germany and a peace settlement.”⁷⁹ Thus the negotiations between the USSR, US, UK, France, FRG and GDR were held under the name of Two-Plus-Four talks, which resulted in the Two-Plus-Four Treaty (officially, Treaty on the Final Settlement with Respect to Germany) signed on 12 September 1990. This treaty, as stated by David Williamson, was “...in effect a peace treaty legally ending the Second World War.”⁸⁰ The treaty terminated the remaining rights of the four occupying powers, thus declaring United Germany full sovereign, confirmed her ability to choose her alliance membership herself, defined the borders and territories of the united state,

⁷⁷ David G. Williamson, *Germany since 1815*, p.370

⁷⁸ “Potsdam Agreement”, 1 August 1945, signed by the USSR, the US and the UK, Art.IA(3)(i), http://www.nato.int/ebookshop/video/declassified/#/en/sources/806_the_potsdam_agreement_-_1945/ (accessed on 23.07.2012)

⁷⁹ United States Department of State, *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1952-1954, Germany and Austria, Vol.VII*, edited by William Z. Slany, <http://digicoll.library.wisc.edu/cgi-bin/FRUS/FRUS-idx?type=turn&entity=FRUS.FRUS195254v07p1.p0148&id=FRUS.FRUS195254v07p1&isize=M> (accessed on 23.07.2012)

⁸⁰ David G. Williamson, *Germany since 1815*, p.371

committed the recognition of the Oder-Neisse border line with Poland, and reduced the *Bundeswehr* (German Armed Forces) to 370,000 troops.⁸¹

The toughest topic in the Two-Plus-Four talks was the membership of a united Germany into NATO. The USSR did not want to see a united Germany within the Atlantic Alliance and pressured for either a neutral Germany or a Germany within both NATO and the Warsaw Pact. Neither the US nor the FRG agreed on such a proposal. They wanted the united Germany to be only within the Atlantic Alliance, though NATO put forth the London Declaration “in which NATO offered dialogue and cooperation to the members of the Warsaw Pact.”⁸² The USSR obstacle was eliminated through West German loans to the USSR, which Gorbachev aimed at using to restructure her economy. The concerns of the UK and France about a unified Germany with a strong economy were also raised, despite the fact that these two states both recognized the will of the German nation to reunite. These concerns derived from the fear that the state that they had so carefully and continuously contained for more than 40 years could try to dominate the continent, once again. These concerns were dispelled by Kohl’s commitment to the continued membership of the united Germany to NATO and the EC, and for that reason incorporating GDR to the EC too.⁸³

Alongside the Two-Plus-Four Talks, unification negotiations between the two Germanies were pursued. As a step towards unification, the FRG and GDR established a monetary and economic union on 1 July 1990, wherein the *Deutsche Mark* (German Mark) of the FRG was introduced in the GDR. The negotiations concluded in the signing of the Unification Treaty in 31 August 1990, in which it was agreed that the GDR would join FRG. Thus as a result of all these

⁸¹ Helga Haftendorn, “The Unification of Germany”, pp.353-354

⁸² *Ibid.*, p.349

⁸³ Cyril E. Black et al., *Rebirth*, p.151

developments and treaties signed, the unification of the two German states took place on 3 October 1990.

3.3 Architectural Debate for European Security: Four Proposals on the European Level

The reunification of Germany, the disengagement of the Soviet republics from their higher agency, and the dissolution of the USSR on 25 December 1991, thus formally bringing the “iron” curtain down on the Cold War, created a new state of affairs for the world. The bipolarity of the previous era had changed into a uni-polar characteristic due to the collapse of the Eastern Bloc, whereas the Western Bloc was still standing. In a short span of time it was to be seen that uni-polarity would evolve into a multi-polar international system, in which it was unclear from where the threat would come. The security concerns and perceptions affecting the world had changed and the existence of the established security structures had started being questioned. It was discussed whether the system met the needs of the newly forming world structure and the changing definition of security. Therefore, the architectural debate on the formation of a security structure in the post-Cold War world and thus in Europe was given importance.

As Stuart Croft has outlined, there were four main proposals for maintaining European security in the early 1990s: the Russian proposal, the French-Belgian proposal, the American-British proposal, and the German-Czech proposal.⁸⁴ The first proposal, which came from Moscow, was rather a revised version of the concept of the ‘Concert of Europe’⁸⁵ from the nineteenth century.

⁸⁴ Stuart Croft, “The EU, NATO and Europeanisation”, p.1

⁸⁵ The Concert of Europe was the system of collective security set up in 1815 after Napoleon’s defeat in the Napoleonic Wars and in the Congress of Vienna. It brought the great powers of Europe together – Austria, Prussia, the Russian Empire, United Kingdom, and France – at the level of intergovernmental conferences. It aimed at preserving the status quo built up with the 1815 Congress of Vienna, which was maintaining the balance of power. Great powers could call for a conference whenever the need was felt. For further information see Georges-Henri Soutou, “Was there a European Order”, pp.329-353; Matthew Rendall, “A Qualified Success for Collective Security: The Concert of Europe and the Belgian Crisis, 1831”, *Diplomacy and Statecraft*, 18/2, 2007, pp.271-295

Intergovernmental conferences, held among the main European actors, to deal with the major problems of European security were proposed. Russia wanted an institutionalized establishment, a kind of a ‘security council’, in which the subordination of NATO and the decoupling of the US would be secured.⁸⁶ Just like her aims and policies during the Cold War, Russia did not want American interference in the continent’s security structures.

The French-Belgian proposal was reluctant to embed the US within the European security notion⁸⁷ and put forward a proposal that rested upon the premise of European security structures being built upon a west-European basis and expanded to the whole continent together with the EU enlargement. The proposers aimed at keeping security as an essential public good, so that a link between the EU and the Western European Union (WEU) would be established. Through this linkage especially France wanted to make the EU command WEU operations in order to create a separate and separable European security than that of the NATO. Even though the French proposal did not aim at leaving the US and NATO entirely out of the picture, it aimed at Western European countries taking the lead in European security structures. To conduct operations without the intervention of the US and thus to shrink NATO’s power upon Europe were the driving factors for this proposal.⁸⁸

As opposed to the Russian and French proposals, the US-UK proposal argued that NATO should be kept in Europe as the sole security actor, offering no fundamental changes to the system set up during the Cold War regarding the NATO predominance in the continent. This proposal could be summed up in Frank Costigliola’s words as “sustaining US predominance in NATO and in Western Europe.”⁸⁹ Thus the Anglo-American proposal stressed the preservation of the

⁸⁶ Stuart Croft, “The EU, NATO and Europeanisation”, pp. 6-7

⁸⁷ Franz Kernic, “European Security in Transition”, p.15

⁸⁸ Stuart Croft, “The EU, NATO and Europeanisation”, p.6

⁸⁹ Frank Costigliola, “An ‘Arm Around the Shoulder’”, p.87

main actor of European security, the long-established NATO, by making few amendments in its role and function, which aimed at further strengthening NATO within Europe.⁹⁰ This proposal did not aim to give a chance to other alternatives for European security. The underlying reason was that throughout the Cold War, the US position in Europe was defined over West Germany. It was the FRG and her deep tie to the NATO - thus the US - that allowed US to shape issues regarding European security. That is why US did not want any formation other than NATO to be strong in Europe.⁹¹ She wanted NATO to be the sole actor of European security, and the unified Germany within NATO - so that she could have an ally that would look after her interests in Europe.

The German-Czech proposal, as the last proposal, was based on a pan-European security concept building upon CSCE/OSCE, which would be central to the continent.⁹² It envisaged an institutionalized system based on collective security that comprised of the NATO countries, Russia, Ukraine, former Eastern Bloc members and the Central Asian Republics. It was aimed at NATO having a less important role in order to allow smaller states to have a better place and a stronger say in the system.⁹³ Germany's main aim in supporting such a formation lied in her interest in and her desire to influence the CEE states. A security formation around CSCE would have allowed Germany to build a sphere of influence, where she could administer the change these CEE states would undergo, and thus achieve a stable, democratic and prosperous neighbourhood. This objective can be traced back in Wilhelm II's will to create *Mittleuropa* (Central Europe) and also in Willy Brandt's *Ostpolitik*.

⁹⁰ Franz Kernic, "European Security in Transition", p.13

⁹¹ Frank Costigliola, "An 'Arm Around the Shoulder'", pp.88-89

⁹² Adrian Hyde-Price, *European Security beyond the Cold War: Four Scenarios for the Year 2010*, (London; California, New Delhi: SAGE , 1991), p.214

⁹³ Stuart Croft, "The EU, NATO and Europeanisation", p.5

These four proposals have all been advocated by their proposer states but only somewhat of a combination of the two proposals has been triumphant: the Anglo-American and the French-Belgian, which have competed and coexisted at the same time. When the reason for failure of the Russian proposal is looked into, it can be seen that nowhere other than Moscow found the proposal supporters. The former Eastern Bloc member states refused this idea, claiming that such a ‘Concert of Europe’ practice would eventually lead to Moscow’s impact on them, which was greatly feared.⁹⁴ Germany and Czechoslovakia advocated their proposal to institutionalize the CSCE until late 1992. By this time the thought that was behind this proposal had lost backing due to a few reasons. Firstly, because of the fear of Germany taking the lead once again in Europe, the Atlantic Alliance did not want a formation of a European security structure around German leadership. They put pressure on Germany stating that the CSCE proposal was not “Atlanticist” and “Europeanist” enough.⁹⁵ Thus this initiative to scale up the CSCE was responded to by US efforts to undermine it. US did not support enhancing the CSCE/OSCE's capabilities, which would have been a German-led initiative and would have contained Russia within the European security institution.⁹⁶ Secondly, the Central Eastern European countries including the Czechs chose to yield to the NATO rather than the CSCE proposal. This was due to the reason that the CEE countries did not feel secure in case of a potential Russian threat as a member of the CSCE but felt secure when inside a stronger NATO. Thirdly, another reason for failure was the unanimity principle of the CSCE, which seemed to be able to lock up the decision making process very easily and thus make CSCE inoperable.⁹⁷

The flow of events in the world backed up the triumph of the Anglo-American proposal. Even though initially they wished for and supported a pan-European security construction through CSCE, the CEE states’ tilt towards NATO, once the

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, p.7

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp.5-6

⁹⁶ Frank Costigliola, “An ‘Arm Around the Shoulder’”, p.100

⁹⁷ Stuart Croft, “The EU, NATO and Europeanisation”, pp.5-6

German-Czech initiated CSCE option failed to become the main security bearer and the CSCE was perceived as a weak security platform, this opened the way for NATO to take the lead in European security formation after the Cold War. The French-Belgian proposal came into to the scene as one of the two triumphant proposals in as much as insisting to incorporate the further-to-be European Union members into the NATO and the formation of the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and the European Security and Defense Identity/European Security and Defense Policy (ESDI/ESDP). In particular, creating and implementing the ESDI/ESDP has realized France's will to form a European military institution and force that was first proposed to be done by WEU.⁹⁸

The picture for European security envisioned by the French started to be formed with the establishment of the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) as the second pillar of the European Union with the signing of the Maastricht Treaty (Treaty on European Union – TEU) in 1992.⁹⁹ Article J of the TEU provided the provisions on CFSP and stated that “The Union and its Member States shall define and implement a common foreign and security policy, governed by the provisions of this Title and covering all areas of foreign and security policy.” (Art. J.1(1) TEU)¹⁰⁰ Even though the objectives of the CFSP have been stated in the Treaty, the tasks have not been defined clearly. It can be deduced that, without setting a timetable, the end goal was to form a common defence structure first by establishing a common defence policy. TEU gave the responsibility of the Union's defence dimension to the WEU. The treaty refers to the WEU as an “integral part of the development of the Union” and “requests the WEU...to elaborate and implement decisions and actions of the Union which have defence implications” (Art. J.4(2) TEU) though this should not be understood as an initiative to rival

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, p.9

⁹⁹ Franz Kernic, “European Security in Transition”, p.15

¹⁰⁰ Maastricht Treaty, “Treaty on European Union”, *Official Journal*, C 191, 29 July 1992, <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/en/treaties/dat/11992M/htm/11992M.html>, (accessed on 29.07.2012)

NATO but rather as a “European voice within transatlantic security” that was to serve “as a ‘bridge’ between the EC/EU and NATO”.¹⁰¹

Shortly after the signing of the Maastricht Treaty in June 1992 the foreign and defence ministers of the WEU formulated the concept of the Petersberg Tasks in order to framework the organization’s future actions. These tasks included humanitarian and rescue tasks; peace-keeping tasks; and tasks of combat forces in crisis management, including peacemaking.¹⁰² Looking at the definition of the tasks it can be claimed that the Petersberg Tasks are far from traditional defence understanding but show “EU’s willingness to engage militarily when necessary”.¹⁰³ It is necessary to observe that EU’s military engagement started with humanitarian, peace-keeping and peacemaking aspects.

Considering all of these events in the early years of the post-Cold War period, by 1994 it became perceivable that Germany had taken a position between the Anglo-American and the French-Belgian proposals. Germany’s policy that “NATO enlargement should be pursued in parallel with the expansion of the EU”¹⁰⁴ showed that Germany wanted to preserve its friendly stance towards the US and France and supported both proposals.

After the unsuccessful German attempt to turn CSCE into Europe’s major security institution, CSCE adapted itself to the changing conditions of the security challenges by enlarging itself, adding new roles and functions to its portfolio and improving relations with NATO and the EU, thus “turning into a “soft power”

¹⁰¹ Alister Miskimmon, *Germany and the Common Foreign and Security Policy of the European Union: Between Europeanisation and National Adaptation*, (Hampshire; New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2007), p.40

¹⁰² Western European Union Council of Ministers Bonn, 19 June 1992, “Petersberg Declaration”, <http://www.weu.int/documents/920619peten.pdf> (accessed on 11.08.2012)

¹⁰³ Fraser Cameron, *An Introduction to European Foreign Policy*, (Oxon; New York: Routledge, 2007), p.74

¹⁰⁴ Stuart Croft, “The EU, NATO and Europeanisation”, p.11

aiming at conflict prevention and crisis management.”¹⁰⁵ The most visual change was accomplished in 1994 when the Conference was transferred into an international organization with permanent institutions, becoming the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE).¹⁰⁶

3.4 Germany’s Perception of European Security at National Level: *Weißbuch* 1994 and the Legitimacy Problem of the Deployment of *Bundeswehr* in Out-of-Area Operations

The *Weißbuch* (White Paper), which describes the security situation of Germany and puts forth a guideline for Germany’s policies regarding security issues and the future of the *Bundeswehr* (German Armed Forces), has been published by the German Ministry of Defense in 1969, 1970, 1971/72, 1973/74, 1975/76, 1979, 1983, 1985, 1994 and 2006. In order to analyze Germany’s stance and policies towards European security after the end of the Cold War the *Weißbuch* of 1994 has been examined. This official document, in defining the security environment that the world faced, states that the position of the security policies were being characterized by the dynamic developments which resulted from the extensive changes and complex risks of the area of conflict. The document puts forward that Germany is surrounded by democratic states, friends and partners¹⁰⁷, and that the territorial integrity of Germany and the Allies is not threatened militarily for the foreseeable future¹⁰⁸ but Germany – due to her political and economic strength – needs to play a “Schlüsselrolle”¹⁰⁹ (key role) in further developing the European structures, and is called to contribute to the solution of the future global tasks. Therefore, it is delivered that Germany plays an important role in deepening and

¹⁰⁵ Franz Kernic, “European Security in Transition”, p.17

¹⁰⁶ For more information on OSCE’s history, see Organization Security and Cooperation in Europe, <http://www.osce.org/who> (accessed on 31.07.2012)

¹⁰⁷ Bundesministerium der Verteidigung, *Weißbuch 1994. Weißbuch zur Sicherheit der Bundesrepublik Deutschland und zur Lage und Zukunft der Bundeswehr*, (Bonn: Druckerei Bachem GmbH & Co KG, 1994), p.24, para.207

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, p.23, para.202

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, p.24, para.208

widening European integration, tightening the Atlantic Alliance and the Euro-Atlantic institutions, and strengthening the United Nations (UN).¹¹⁰ It can be inferred that Germany pledges herself to become one of the determining states of European security policies through further enhancing the established European structures.

Although reunification loaded a heavy financial burden on the old FRG¹¹¹ it gave the unified German government a powerful position to play a greater role in the European level. The unification was perceived as an opportunity for Germany to enhance her effectiveness in matters concerning European security and was thus a desired aim. This ambition can be traced in the 1994 *Weißbuch*. Germany perceives that her international responsibility has grown especially in the area of security “in und für Europa”¹¹² (in and for Europe) and presents five main interest points forming German foreign and security policy:

- i) the conservation of freedom, security and welfare of the German citizens;
- ii) the integration with the European democracies within the EU, as democracy, rule of law and wealth in Europe means peace and security for Germany;
- iii) furthering a long-term, similar values and interests based transatlantic alliance, in which the United States is defined as the “Weltmacht” (world power);
- iv) bringing her eastern neighbours into line with the western structures, and the designing a new and all-of-the-European-states-included cooperative security system;
- v) emphasizing global attention to international law and human rights.¹¹³

The *Weißbuch* also emphasizes that her eastern neighbours are substantial for Germany. Particularly Russia’s partnership is considered to be important for stability in Europe and the world. It is put forth that Germany gives great

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹¹ Brigitte H. Schulz, “Globalisation, unification, and the German welfare state”, *International Social Science Journal*, 52/163, 2000, p.44

¹¹² Bundesministerium der Verteidigung, *Weißbuch 1994.*, p.44, para.307

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, p.42, para.308

importance to the path her eastern neighbours have taken up to become a democratic and market based economy, and supports their introduction into the western institutions.¹¹⁴ This policy objective was the policy that Germany had advocated during the architectural debates in the early 1990's. Her proposal to build up a European security structure around the CSCE to allow the CEE states to secure their transition to democratic republics and have a louder voice within the security structure shows that Germany has not reproduced her propensity towards CEE.

Paragraph 311 of the document inserts that Germany and German security is not only directly affected by the developments in Central and Eastern Europe but also indirectly affected by the instable situations in the Mediterranean, the Middle East and the Near East.¹¹⁵ Thus, in the following pages it is stated that “the military security provisions of our state can therefore not be limited solely to the national and alliance defence.”¹¹⁶ It can be interpreted in retrospect that these statements regarding developments in the world affecting German security were preliminary preparations to be able to deploy the *Bundeswehr* in out-of-area missions, which was legitimized by the ruling of the Federal Constitutional Court on July 12, 1994,¹¹⁷ about 3 months after the publication of the *Weißbuch*.

The decision of the Federal Constitutional Court concerning Article 87(a) and Article 24 of the *Grundgesetz* (Basic Law),¹¹⁸ which are related with security and

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp.43-44, para.313

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p.43, para.311

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p.47, para.403

¹¹⁷ For the full German text see, Decision of the German Federal Constitutional Court of 12 June 1994 about Out-of-area Operations, “BVerfG Urteil vom 12.07.1994 (2 BvE 3/92)”, http://www.ejura-examensexpress.de/online-kurs/entsch_show_neu.php?Alp=1&dok_id=899 (accessed on 07.08.2012); United Nations Juridical Yearbook 1994, Part Three, Chapter VIII, “Press release issued by the Federal Constitutional Court No. 29/94”, <http://untreaty.un.org/cod/UNJuridicalYearbook/pdfs/english/ByVolume/1994/chpVIII.pdf> (accessed on 07.08.2012); Anja Dalgaard-Nielsen, “The Test of Strategic Culture: Germany, Pacifism and Pre-emptive Strikes”, *Security Dialogue*, 36/3, 2005, p.345

¹¹⁸ German Bundestag, “Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany”

the deployment of the German Armed Forces, is an important milestone in German foreign and security policy. Whereas until that time, Article 87(a), which was added into the Basic Law after rearmament was achieved in the early 1950's,¹¹⁹ was interpreted as the defence of the German and NATO territories, with the decision of the Constitutional Court in 1994 Article 87(a) and Article 24 have been interpreted as German troops also to be deployed in out-of-area operations. The reasoning underlying this decision was that Article 87(a)(2) states that "...the Armed Forces may be employed only to the extent expressly permitted by this Basic Law.", which turned the attention to Article 24 in defining the limits of the employment. Article 24(2) expresses that "...the [German] Federation may enter into a system of mutual collective security..." for the maintenance of peace in order to "...bring about and secure a lasting peace in Europe and among the nations of the world". As a result in the decision the Constitutional Court has decided the following:

In the proceedings on the dispute over the deployment of German forces the Federal Constitutional Court (Second Panel) has ruled that the Federal Republic of Germany is at liberty to assign German armed forces in operations mounted by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and Western European Union (WEU) to implement resolutions of the Security Council of the United Nations (UN). The same applies to the assignment of German contingents to peacekeeping forces of the UN.¹²⁰

¹¹⁹ Clay Clemens, "Opportunity or Obligation? Redefining Germany's Military Role Outside of NATO", *Armed Forces & Society*, 19/2, Winter 1993, p.232

¹²⁰ Karl-Heinz Börner, "The Future of German Operations Outside NATO", *Parameters*, Vol.XXVI, Spring 1996, <http://www.carlisle.army.mil/usawc/parameters/Articles/96spring/borner.htm> (accessed on 07.08.2012); For the original German text see part "Gründe (A)" of the Decision of the German Federal Constitutional Court of 12 June 1994 about Out-of-area Operations, "BVerfG Urteil vom 12.07.1994 (2 BvE 3/92)"; In the same ruling the Constitutional Court also reached the decision that the deployment of the Armed Forces should be realized with the consent of the German Parliament, which was to be achieved – in principal – prior to any deployment, arousing the debate of the German Armed Forces being a "parliamentary army". For further information see German Bundestag, "The influence of the Defence Committee on international missions of the Bundeswehr outside national and Alliance defence", http://www.bundestag.de/htdocs_e/bundestag/committees/a12/aufgaben/aufg06.html (accessed on 01.08.2012)

This decision shows a change in Germany's security and military perception. Going from defence of Germany's and the Alliance's territories to the usage of the Armed Forces in foreign territories for purposes other than defence¹²¹ can be construed together with the stance Germany took after the triumph of the Anglo-American and French-Belgian proposals for European security. Given that these two proposals were being actualized, Germany's policy to stand in between them and support both of them was permitted to be implemented in the decision of the Constitutional Court. Not only mentioning NATO and WEU operations but also counting in UN peacekeeping missions can be interpreted as Germany's ambition to pursue a security policy within the given framework in order to take a bigger role in European security. This decision was also important for diffusing pressure Germany experienced when she refused to deploy her Armed Forces in the Gulf War of 1990-1991. This was due mainly to two reasons. Firstly, while having reunification at the top of their agenda Germany was reluctant to engage in a military mission that was in an area outside of the German territory, where an engagement of the German Armed Forces was interpreted to be unconstitutional. The second reason was intertwined with her history. She had been the aggressor to two world wars and had not directly engaged in a war for 45 years.¹²² As a result, even though domestic debates on the issue did occur, Germany did not join the alliance against Saddam Hussein.

Abstention from joining the war caused resentment among the Alliance, particularly for the US, leading it to question German solidarity to NATO. Though Germany had contributed to the war with substantial financial aid, she had not

¹²¹ Maja Zehfuss, "Constructivism and Identity: A Dangerous Liaison", *European Journal of International Relations*, 7/3, September 2001, p.321

¹²² Nina Philippi, "Civilian Power and war: the German debate about out-of-area operations 1990-1999", in *Germany as a Civilian Power? The foreign policy of the Berlin Republic*, edited by Sebastian Harnisch and Hanns W. Maull, (Manchester; New York: Manchester University Press, 2001), pp.50-51

played her role as a dependable ally inside NATO and faced great pressure.¹²³ This acted as a driving force for Germany to revise her policy on security and military interventions, and Germany started expressing her will to take on more responsibility in international matters. Even before the ruling of the Constitutional Court, Germany took part in the UN Operation in Somalia, where she assumed a humanitarian duty and accordingly justified it as abiding by the constitution.¹²⁴ After the legitimization of the deployment of the Armed Forces in out-of-area missions, Germany took part in 1995 in NATO's campaign Operation Deliberate Force in Bosnia and Herzegovina with the German Air Force¹²⁵, and also participated in NATO's peacekeeping force IFOR and SFOR in Bosnia and Herzegovina, which were under a UN mandate.¹²⁶ Germany could start sharing the burden of the military actions, and thereby play the international role both she and the transatlantic alliance wanted.

It can be seen that the security and defence policy of the united Germany has undergone some changes in comparison to the pre-unification FRG foreign and security policy objectives but also has followed in the footsteps of her predecessor. Defining Germany a key role in further integration of Europe, the need to be able to pursue out-of-area missions and the will to incorporate her eastern neighbours into the western structures as free-market based democratic republics can be interpreted as shifts in her policy, whereas stressing NATO's importance in Europe and the world, and expressing her commitment to the NATO, EU, CSCE/OSCE, UN, international law and human rights are seen as her will for the preservation of multilateralism that can be regarded as continuity in her foreign policy.¹²⁷

¹²³ Alister Miskimmon, *Germany and the Common Foreign and Security Policy*, p.36

¹²⁴ Nina Philippi, "Civilian Power and war", p.54

¹²⁵ Adrian Hyde-Price, *Germany and European order: Enlarging NATO and the EU*, (Manchester; New York: Manchester University Press, 2000), p.137

¹²⁶ Nina Philippi, "Civilian Power and war", p.50

¹²⁷ Adrian Hyde-Price, *Germany and European order*", p.148

3.5 Milestones of European Security and Germany's Stance

As stated above, different proposals have been put forth in an attempt to form the post-Cold War security system in Europe that was open to newly defined threats from various regions of the world. In this context, the formation of the European Security and Defence Identity (ESDI) within NATO, the strengthening the CFSP and the establishment of the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) within the EU carry substantial importance for European security. These formations have defined what European security and its scope would be. Hence, it is important to examine the events that led to these formations and Germany's stance towards them.

3.5.1 Berlin Summit (NATO Ministerial Meeting), 3-4 June 1996

The decisions that came out of the 1996 NATO ministerial meeting in Berlin were important for the future development of European security. “[A] European Security and Defence Identity within NATO” was foreseen to be built that would be “separable but not separate” from NATO structures, which were to be conducted under the political guidance of the WEU.¹²⁸ The forming of the ESDI had the aim to firstly, allow European countries a certain space to act militarily where NATO wished not to take part as a whole, and secondly, to allow the US to have an indirect influence on the European security formation.¹²⁹ With this decision, the European countries through the WEU were allowed to use NATO assets if they so wished, thus this opening “the door for the EU to proceed with its own security and defence project without challenging NATO too much.”¹³⁰

The initiative of ESDI and to make use of NATO assets for the WEU was mainly the proposal of the UK and the US, who did not want to see a separate security

¹²⁸ Final Communiqué of the Ministerial Meeting of the North Atlantic Council Berlin, 03 June 1996, “Press Communiqué M-NAC-1(96)63”, <http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/1996/p96-063e.htm> (accessed on 10.08.2012)

¹²⁹ Anthony Forster and William Wallace, “What is NATO for?”, *Survival: Global Politics and Strategy*, 43/4, 2001, p.115

¹³⁰ Franz Kernic, “European Security in Transition”, p.15

formation. Allowance to build a separate European security structure, as the French wanted, was not wished for by the Anglo-American but the incorporation of WEU into the EU was also not desired. Particularly the UK stood apart from the latter initiative, which the French and German supported, and for that reason the result of the NATO Berlin Summit of 1996 was an achievement for the UK.¹³¹ On the other hand, even though the initial aim was to incorporate the WEU into the EU, the creation of the ESDI was a development that Germany did not recalcitrate due to her policy to stand in between Atlanticism and Europeanism. In spite of the fact that it was agreed that operations for European security could be conducted by the WEU by using NATO assets, it was not until the Berlin Plus Agreements in 2002 that this clause was realized.¹³²

3.5.2 Treaty of Amsterdam, 2 October 1997

The Treaty of Amsterdam (ToA), signed in 1997, which had the aim to deal with and fix the shortages of the Maastricht Treaty also had the aim to improve the CFSP, make it more workable, and in-line with this objective form new establishments. Article 26¹³³ created the position of the Secretary-General of the Council/High Representative for CFSP (SG/HR), who was to be responsible for assisting the Council in CFSP-related matters. Also referred to as Mr/Mrs CFSP, the SG/HR was designated to contribute to the formulation, preparation, and implementation of CFSP-related decisions. The Amsterdam Treaty also added a new foreign policy instrument to the existing joint action and common position instruments: common strategies.¹³⁴ The European Council gained the right to define, by consensus, common strategies in areas where the Member States had

¹³¹ Alister Miskimmon, *Germany and the Common Foreign and Security Policy*, pp.89-90

¹³² Jolyon Howorth, "The European Security Strategy and military capacity: The first significant steps", in *The EU and the European Security Strategy: Forging a global Europe*, edited by Sven Biscop and Jan Joel Andersson, (Oxon; New York: Routledge, 2008), p.101

¹³³ Treaty of Amsterdam, "Consolidated Version of the Treaty on European Union", *Official Journal*, C 340/02, 10 November 1997, <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/en/treaties/dat/11997M/htm/11997M.html#0145010077> (accessed on 08.08.2012)

¹³⁴ Franz Kernic, "European Security in Transition", p.16

important interests in common. Though this was an attempt for greater commonality among the Union, it did not change the inter-governmental structure of the CFSP.

Article 17 states that “the WEU is an integral part of the development of the Union providing the Union with access to an operational capability”. These mentioned capabilities were the Petersberg Tasks of the WEU which were incorporated into the TEU with this treaty. The codification of these tasks provided the Union with the legality of conducting humanitarian, peacekeeping and peacemaking military missions, which can be seen as the EU’s intention to expand its limits on security matters. Including the Petersberg Tasks in the *acquis communautaire* can also be seen as a compromise between UK and Germany. Whereas Germany – as indicated in the 1996 NATO Berlin ministerial meeting – wanted to incorporate the WEU within the EU, UK did not wish for such a development and agreed to the incorporation of the Petersberg Tasks to the EU.¹³⁵

With the new challenges of the post-Cold War era facing the international system, Germany wanted CFSP to gain an institutional structure, in which she could provide greater security for herself and also hold a stronger position within European security.¹³⁶ Thus, this is was the policy orientation of Germany at the negotiations for the Amsterdam Treaty but it has been since discussed that the Treaty has not proven to enhance the burden sharing of security issues with the transatlantic alliance.

3.5.3 St.Malo Declaration, 4 December 1998

Another milestone for European security in the 1990’s was the declaration that was announced at the end of the British-French summit in St. Malo in 1998, known as the St. Malo Declaration. This joint declaration of Britain and France

¹³⁵ Alister Miskimmon, *Germany and the Common Foreign and Security Policy*, p.90

¹³⁶ *Ibid.* , p.65

stated that the EU should have “the capacity for autonomous action, backed up by credible military forces, the means to decide to use them, and a readiness to do so, in order to respond to international crises.”¹³⁷ This was to be done where the Alliance as a whole was not engaged and to avoid unnecessary duplication, it was decided that the EU should take into account the assets of the WEU. It was this declaration that was an important milestone for the process of forming a common European Defence and Security Policy (ESDP) and thus, European military capabilities.¹³⁸ This declaration was significant as it brought two different views/camps of European security together to decide on a common statement. France, being the camp that wanted to form European capabilities and the UK, being the camp that was mainly for the preservation of NATO in Europe, had agreed for the creation of a European autonomous military action capacity.

Prior to the St. Malo Declaration, the French came together with the Germans at Potsdam. They re-affirmed their joint position and also declared the incorporation of the WEU into the EU as a further goal for Europe.¹³⁹ Thus, when the St. Malo Declaration was announced Germany was supportive of the formation of the joint military capabilities.

3.6 Conclusion

Like her policies during the Cold War, Germany stayed committed to the transatlantic alliance and the European integration process, and also expressed her motivation to orient herself towards multilateralism. Germany regarded the US as

¹³⁷ “British-French summit St.Malo, 3-4 December 1998”, in *From St.Malo to Nice. European defence: core documents*, compiled by Maartje Rutten, (Paris: Institute for Security Studies of Western European Union, Chaillot Paper 47, 2001), <http://www.iss.europa.eu/uploads/media/cp047e.pdf> (accessed on 08.08.2012)

¹³⁸ Mike Bowker, “European Security” in *Contemporary Europe*, 2nd ed., edited by Richard Sakwa and Anne Stevens, (Hampshire; New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2006), p.249

¹³⁹ Richard G. Whitman, “Amsterdam’s unfinished business? The Blair government’s initiative and the future of the Western European Union”, *Occasional Papers of the Institute for Security Studies for the Western European Union*, 7 January 1999, p.8, <http://www.deutsche-aussenpolitik.de/resources/seminars/gb/g&bpeu/document/occ7x.pdf> (accessed on 13.08.2012)

a world power and promoted NATO's existence in Europe. At the same time, Germany gave importance to the deepening and widening of the EU and supported the formation of the CFSP and the ESDP. Germany's engagement in out-of-area military operations could be interpreted as change but it should be kept in mind that Germany took part in these actions within the established international organizations.

The difference between her Cold War and post-Cold War security policies occurred in the field of firstly, wanting to form a sphere of influence in the CEE by promoting CSCE to be the main European security institution, and after the failure of this proposal, secondly, by playing a leading role to incorporate these states to be integrated into the western establishments, i.e. NATO, EU. On the other hand, once Germany started promoting this policy with her proposal for the European architectural debate, she went on to promote it in the *Weißbuch* of 1994. Thus, advocating a European security system that incorporated the CEE within the established structures had not changed even though the failure of the German proposal.

Germany's stance towards the international system can be regarded as continuity from the Cold War years. Just as Germany practiced her foreign policy during the Cold War by not confronting the system, she went on to do the same after the reunification. She supported the formation of the CFSP and the ESDP within the EU but not as an institution against NATO. Supporting European security formations but at the same time not challenging the US and NATO was the policy objective of Germany for the consolidation of European security in the 1990s.

CHAPTER 4

A EUROPEAN GERMANY AS A GLOBAL PLAYER: GROWING ASSERTIVENESS OF GERMANY

4.1 Introduction

This chapter focuses on the analysis of the German stance towards European security starting from the Kosovo War and the NATO military intervention in 1999, and finalizes the examination with the assessment of the Treaty of Lisbon of 2007. The events concerning European security, the debates that took place, Germany's initiatives, the agreements signed, the official documents produced and the institutions built up for European security for the given period will be explored.

4.2 The Kosovo War and NATO Military Operation, 1999

An important landmark and a turning point for German history was her participation in the NATO Operation Allied Force, which was conducted to protect the Kosovo Albanians from the Serbian ethnic cleansing within the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. It was for the first time since the end of WWII that Germany was engaged in an active combat mission and it was a mission without a clear UN mandate, which according to the Federal Constitutional Court's decision of July 12, 1994 was the way in which Germany could engage in out-of-area operations. A United Nations Security Council (UNSC) resolution was issued on 23 September 1998 stating that a ceasefire should be maintained in Kosovo and the humanitarian catastrophe should be reduced¹⁴⁰ but this resolution did not contain a mandate for military action against the Serbs in the Federal Republic of

¹⁴⁰ Resolution of the United Nations Security Council of 23 September 1998, "Resolution 1199 (1998) (S/RES/1199 (1998))", <http://www.un.org/peace/kosovo/98sc1199.htm> (accessed on 22.08.2012)

Yugoslavia, which was because of Russia's and China's reservation to interfere in the domestic affairs of a sovereign state. After this resolution, an agreement on an armistice, which also allowed unarmed OSCE observers to supervise the armistice, was reached with the Serb President Milosevic on 12 October 1998 but it was soon violated in January 1999 with the killing of forty-five Albanian civilians in Racak.¹⁴¹ This event changed the minds of the NATO Allies and the use of force was being considered for real. Even though the US directly opted for an air strike, the Europeans and especially the Germans were in favour of solving the crisis diplomatically before using force as a last resort. The result was the diplomatic negotiations in Rambouillet between February and mid-March 1999 which were unsuccessful. After Rambouillet it was agreed by the allies that peaceful manners were used to stop the crisis but they had not succeeded and military force could be used upon the Serbs to stop the intended ethnic cleansing on the Kosovo Albanians.¹⁴²

On 24 March 1999 the NATO air campaign Operation Allied Force was launched. A few days prior to the operation the German Parliament gave resolutions for the participation of the German Air Force jets and Armed Forces support ground troops for this operation but kept the right to evaluate the engagement of the ground troops in peace-keeping missions in a later resolution.¹⁴³ This was a thorny issue for the German government and also for the public because of the Nazi past and thus was left aside to be considered later if such a deployment would be needed. As the war continued, search for a diplomatic solution was also sought in order to end the war in favour of the NATO allies. It was Germany who put forth a peace plan which later was altered and agreed upon at the G-8 Summit in May 1999¹⁴⁴ and also provided the basis of the UNSC Resolution 1244 of 10 June

¹⁴¹ Hanns W. Maull, "Germany's foreign policy, post-Kosovo: still a 'Civilian Power'?", in *Germany as a Civilian Power? The foreign policy of the Berlin Republic*, edited by Sebastian Harnisch and Hanns W. Maull, (Manchester; New York: Manchester University Press, 2001), p.108

¹⁴² Jeffrey S. Lantis, *Strategic Dilemmas and the Evolution of German Foreign Policy since Unification*, (Westport: Praeger Publishers, 2002), p.147

¹⁴³ *Ibid.*, pp.149-150

¹⁴⁴ Hanns W. Maull, "Germany's foreign policy", p.109

1999.¹⁴⁵ Germany's success lied in her effort to bring Russia and the UN into the issue and to reach an agreement that Russia, alongside the NATO allies, would agree upon as she new that without Russia's support a UN resolution and stability in the South Eastern Europe would not be achieved. When the NATO bombing ceased on 10 June 1999 and the NATO-led KFOR peacekeeping force, which was formed under the auspices of the UN with the UNSC Resolution 1244, moved into Kosovo, Germany was given a sector to keep under her control together with the states that made up the KFOR: the US, the UK, France and Italy.¹⁴⁶

Another German initiative that had been presented and started being debated on even before the NATO air bombing was launched was the Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe. Germany presented this proposal to the EU in early 1999 and it was the EU that called for the participation of the respective states, the supporting states, the international organizations and the NGOs to meet. The Pact was signed on 10 June 1999 with the aim to find a medium and long term solution to the conflicts in South Eastern Europe through socio-economic development, democratization and regional cooperation. According to the Pact, membership to the EU would be respective when the concerning states fulfill the necessary criteria.¹⁴⁷ This Pact and its objectives were in line with the objectives of the 1994 *Weißbuch*. As stated in Chapter 3 of this thesis, one of the five main points put forward in the 1994 *Weißbuch* was bringing the eastern neighbours in line with the western structures, and designing a new and all-of-the-European-states-included cooperative security system.¹⁴⁸ These points can be traced in the Pact's aim to help the states achieve economic growth, democratize, maintain peace and stability, and as a result become eligible to enter the western structures, inter alia security structures.

¹⁴⁵ Resolution of the United Nations Security Council of 10 June 1999, "Resolution 1244 (1999) (S/RES/1244 (1999))", <http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N99/172/89/PDF/N9917289.pdf?OpenElement> (accessed on 22.08.2012)

¹⁴⁶ Jeffrey S. Lantis, *Strategic Dilemmas*, p.159

¹⁴⁷ "Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe", Cologne, 10 June 1999, <http://www.stabilitypact.org/constituent/990610-cologne.asp> (accessed on 22.08.2012)

¹⁴⁸ Bundesministerium der Verteidigung, *Weißbuch 1994*, p.42, para.308

Germany's participation in the NATO air campaign to put an end to the Kosovo War was an important step in Germany's path in normalization regarding the use of force after the calamitous memories of WWII but also a sign for her emancipation from Cold War restrictions. Kosovo has been a defining point for Germany to participate in out-of-area military interventions with humanitarian premises.¹⁴⁹ It has also been of substantial importance regarding Germany's role within the transatlantic alliance. She played her awaited role since the end of the Cold War by taking part in the military crisis management and thus put more effort in sharing the burden of security maintenance in Europe. What is more, associating the international institutions NATO, EU, UN, OSCE, G-8 for the resolution of the crisis was a sign for her further commitment to multilateralism. Whereas these points can be seen as continuity to her foreign policy objectives, Germany's ambition to shape the post-Kosovo War order through her diplomatic initiatives and the Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe can be perceived as implementing her own interests in the region by making use of the institutions she is engaged in, namely the EU. Though used under an international security organization and for a humanitarian cause, Germany's use of force for the first time in an out-of-area active combat operation indicates the significance Kosovo resembles in Germany's changing security policy. What should also be beared in mind that Germany could implement her interests in this occasion because these interests were also for the favour of the contracting parties. Germany's influence was besides other factors closely interlinked with her EU, WEU and G-8 presidency in the first half of 1999.¹⁵⁰

4.3 The Milestones of ESDP and Germany's Stance

The US dominance of the NATO Operation in Kosovo and the prevalent search for a European security structure since the end of the Cold War that was bolstered with the St. Malo Declaration in late 1998 resulted in the establishment and deepening of a European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) within CFSP in the

¹⁴⁹ Adrian Hyde-Price, "Germany and the Kosovo War: Still a Civilian Power?", in *New Europe, New Germany, Old Foreign Policy?: German Foreign Policy since Unification*, edited by Douglas Webber, (London; Portland, Oregon: Frank Cass, 2001), p.30

¹⁵⁰ Alister Miskimmon, *Germany and the Common Foreign and Security Policy*, p.127

Cologne and Helsinki European Council meetings making these meetings of vital importance for EU's security structure building process.¹⁵¹ The ESDP process and capabilities have been further developed with the Treaty of Nice, the Berlin Plus Agreement between the NATO and the EU, and the Headline Goal 2010 of 2004, thus making these events milestones for ESDP.

4.3.1 The Cologne European Council, 3-4 June 1999

At a time when the Operation Allied Force was continuing and there were dense diplomatic meetings within the international community, the summit of the European Council took place in Cologne under the EU Presidency of Germany on 3-4 June 1999. The importance of the summit was that it embraced the St. Malo Declaration, accepted EU's need for military capabilities in order to "fully assume its tasks in the field of conflict prevention and crisis management", which are the Petersberg tasks, and oversaw the launching of "a common European policy on security and defence" (later to be named as the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP)) interlinked with the CFSP.¹⁵² ESDP, unlike ESDI, which was formulated under NATO, was an EU establishment and it was an attempt to form an alternative to NATO for autonomous action.¹⁵³ Regarding the relationship between the WEU and the EU, those functions of the WEU that were perceived as necessary to the EU to fulfill her new responsibilities¹⁵⁴ under the Petersberg Tasks would be included into the EU. This was an attempt to make use of the military assets of the WEU and also avoid any unnecessary duplication of military capabilities. In order to create decision making bodies in the common security and defence policy, the Cologne Council Conclusions set forth the establishment of the Political and Security Committee, the European Union Military Staff and the European Union Military Committee. This can be perceived as a desire to deeply

¹⁵¹ Adrian Hyde-Price, "Germany and the Kosovo War", p.28

¹⁵² "Cologne European Council, 3-4 June 1999, Conclusions of the Presidency", http://www.europarl.europa.eu/summits/koll_en.htm (accessed on 25.08.2012)

¹⁵³ Guglielmo Carchedi, "The Military Arm of the European Union", *Rethinking Marxism*, 18/2, April 2006, p.328

¹⁵⁴ The Petersberg Tasks were incorporated into the EU Law with the Treaty of Amsterdam which entered into force on 1 May 1999. This was the reason for EU's responsibilities under the Petersberg Tasks being considered as 'new' in the Cologne European Council.

root ESDP within the Union by establishing permanent bodies for decision making purposes. These bodies were set up as interim institutions in May 2000 and received their official status at the Nice European Council in late 2000.¹⁵⁵

The launch of the ESDP showed EU's growing will to gain autonomous capacity for military missions and take on more responsibility but it should not be perceived as a departure from NATO. The transatlantic alliance remained the main security provider for Europe whereas ESDP can be evaluated as EU's contribution to strengthen European security. Germany's investment and support in ESDP rested upon ESDP's provisions being in line with Germany's policy objectives. Being an Atlanticist and a Europeanist, Germany supported the formation of a European security structure that did not directly include the US, in which the CEE states could join and the institution could provide Germany with the necessary environment to implement her aims set in the *Weißbuch* 1994: bringing her eastern neighbours into line with the western structures. The ESDP would also provide Germany with the necessary circumstances to work together with the UK and France on European security and defence that would deepen the CFSP. As a result, Germany would gain the opportunity to insert her policy objectives within the EU and thus undertake a bigger role for European security.¹⁵⁶

4.3.2 The Helsinki European Council, 10-11 December 1999

Following the Cologne European Council, the Helsinki European Council in late 1999 had the aim with regards to the CFSP to develop EU's capabilities in military and non-military crisis management. The Presidency Conclusions stated that the Union was determined to "develop an autonomous capacity to take decisions and, where NATO as a whole is not engaged, to launch and conduct EU-led military

¹⁵⁵ Wolfgang Wagner, "Missing in Action? Germany's Bumpy Road from Institution-Building to Substance in European Security and Defence Policy", in *Germany's EU Policy on Asylum and Defence: De-Europeanization by Default?*, edited by Gunther Hellmann, (Hampshire; New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2006), p.126

¹⁵⁶ Alister Miskimmon, *Germany and the Common Foreign and Security Policy*, p.111

operations in response to international crises.”¹⁵⁷ It was also put forth that this process was to avoid unnecessary duplication.

It was at this council meeting that the Helsinki Headline Goal (HHG) was set. According to this goal, by 2003 the EU member states were to be able to deploy up to 60.000 soldiers within sixty days and sustain for at least one year. The force was given the name European Rapid Reaction Force (ERRF) and it was to carry out the full range of the Petersberg Tasks. The ERRF was actually the first real military capability that the EU established on its own will and from its’ member states’ troops that have the full command of a military troop. Forming the ERRF was the implementation of the ESDP’s “capacity for autonomous action” provision.¹⁵⁸ Linked with this, it is an important step in the development of the ESDP since the St. Malo Declaration of 1998. One of the driving factors for the ERRF within the EU lied, amongst other reasons, in the experience of the Kosovo War. The NATO-led military operation showed that the US was still predominant in military missions within Europe and especially France and Germany wanted an autonomous military capacity. Though the UK, until the St. Malo Declaration was not supportive of such an EU force and promoted NATO as the only security structure in Europe, she came to terms with this proposal as she observed that Germany and France¹⁵⁹ wanted to obtain the necessary capability to conduct

¹⁵⁷ “Helsinki European Council, 10 and 11 December 1999, Presidency Conclusions”, http://www.europarl.europa.eu/summits/hell_en.htm (accessed on 25.08.2012)

¹⁵⁸ Andreas Wenger and Doron Zimmerman, *International Relations: From the Cold War to the Globalized World*, (Colorado; London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2003), p.279

¹⁵⁹ Germany and France had come together at the Potsdam Summit just a few days before St. Malo and had re-affirmed their joint position and also agreed upon the inclusion of the WEU into the EU as a future goal for the EU. In May 1999 the two states’ representatives once again came together at the Franco-German Defence and Security Council meeting in Toulouse and agreed upon the main premises of ESDP, which were in the same manner as the St. Malo Declaration, and also agreed to the transformation of the Eurocorps into a form of rapid response force. These two summits were important for Germany and France as well as the UK. It was important for Germany because with these summits Germany knew she was not alone in wanting to reform the European security structure, and it was important for France because she had found a sound supporter for her desire to establish a EU security institution. The summits were significant for the UK because they showed Germany’s and France’s aim for the future of the Union’s security. For further information see Helga Haftendorn, *Coming of Age: German foreign policy since 1945*, (Lanham, Md.: Rowman&Littlefield, 2006), pp.330-331; Alister Miskimmon, *Germany and the Common Foreign and Security Policy*, pp.117-119

operations “independently of NATO and thus of the United States.”¹⁶⁰ As for the US, as long as the EU saw NATO as her main security institution for Europe and stayed subordinated under NATO, such a military force was perceived as a contribution of the EU to the maintenance of European security.

4.3.3 The Treaty of Nice, 26 February 2001

With the aim to prepare the Union to the planned entrance of the 10 new member states in 2004, the Treaty of Nice (ToN), which was signed in 2001, targeted at making changes for the EU to function properly with 25 (and later to be 27) member states. The amendments made by the ToN regarding CFSP were pursued to make it more coherent and effective. Giving the Council the right to appoint special representatives for a specific policy area (Art.18(5))¹⁶¹ and the right to authorize the Presidency to open negotiations with a third party, may it be one or more states or international organizations, were conducted in this regard.(Art.24(1)) Another contribution of the ToN was enlarging the notion of enhanced cooperation to the field of CFSP,¹⁶² which was stated that it can take the form of a joint action or a common position. Any policy area under the CFSP except areas that are related to issues that may have a military and defence inference were the implementation areas of the enhanced cooperation. (Art. 27a(1) and 27b ToN on TEU) The Treaty of Nice, though introducing new practices to the CFSP, was not a big step regarding the development of the system but it was an important event to perceive that the intergovernmental level of the ESDP and CFSP would not be given in to the supranational authority so easily. Thus the following treaty attempt, the Treaty Establishing a Constitution for the EU that could not be ratified, and the next treaty, the Treaty of Lisbon that has been ratified, have produced similar results though with exceptions.

¹⁶⁰ Guglielmo Carchedi, “The Military Arm”, pp.328-329

¹⁶¹ Treaty of Nice, “Consolidated Version of the Treaty on European Union”, *Official Journal*, C 325/5, 24 December 2002, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/en/treaties/dat/12002M/pdf/12002M_EN.pdf (accessed on 08.08.2012)

¹⁶² Enhanced cooperation was first established with the Treaty of Amsterdam but CFSP was left out of the application area.

4.3.4 The Berlin Plus Agreement, 16 December 2002

Even before the establishment of the ESDP, the US did not support the idea of a separate European defence structure and promoted the inclusion of the European Security and Defence Identity within NATO at the 1996 Berlin NATO Ministerial meeting. This would have allowed for NATO to have an indirect influence on the European security formation. Thus at this meeting it was agreed that EU could make use of NATO assets through WEU but this decision could not be implemented due to a disagreement aroused by the NATO member states who were not members of the EU.¹⁶³ The disagreement was solved through negotiations only in 2002 and the Berlin Plus agreement, a package of arrangements, was signed on 16 December 2002. According to this agreement, EU could make use of NATO planning assets and equipment.¹⁶⁴ It set up an inter-institutional cooperation for EU-led crisis management operations, in which either the EU could take action autonomously using the headquarters of one of the member states or use NATO's own assets.¹⁶⁵ This was significant in two ways. Firstly, it gave the EU states the military capabilities they lacked to fully conduct a military operation; and secondly, it formed the official bond between the EU and the NATO, which was by some states regarded as necessary for ESDP to function properly, as they regarded NATO as their sole security institution.¹⁶⁶ This improvement was also important for Germany because she is a supporter of both of the institutions to maintain European Security and is often criticized by both of the sides that she is either not Atlanticist or Europeanist enough. This cooperation would make her policy choices easier.

¹⁶³ European Security and Defence Assembly-Assembly of the Western European Union, "The EU-NATO Berlin Plus agreements", *Assembly Fact Sheet No:14*, November 2009, [http://www.shape.nato.int/resources/4/documents/14E_Fact_Sheet_Berlin_Plus\[1\].pdf](http://www.shape.nato.int/resources/4/documents/14E_Fact_Sheet_Berlin_Plus[1].pdf) (accessed on 17.08.2012)

¹⁶⁴ Peter van Ham, "EU, NATO, OSCE", p.25

¹⁶⁵ EU-NATO Declaration on ESDP, "Press Release (2002) 142", 16 December 2002, <http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/2002/p02-142e.htm> (accessed on 17.08.2012)

¹⁶⁶ Stephan Keukeleire, "European Security and Defense Policy: From Taboo to a Spearhead of EU Foreign Policy?", in *The Foreign Policy of the European Union: Assessing Europe's Role in the World*, edited by Federiga Bindi, (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2010), p.57

4.3.5 Headline Goal 2010

The Helsinki Headline Goals of 1999 had the aim of reaching to be able to operate by 2003 but even though ERF troops were formed until the targeted time they were not the actual sized envisaged and had shortcomings. Thus in order to identify those shortcomings, ameliorate them, and also expand the goals and the timetable in achieving these goals, the Headline Goal 2010 (HG2010) was formally adopted at the European Council meeting in June 2004. “Building on the Helsinki Headline ... the Member States have decided to commit themselves to be able to by 2010 to respond with rapid and decisive action applying a fully coherent approach to the whole spectrum of crisis management operations covered by the TEU.”¹⁶⁷ These operations include the Petersberg tasks as well as joint disarmament operations, the support for third countries in combating terrorism and security sector reform. (Article A(2) HG2010)

The most important contribution of the HG2010 to the ESDP was the formation of the EU Battlegroups, which had the aim to make the EU military assets more operable. Thus these Battlegroups were designed to cope with the requirements of both the Kosovo-style warfare and also the type needed to fight against international terrorism.¹⁶⁸ The EU Battlegroups are units of highly-trained 1,500 soldiers that are available at fifteen days’ notice and sustainable for at least thirty days, which can be extendable to 120 days by rotation. They can either operate alone in operations or as the initial phase of larger operations.¹⁶⁹ Together with the ERF, the EU Battlegroups form the core of the military capabilities of the EU. Even though the Battlegroups have been formed and been operable since 2005, as of June 2012 they have not been deployed in any crisis mission because of the member states unwillingness to engage in risky missions.¹⁷⁰ This puts the

¹⁶⁷ “Headline Goal 2010”, 17-18 June 2004, <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsUpload/2010%20Headline%20Goal.pdf> (accessed on 29.08.2012)

¹⁶⁸ Jolyon Howorth, “The European Security Strategy”, p.91

¹⁶⁹ Stephan Keukeleire, “European Security and Defense Policy”, p.62

¹⁷⁰ Myrto Hatzigeorgopoulos, “The Role of the EU Battlegroups in European Defence”, *European Security Review*, ESR 56, June 2012, http://www.isis-europe.eu/sites/default/files/publications-downloads/esr56_EUBattlegroups-June2012%20MH_0.pdf (accessed on 29.08.2012)

EU Battlegroups in a controversial situation, as these units were designed to enhance ESDP missions and thus the EU military capabilities but could not provide the EU with these aims.

4.4 Afghanistan: Operation Enduring Freedom and ISAF, 2001

The attacks to the World Trade Center in New York on 11 September 2001 were unexpected and astonishing not only for most of the people around the world but also for the international community. 9/11, as commonly referred to, had implications for almost every actor in the international system, among them the US and NATO being the most affected. The attacks, which all of a sudden changed the security agenda of these two actors, led the US to pursue a “more assertive and unilateralist”¹⁷¹ foreign policy. The international community felt solidarity with the US and thus supported the ‘War on Terror’ that she had declared. As a result, the UNSC reached Resolution 1368 on 12 September 2001 that stated the following:

[S]tresses that those responsible for aiding, supporting or harbouring the perpetrators, organizers and sponsors of these acts will be held accountable... *Expresses* its readiness to take all necessary steps to respond to the terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001, and to combat all forms of terrorism, in accordance with its responsibilities under the Charter of the United Nations¹⁷²

This resolution showed the solidarity that the international community felt with the US and was also used to legitimize the US-led military operation in Afghanistan which started in October 2001. The NATO member states also felt solidarity with

¹⁷¹ Marco Overhaus, “Civilian Power under Stress: Germany, NATO, and the European Security and Defense Policy”, in *Germany’s Uncertain Power: Foreign Policy of the Berlin Republic*, edited by Hanns W. Maull, (Hampshire; New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2006), p.73

¹⁷² Resolution of the United Nations Security Council of 12 September 2001, “Resolution 1368 (2001) (S/RES/1368 (2001))”, <http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N01/533/82/PDF/N0153382.pdf?OpenElement> (accessed on 29.08.2012)

the US and - for the first time in history – activated Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty.¹⁷³

Concerning Germany, the German Parliament declared in a resolution on 19 September 2001 that she was in “uneingeschränkte Solidarität” (unlimited solidarity) with the United States and that she would put in any effort in combating international terrorism, including the use of force.¹⁷⁴ Germany legitimized her action in Afghanistan by putting forth that the 9/11 attacks were not only made against the US but also against the Western World, which Germany was a part of. Additionally, arguing that the threats should be avoided at their sources and not be dealt with when the problems are at the doorstep of Germany, the German government found support for joining the military intervention. The basis of the perception of legitimizing out-of-area missions in a different continent can be traced in the *Weißbuch* 1994 where it was stated that Germany and German security was indirectly affected by the instable situations in the Mediterranean, the Middle East and the Near East.¹⁷⁵ Thus to keep Germany (and Europe) safe, the military security provisions of the German state were enlarged to areas sitting outside of the national and alliance defence.

Only 27 days after the attacks, on 7 October 2001, the US army together with the UK started air strikes against the al-Qaeda organization and the Taliban regime in

¹⁷³ Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty states that when an armed attack on one or more of the member states occur, it will be considered as an attack on all of the member states and the member states will take all necessary actions individually and collectively to secure the security of the transatlantic alliance. “The North Atlantic Treaty”, Washington D.C, 4 April 1949, http://www.nato.int/nato-welcome/pdf/nato_treaty_en_light.pdf (accessed on 27.08.2012); NATO, “Invocation of Article 5 confirmed”, 2 October 2001, <http://www.nato.int/docu/update/2001/1001/e1002a.htm> (accessed on 29.08.2012)

¹⁷⁴ German Bundestag, “Entschließungsantrag der Fraktionen SPD, CDU/CSU, BÜNDNIS 90/DIE GRÜNEN und FDP zu der Regierungserklärung des Bundeskanzlers zu den Terroranschlägen in den USA und zu den Beschlüssen des Sicherheitsrats der Vereinten Nationen sowie der NATO”, 14/6920, 19 September 2001, <http://dipbt.bundestag.de/dip21/btd/14/069/1406920.pdf> (accessed on 29.08.2012); On the same day as the *Bundestag* resolution, Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer met with US Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz in Pentagon, USA and shared the outcome of the resolution with Wolfowitz. Jim Garamone, “Germany Offers America “Unlimited Solidarity””, *American Forces Press Service*, 19 September 2001, <http://www.defense.gov/news/newsarticle.aspx?id=44857> (accessed on 29.08.2012)

¹⁷⁵ Bundesministerium der Verteidigung, *Weißbuch 1994*, p.43, para.311

Afghanistan. The US accused al-Qaeda of carrying out the 9/11 attacks and the Taliban of supporting and supplementing them. US President Bush, while declaring the start of the strikes under the name Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF), stated the aim of the operation as “to disrupt the use of Afghanistan as a terrorist base of operations and to attack the military capability of the Taliban regime.”¹⁷⁶

The terrorist attacks of 9/11 were a challenge to the German foreign and security policy as the way in which Germany would react to the situation would define her relations with the US and her stance in the transatlantic alliance. Chancellor Gerhard Schröder and Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer were in favour of a military engagement and justified their policy by explaining the new role that Germany was prone to take up after she became full sovereign with the unification.¹⁷⁷ This gave her new responsibilities within her multilateral ties, and it was significant for Germany to play her role as a dependable ally and keep her position within the transatlantic partnership. As she had declared unlimited solidarity with the US, Germany gave support to the OEF through taking military action with combat forces. It was the first time since WWII that Germany engaged in an operation with combat ground troops,¹⁷⁸ though the areas in which Germany engaged were of low combat risk areas.

Soon after the military operation started the Taliban regime was ousted from Kabul and from most parts of Afghanistan. While the operation in Afghanistan was taking place, an agreement (known as the Bonn Agreement) was reached in the UN Conference on Afghanistan in Bonn on 5 December 2001, which foresaw the establishment of an Afghan interim authority by the end of December the same

¹⁷⁶ George W. Bush, “Bush Announces Strikes Against Taliban”, *The Washington Post*, 7 October 2001, http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/nation/specials/attacked/transcripts/bushaddress_100801.htm (accessed on 26.08.2012)

¹⁷⁷ Dieter Dettke, *Germany Says “No”: The Iraq War and the Future of the German Foreign and Security Policy*, (Washington, D.C.: Woodrow Wilson Center Press; Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2009), p.117

¹⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, p.136

year.¹⁷⁹ Germany regarded this agreement as a success for herself as she promoted and supplied the necessary foundation for diplomatic and peaceful negotiations in achieving the establishment of an Afghan interim authority and later a permanent government, which she saw as the vital point for success. In accordance with the provisions of the Bonn Agreement, the UNSC Resolution 1386 dated 20 December 2001 authorized the creation of the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) with the aim to “assist the Afghan Interim Authority in the maintenance of security in Kabul and its surrounding areas”.¹⁸⁰

Germany took part in the ISAF from the very beginning through a Parliament approval, which started its missions in January 2002.¹⁸¹ It was during the German and Dutch joint leadership mission in ISAF between February and August 2003 that NATO took command of ISAF. Bringing NATO in charge of the command was a German initiative due to the hardship in finding a different contributing state to take the lead every six months. Not all the states had contributed in the same amount and not all of them had the capacity to rule over as big an international force as ISAF. The proposal was accepted by the NATO Council in April 2003, which took effect on 11 August 2003 and the first commander of the NATO-led ISAF command was a German general.¹⁸²

In Afghanistan, the adaptation of the constitution in January 2004, the presidential elections in October 2004, the parliamentary elections in September 2005 and as a result of these, the opening of the Parliament in December 2005 brought the process of establishing a permanent Afghan government that had started with the

¹⁷⁹ Bonn Agreement, “Agreement on Provisional Arrangements in Afghanistan Pending the Re-Establishment of Permanent Government Institutions”, 5 December 2001, <http://www.un.org/News/dh/latest/afghan/afghan-agree.htm> (accessed on 29.08.2012)

¹⁸⁰ Resolution of the United Nations Security Council, “Resolution 1386 (2001) (S/RES/1386(2001))”, <http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N01/708/55/PDF/N0170855.pdf?OpenElement> (accessed on 27.08.2012)

¹⁸¹ Martin Wagener, “Normalization in Security Policy? Deployments of Bundeswehr Forces Abroad in the Era Schröder, 1998-2004”, in *Germany’s Uncertain Power: Foreign Policy of the Berlin Republic*, edited by Hanns W. Maull, (Hampshire; New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2006), p.82

¹⁸² Marco Overhaus, “Civilian Power under Stress”, p.72

Bonn Agreement of 2001 to a successful end.¹⁸³ This was a political success for the international community and the states that had contributed to the ISAF but it held a more important meaning for Germany. Along with her contribution through combat forces to the military intervention and her contribution to peace-keeping forces in Afghanistan, Germany had greatly contributed to the political negotiations for the establishment of a permanent government. Thus achieving the aimed result on the political level was a significant step.

Though the parliament has been functioning since 2005, the security of the Afghan people could not be maintained thoroughly. In the Afghanistan Compact of 2006, which was due to last for 5 years, among other topics, provisions regarding security were touched upon. ISAF and OEF were described as the main security providers in the country and the training of the Afghan national security forces by the ISAF troops were given importance to.¹⁸⁴ At the November 2010 NATO Summit in Lisbon, it has been decided that starting in early 2011, by the end of 2014 the Afghan security authorities would resume all the responsibility from the NATO-led ISAF troops.¹⁸⁵ The German deployment of *Bundeswehr* (Armed Forces) troops under Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) has ended in July 2011.¹⁸⁶

4.5 Iraq Intervention: Old vs. New Europe, 2003

The terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001 did not only cause a military intervention in Afghanistan but also an intervention in Iraq, which was the claim of the US President Bush. The Bush administration had mentioned Iraq together with Afghanistan right after the 9/11 attacks but Afghanistan was given precedence to Iraq regarding a military intervention in the name of fight against

¹⁸³ Dieter Dettke, *Germany Says "No"*, p.135

¹⁸⁴ "The Afghanistan Compact", London, 31 January-1 February 2006, http://www.nato.int/isaf/docu/epub/pdf/afghanistan_compact.pdf (accessed on 29.08.2012)

¹⁸⁵ "Lisbon Summit Declaration", 20 November 2010, http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_68828.htm (accessed on 29.08.2012)

¹⁸⁶ Auswärtiges Amt, "Operation Enduring Freedom", http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/DE/Aussenpolitik/RegionaleSchwerpunkte/AfghanistanZentralasien/OEF_node.html (accessed on 29.08.2012)

terrorism. Once the Taliban regime in Afghanistan had been ousted, an interim government had been established, and the security of the interim government and the Afghan people had been provided by the ISAF, time had come to point a finger at Iraq. Thus Iraq's supposed hostile attitudes toward the US was expressed by US President Bush at his State of the Union Address on 29 January 2002, stating North Korea, Iran and Iraq as an "axis of evil" which posed a great danger to the world as these states "[b]y seeking weapons of mass destruction...could provide these arms to terrorists".¹⁸⁷ Other than the alleged possession of weapons of mass destruction, the Bush administration put forth concerns about Saddam Hussein, his human rights violation, and undemocratic rule, which were presented as other reasons for intervention.¹⁸⁸ This was the way in which Bush tried to legitimize the 2003 Iraqi intervention.

After Bush's 'axis of evil' speech, Germany stated that the actions going to be taken in Iraq should be in the same multilateral manner as in Afghanistan, meaning that the operation against Iraq should hold a UNSC resolution, in which authorization for a military operation would be given. Putting forth this condition was the initial stance for German support in Iraq,¹⁸⁹ though this did not mean a full support for pre-emptive strikes. On 8 November 2002, the UNSC Resolution 1441 was reached as a compromise between the US and UK on the one hand, and France and Germany, on the other. Whereas the US was searching for a justification to invade Iraq, Germany and France argued for continued diplomacy and weapons inspections instead of an invasion. Resolution 1441 authorized the "resumption of inspections in Iraq" and stated that if violations of her obligation were continued, Iraq would face "serious consequences".¹⁹⁰ This resolution did not give permission for the US and her supporter states to intervene in Iraq, and thus

¹⁸⁷ George W. Bush, "State of the Union address", *CNN*, 29 January 2002, <http://edition.cnn.com/2002/ALLPOLITICS/01/29/bush.speech.txt/> (accessed on 29.08.2012)

¹⁸⁸ Dieter Dettke, *Germany Says "No"*, p.155

¹⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, p.132

¹⁹⁰ Resolution of the United Nations Security Council of 8 November 2002, "Resolution 1441 (2002) (S/RES/1441(2002))", <http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N02/682/26/PDF/N0268226.pdf?OpenElement> (accessed on 29.08.2012)

was not accepted as a resolution for legitimizing the intervention, mainly by Germany and France. At the NATO Summit in Prague in November 2002, President Bush stated that he was in favour of Saddam Hussein disarming peacefully but if that would not be the case then “the United States will lead a coalition of the willing to disarm him.”¹⁹¹ This was a call to the states that wanted to collaborate with the United States on Iraq, thus forming the ‘coalition of the willing’.

The German stance towards an intervention in Iraq was different than that of her stance towards Afghanistan. Though Germany had felt ‘unlimited solidarity’ with the US after 9/11 and had participated in the US’ ‘War on Terror’ by taking part in the OEF and the ISAF, she refused to take part in the Iraqi intervention. For Germany a solid proof of link between al-Qaeda – the main Islamic terrorist group threatening the western world, as perceived by the German Foreign Minister Fischer – and the Iraq regime was not evident. Germans did not approach the situation at hand in the same way as the Americans did. As a result an immediate military operation was seen as unnecessary by the Germans.¹⁹² This was a shift from Germany’s foreign policy objectives formed after WWII within the dense multilateral system. Such a change in German foreign policy resulted mostly from the circumstances that evolved after the reunification and the dissolution of the USSR. The reunified Germany was a greater power than the two separate German states were. Additionally, she felt no imminent threat to her own territories due to the end of the East-West conflict. She perceived of herself being surrounded by friendly neighbours and thus did not feel the need to fully subordinate under the US security protection. Another reason for not participating in Iraq was because of Germany’s perception that as a dependable ally by participating in military missions not only in continental Europe but also in various regions of the world, she considered that her partners needed to consult her when political and military

¹⁹¹ “Press Conference by US President George W. Bush and Vaclav Havel, President of the Czech Republic”, <http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/2002/s021120b.htm> (accessed on 29.08.2012)

¹⁹² Henner Fürtig, “Playing the muscle-man or new self-assuredness? Germany and the Iraq War”, *International Journal of Contemporary Iraqi Studies*, 1/3, 2007, p.316

decisions were taken.¹⁹³ As contributing more to European security in comparison with the past, Germany wanted the US to “pay attention to what Berlin said.”¹⁹⁴ Thus when this did not happen and the US choose to implement what she had planned, the German chancellor did not support Bush and did not engage in the intervention of Iraq. Though this act should not be perceived as a total disengagement from her old stance regarding European security and her relations with the US, it marked a significant shift in her foreign policy and a deterioration of the German – US relations.¹⁹⁵

Saying ‘no’ to a German Armed Forces deployment in Iraq also had a reason lying in domestic politics. The rejection was voiced as early as August 2002 by Chancellor Schröder who was campaigning to be re-elected at the September 2002 general elections. As Germany had entered into two wars – Kosovo in 1999 and Afghanistan in 2001 – during his chancellorship, Schröder, not wanting to risk his possible votes, did not choose to engage in a third war, which was highly protested amongst the German nation.¹⁹⁶ Thus this choice of policy had repercussions for Germany. After the NATO Summit in Prague the German-US relations were tense and Germany as a state deeply integrated in multilateral ties did not want to stand alone in her opposition to the Iraq War. As a result Germany started cooperating with France, which not only was hesitant in involving in a military intervention in Iraq but was also an effective actor regarding international security due to her permanent seat at the UNSC. When the US and the UK wanted to pass a second UN resolution to force the full cooperation of the Iraqi government, otherwise implementing disarmament militarily, France rejected the proposal expressing that there was still enough progress to be made regarding weapons’ inspections.¹⁹⁷ In February 2003 France, Germany and Russia formed a trilateral initiative to warn the US and her supporter states to get a second UNSC resolution but the US did

¹⁹³ *Ibid.*, pp.320-321

¹⁹⁴ Tuomas Forsberg “German Foreign Policy”, p.224

¹⁹⁵ Fraser Cameron, *An Introduction to European Foreign Policy*, pp.32-34

¹⁹⁶ Anja Dalgaard-Nielsen, “The Test of Strategic Culture”, p.351

¹⁹⁷ Henner Fürtig, “Playing the muscle-man or new self-assuredness?”, p.323

not want to wait anymore for an intervention and on 19 March 2003 President Bush addressed the start of the Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF): “American and coalition forces are in the early stages of military operations to disarm Iraq, to free its people and to defend the world from grave danger.”¹⁹⁸

Apart from deteriorating the German-US relations, the Iraq War “has shown how deep the divisions in Europe can be”.¹⁹⁹ The debate on the division in Europe started with the difference in policies regarding the Iraq military intervention. The 9/11 attacks had gathered the European states all together in feeling solidarity with the US and thus acting together in Afghanistan. Though the Iraqi intervention was presented as a continuation of the war fought against terror, there arose two opposite sides on the possible military intervention in Iraq. These were the for-war and against-war views on a military operation towards Iraq, which the US Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld coined as ‘new Europe’ and ‘old Europe’, respectively.²⁰⁰ He defined old Europe as France and Germany, and new Europe as the CEE states of which some were already NATO members and some were newly invited to become one. Whereas the old Europe showed resistance in taking part in Iraq as to criticize the unilateralism of US policy, the new Europe was willing to engage militarily in Iraq in return for some benefits from the US.²⁰¹ The division by the new Europe became visible with the open letter signed on 30 January 2003 by the Heads of State and Government of the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Britain, Italy, Spain, Portugal and Denmark, which have given support to the US regarding Iraq. A few days later the ten countries, who wanted to join NATO and were called the “Vilnius Ten” (Albania, Bulgaria, Croatia, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, the Republic of Macedonia, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia) also

¹⁹⁸ George W. Bush, “George Bush’s address on the start of war”, *The Guardian*, 20 March 2003, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2003/mar/20/iraq.georgebush> (accessed on 29.08.2012)

¹⁹⁹ Mike Bowker, “European Security”, p.250

²⁰⁰ U.S. Department of Defense, “Secretary Rumsfeld Briefs at the Foreign Press Center”, 22 January 2003, <http://www.defense.gov/Transcripts/Transcript.aspx?TranscriptID=1330> (accessed on 29.08.2012)

²⁰¹ Mustafa Türkeş, "New vs. Old Europe": Contested Hegemonies and the Dual-Guarantee Strategy of the East European Countries", *International Problems*, No.3, 2005, p.230

released a joint statement supporting the US military intervention of Iraq.²⁰² This division was not only a division of the NATO but also of the EU. The EU was also divided into two camps: the formation around the Franco-German axis which included Belgium and Luxembourg, and the formation consisting of the UK, Italy, Spain and the soon-to-be member states of the former soviet bloc. By the time the Treaty of Nice entered into force in February 2003, the EU was split into two parties regarding foreign policy, making it vulnerable to form a common foreign policy on Iraq within the scope of the CFSP.²⁰³

On 1 May 2003 President Bush declared that the mission had been accomplished and on 22 May 2003 UNSC Resolution 1483 was passed, where France, Germany and Russia had to vote 'yes' to legitimize the US and UK as occupation forces in Iraq.²⁰⁴ The OIF went on until the 18 December 2011 when the last US troops withdrew from Iraq, thus ending the Iraq War. Until that date the states making up the 'coalition of the willing' had withdrawn on various dates.

4.6 Germany's Perception of European Security at National Level: *Weißbuch* 2006

The *Weißbuch* (White Paper) of 2006, which was published 12 years after the previous one, once again had the aim to define the German security environment, her stance towards national and European security and the future of the German Armed Forces. It is stated that the international security environment has changed radically (since last addressed in 1994) which has created new risks and threats that have a destabilizing effect on Germany, her immediate surrounding and also

²⁰² Antonio Missiroli, "Between the EU and US: The Enlarged Union, Security and the Use of Force", in *The Strategic Implications of European Union Enlargement*, edited by Esther Brimmer and Stefan Fröhlich, (Washington, D.C. : Center for Transatlantic Relations, The Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies, Johns Hopkins University , 2005), p.328

²⁰³ Peter Van Ham, "The EU's War over Iraq. The last Wake-Up Call", in *European Foreign Policy: From Rhetoric to Reality?*, edited by Dieter Mahncke, Alicia Ambos and Christopher Reynolds, (Brussels: P.I.E.-Peter Lang, 2006), pp.220-221

²⁰⁴ Resolution of the United Nations Security Council of 22 May 2003, "Resolution 1483 (2003) (S/RES/1483(2003))", <http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N03/368/53/PDF/N0336853.pdf?OpenElement> (accessed on 29.08.2012)

adaptation to the new security environment and threats. The clause “preventing regional crises and conflicts that may affect Germany’s security, wherever possible, and helping to control crises” can be read together with the following sentence also taken from the *Weißbuch* 2006: “German security policy also has to take account of developments in geographically remote regions, insofar as they affect our interests.”²⁰⁸ Thus these two sentences may be interpreted as precautionary clauses for legitimization of future missions that Germany may take part in.

As regards to the transatlantic alliance, Germany still perceives the alliance for herself and for Europe as the core security institution. It is stated that Germany’s future security and defence policy will continue to be set up on the North Atlantic Alliance. Even though the *Weißbuch* 2006 does not define the US as a ‘world power’ anymore, it addresses the US as the partner in the fundamental issues of European security. The joint effort of the two states is given importance to and it is stated that the two states should keep the bond by continual cultivation and deepen it through “means of mutual consultation and coordinated action.”²⁰⁹ When considering the EU’s place within German security policy, Germany sees the Union as an asset for its political stability, security, and prosperity that is effective on Germany and other member states alike. Just like the 1994 White Paper, the document of 2006 also perceives her security lying not solely in the European territories but also in various regions of the world. She sets the goal for German foreign policy to strengthen the European area of stability through the consolidation and development of European integration.²¹⁰ As a new subtitle, the strategic partnership between NATO and the EU is inserted to the text and it is described as “one of the pillars of the European and transatlantic security architecture.”²¹¹ The document states that the EU and NATO are not competitors because of their contribution to Germany’s security and the effort contributed to

²⁰⁸ German Federal Ministry of Defence, “White Paper 2006”, p.21

²⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, p.25

²¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p.33

²¹¹ *Ibid.*, pp.40-41

improve the relationship among these two institutions will be continued. As an important partner of Germany, Russia is once again given importance to, and reinforcing a security partnership with Russia is set as a goal.

In order to comprehend how Germany preserves her security this following sentence is particularly important: “No state in the world nowadays is able to ensure its security on its own. Germany therefore safeguards its security interests primarily in international and supranational institutions and plays an active role in shaping their policies.”²¹² Germany clearly states that she pursues policies to shape the international – NATO – and supranational – EU – organizations, thus aims that can be regarded as assertive in nature.

The changes that the document has addressed are to avail Germany to further enhance her position within the European security structures with the security environment better defined. The changes from the *Weißbuch* of 1994 to the *Weißbuch* of 2006 may not be fundamental in character but they offer a better defined security environment in which Germany is to operate. While the 1994 document can be read as a real guideline and a change for Germany and European security in a newly established world after the end of the Cold War, the 2006 document can be seen as a continuity of the previous one, this quality of the latter document not undermining its assertive ambitions.

4.7 The Treaty of Lisbon, 13 December 2007

The Treaty of Lisbon (ToL), which was signed on 13 December 2007, derives from the Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe, which was signed on 29 October 2004 but was rejected at the referenda in France and the Netherlands mostly because the provisions and constitution like structure of the treaty that was found too a national compromise to give in to the EU. This treaty was actually a cropped version of the first draft of the treaty formed in 2002-2003 by the European Convention that was established to prepare the draft of the Constitutional Treaty. What is more, the ToL is an even more cropped version of

²¹² *Ibid.*, p.22

the Constitutional Treaty, which – though its innovative structures – preserved its intergovernmental property in regards CFSP and thus the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP, which has replaced the ESDP with the ToL).

The High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, which was created by the ToL (Art. 18(1) TEU),²¹³ was given three main duties: the Secretary-General of the Council/High Representative for CFSP (SG/HR), the Commissioner for External Affairs and the President of the Foreign Affairs Council. By holding posts in the Council, the Commission and in the six-monthly rotating Presidency of the Council, the High Representative was aimed at achieving “more visibility and more stability” for the EU in the matters of CFSP.²¹⁴ As this may seem as an attempt to gather most of the external affairs related posts under a single coordination to ensure greater coordination and consistency in EU foreign policy and present the EU better outside the Union, it also places various duties on the High Representative from different institutions. This makes the post hard to operate and to pursue a common policy in foreign affairs. As Verola argues, the success of the CFSP lies in the talent of the High Representative to assume these different roles and make use of them,²¹⁵ which makes the post dependant on personal qualifications of the High Representative.

The ‘permanent structured cooperation’, which came into effect with the ToL is describe in Article 42(6) as “[t]hose Member States whose military capabilities fulfill higher criteria and which have made more binding commitments to one another in this area ... shall establish permanent structured cooperation within the Union framework.” The driving force for such cooperation can be traced in the attitude of the “militarily neutral countries” who do not wish to take part in EU

²¹³ Treaty of Lisbon, “Consolidated versions of the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union”, *Official Journal*, C 115/01, 9 May 2008, <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/JOHtml.do?uri=OJ:C:2008:115:SOM:EN:HTML> (accessed on 29.08.2012)

²¹⁴ Jean-Claude Piris, *The Lisbon Treaty: A Legal and Political Analysis*, (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010), p.245

²¹⁵ Nicola Verola, “The New EU Foreign Policy under the Treaty of Lisbon”, in *The Foreign Policy of the European Union: Assessing Europe’s Role in the World*, edited by Federiga Bindi, (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2010), p.45

military missions. This clause gives them an ‘opt-out’ option²¹⁶ and helps the states that want to pursue military missions. The implementation of the permanent structured cooperation within the ToL with an easier adoption process than the way it had been proposed at the European Convention for the preparation of the Constitutional Treaty in 2002-03 was more desirable for both Germany and France as these states were the ones who had been talking about a creation of a ‘European Defence Union’ during the European Convention. Whereas Germany and France had agreed to a unanimous Council decision for this kind of cooperation,²¹⁷ with the ToL the procedure for the permanent structured cooperation was made simpler and easier.²¹⁸ This could be regarded as a policy implementation of Germany into the EU level, as actions for closer cooperation among member states within the EU for the aim to act as a single voice was set forth in the White Paper of 2006. .

The scope of the Petersberg Tasks were extended to include “joint disarmament operations, humanitarian and rescue tasks, military advice and assistance tasks, conflict prevention and peace-keeping tasks, tasks of combat forces in crisis management, including peace-making and post-conflict stabilisation.” (Art. 43 TEU) The new tasks made available for the EU to pursue operations on a larger scale and thus to enhance EU’s role in crisis management.

As mentioned above, the Treaty of Lisbon has introduced new structures to the CSDP and CFSP, which have slightly added to the Union’s area of activity but the CFSP and CSDP have remained to be highly intergovernmental. Whereas a constitutional treaty was aimed at in the first place (the Constitutional Treaty of 2004), the result that came out to be accepted by all the member states was another treaty amending the former ones. In these regards the Treaty of Lisbon has not been what Germany aimed as it can be inferred from the *Weißbuch* 2006 that Germany aims at a united Europe with necessary capabilities to act. According to

²¹⁶ Franz Kernic, “European Security in Transition”, p.19

²¹⁷ Overhaus, Marco, “Civilian Power under Stress”, p.73

²¹⁸ For more information on the process of the ‘permanent structured cooperation’, see Jean-Claude Piris, *The Lisbon Treaty*, pp.276-278

Germany this is the only way in which Europe will be able to take the responsibility to cope with the challenges of collective security.²¹⁹

4.8 Conclusion

Germany's military engagement and making use of force in an out-of-area operation, for the first time since WWII, shows the importance of Kosovo for the German security perception and the reason why it is taken as a turning point in Germany's stance towards European security. Germany committed to multilateralism by taking part in the operation in Kosovo and the diplomatic efforts to solve the crisis peacefully within the international community but also by deploying troops. This showed Germany's will to let go of her Cold War restrictions and the changing perception of German security policies, which was also visible in her effort to establish the ESDP at the Cologne European Council under her presidency. Thus the Helsinki European Council that took place six months later set military capability goals to maintain by 2003, which were ambitious goals but indicated Germany's will to develop military capabilities under the EU. This was also mostly wanted by France and the UK.

While enhancing ESDP, and the Treaty of Nice being on the way to be ratified by all the member states' domestic legislatures, the political agenda of the international community changed with the 9/11 terrorist attacks on the US. Germany shared solidarity with the US and her support for the intervention in Afghanistan in late 2001 showed a continuity of her will to operate in out-of-area missions. Germany was being the dependable ally on which the US and NATO members could count. Germany also engaged under the ISAF, which showed that she not only engaged in military intervention operations but also in operations of post-war reconstructing. Germany's commitment to multilateralism was apparent when she proposed to bring in NATO to take the command of the ISAF. While Germany's position within the NATO grew with Afghanistan, the Iraq War, proved just the opposite. Germany's rejection to participate in the military intervention in Iraq, which was an unexpected action, froze the relations between

²¹⁹ German Federal Ministry of Defence, "White Paper 2006", p.33

her and the US, and also divided the EU into two camps: the old Europe vs. the new Europe; Germany being regarded as standing on the old side of it. Germany's decision to reject to join the military intervention marked a shift in her foreign policy. For the first time since Germany entered NATO and started rearming after WWII, she presented her thought that opposed the US so abruptly and openly. This was not a sharp disengagement in her policy towards neither the US nor international security but a shift from a state following US' lead unconditionally to a state that started choosing for herself which wars to engage in and which not. When she tried to find partners who, just like her, opposed a war on Iraq and defended the policy of non- participation, the assertive side of the German policies became apparent. It was soon after the Iraq intervention that the Constitutional Treaty was rejected and it became clear that the EU would keep her intergovernmental property in CFSP and ESDP matters for some more time to come.

While not bringing a radical change to Germany's foreign and security policy objectives, the *Weißbuch* of 2006 is an important document to assess Germany's stance and define her policies towards European security. The document possesses continuity from the 1994 *Weißbuch* regarding her position to provide for the European security, though a better defined security environment has been produced in the document. While the 2006 White Paper contains ambitious goals for Germany and shows her change towards a new and different sort of assertiveness that aims at emancipating from the Cold War limitations by being more influential at the EU policy level, the Treaty of Lisbon has shown that this influence is efficient up to a certain point. Although the ToL contains clauses that Germany supported, the intergovernmental structure of the CFSP has not been abandoned. As a result, this restrains Germany's aim to shape the policy of the Union.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

In this thesis, Germany's stance towards European security in the post-Cold War era is evaluated with a focus on continuities and changes in the German stance. The relationship between the growing effectiveness of Germany within the EU and her European security policies, and to what extent Germany's expanding dominance within the EU has an effect on her assertiveness regarding European security are depicted.

Germany's security policy in Europe, it may be stated, started under the chancellorship of Bismarck. Before unifying the German city states in 1871 Germany fought three hefty wars but once Bismarck won these wars, he unified the city states and pursued a policy of *Realpolitik* that was built upon intertwined web of alliances, which restored him a place in the European balance of power and also allowed him to preserve peace and stability not only in Germany but also in continental Europe. The era after Bismarck was dominated by Emperor Wilhelm II's *Weltpolitik* (World Policy), which had the ambition of possessing more colonies and more power, and thus taking the lead in Europe. The Bismarckian alliance system had been abandoned and change in foreign policy was visible. The main reason the Second Reich entered into war was its desire for more land and power. WWI was a catastrophe for the German people and due to the heavy burden of the Treaty of Versailles, signed at the end of WWI, the Weimar Republic showed a shift in her foreign and European security policy once again. She sought to revise Versailles through peaceful means and thus through this policy gain herself enough elbowroom to act freely, but events led to the rise of the fascist Nazi Party and Adolf Hitler. Hitler had the aim of raising Germany to a World Power, a policy aim that could be traced in Wilhelm II's World Politics, but

these two policies were different from each other. Even though Wilhelm II's World Politics is seen as the cause of WWI, the scope and brutality of Hitler's foreign policy and what he risked could never be compared to any of the previous or later German states' foreign policy objectives. Never before had any German state implemented such a destructive and fascist goal as the Nazi Germany had and never after did any state follow suit. Hitler's Nazi Germany therefore presented a clear change – even a rupture - in Germany's foreign policy objectives from the peacefully negotiated revisionist behavior of the Weimar Republic towards a war oriented policy.

As no central government was allowed to be formed during the Allied Occupied Germany, no foreign policy could be pursued during this period. When the Federal Republic of Germany was established, her main policy orientation in the post-WWII period was European and Western integration. These two clauses meant her complete integration into Western structures like the NATO, the EU, and the WEU. The FRG was not full sovereign when she was established but gained most of her sovereign rights with the 1955 General Treaty, which marked an important milestone in the FRG's foreign policy. Through this treaty she gained the right to remilitarize and pursue a foreign policy of her own will. Other than being integrated into Western structures, Germany, aided by the East-West détente, also pursued *Ostpolitik* (Eastern Policy) from the late 1960s onwards. This was not a change but a shift in her policy and it was a policy that helped arouse the East Germans' attention towards West Germany that would later lead to peace, the fall of the Berlin Wall and the will to unity.

The events which occurred during the disintegration of the Soviet Union paved the way for Germany to reunite. If it had not been for the demonstrations in Poland and Hungary starting in early 1989 that had represented an example to the citizens of the GDR and worked as a catalyst to demonstrate the strict rule of the ruling communist party, the Berlin Wall would probably not have fallen. In the early years of the unification, Germany was reluctant to pursue a new kind of foreign policy and held on to her Cold War role of abstention. However, with the new

international environment quickly evolving, it was anticipated that Germany would take responsibility and pursue an effective foreign and security policy, with pressure coming especially from the US. The *Weißbuch* (White Paper) of 1994 created a fundamental change in Germany's security perception and also her security policy. The Federal Constitutional Court's ruling in 1994 on the deployment of German armed forces in out-of-area missions opened the way for Germany to pursue the dependable ally role. Germany started to play that role by engaging in the NATO-led air campaign in Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1995, but it was not until the Kosovo War in 1999 that Germany deployed active combat troops for the first time since WWII. This has marked the turning point in her policy. On the one hand, deploying troops and acting together with the Transatlantic Alliance was a way for Germany to show her commitment to NATO and to the multilateral properties of her foreign and security policy. On the other hand, deploying troops and engaging in active combat missions showed Germany's emancipation from the security perception that had been planted immediately after WWII and deepened all through the Cold War years. This is the new and different sort of foreign and security policy that Germany has started practicing since the Kosovo War. Afghanistan was another venue where this was practiced and continuity was traced but it was the Iraq intervention that stressed the assertive side of the German policy. The 'no' to the Iraq War by the then Chancellor Schröder shifted Germany's stance away from her old perception towards a new European security perception. It caused a rift between the US and Germany, and divided Europe into two. Germany did not confront the US on the Iraq issue but a clear change in her policy was visible. Hence, this is an example of the new and different sort of assertiveness Germany has started to pursue in her European security policies.

In comparison to the 1994 *Weißbuch*, the *Weißbuch* of 2006 did not aim at a policy change but rather at a consolidation of her stance within the European security structures. This new and different sort of assertive policy was also made visible in this document. While defining Germany's role in international organizations, it is stated that Germany pursues her security interests in international and

supranational institutions through playing an active role in shaping their policies. The mentioned international organizations include mainly the UN, the NATO and the OSCE, and what is meant by the supranational organization is the EU. Thus this shows Germany's aspiration to expand her dominance within the main international organizations and specifically within the EU. Having a look at the EU level of this evaluation, Germany playing an important role in the formation of the ESDP during the Cologne and Helsinki European Councils and aiming at forming a more supranational CFSP and ESDP has scaled up her effectiveness in the Union though Germany up until the Treaty of Lisbon could not reach the level of supranational property she had envisioned when starting the negotiations for a Constitutional Treaty in 2002.

As a conclusion, while Germany stays committed to her multilateral ties and acts within them, she also pursues her own interests and shapes the policies of the international and supranational institutions she belongs to by playing an active role in them. This is especially valid for her role within the EU. A Germany which is backed by the EU, or in other words a European Germany, is a state characterized by a new and different sort of assertiveness and thus enjoys the emancipation from the Cold War restrictions that had contained her for forty-five years.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Published Official Documents

“The Afghanistan Compact”, London, 31 January-1 February 2006, http://www.nato.int/isaf/docu/epub/pdf/afghanistan_compact.pdf (accessed on 29.08.2012)

Bonn Agreement, “Agreement on Provisional Arrangements in Afghanistan Pending the Re-Establishment of Permanent Government Institutions”, 5 December 2001, <http://www.un.org/News/dh/latest/afghan/afghan-agree.htm> (accessed on 29.08.2012)

“British-French summit St.Malo, 3-4 December 1998”, in *From St.Malo to Nice. European defence: core documents*, compiled by Maartje Rutten, (Paris: Institute for Security Studies of Western European Union, Chaillot Paper 47, 2001), <http://www.iss.europa.eu/uploads/media/cp047e.pdf> (accessed on 08.08.2012)

Bundesministerium der Verteidigung, *Weißbuch 1994. Weißbuch zur Sicherheit der Bundesrepublik Deutschland und zur Lage und Zukunft der Bundeswehr*, (Bonn: Druckerei Bachem GmbH & Co KG, 1994)

“Cologne European Council, 3-4 June 1999, Conclusions of the Presidency”, http://www.europarl.europa.eu/summits/koll_en.htm (accessed on 25.08.2012)

Decision of the German Federal Constitutional Court of 12 June 1994 about Out-of-area Operations, “BVerfG Urteil vom 12.07.1994 (2 BvE 3/92)”, http://www.ejura-examensexpress.de/online-kurs/entsch_show_neu.php?Alp=1&dok_id=899 (accessed on 07.08.2012)

EU-NATO Declaration on ESDP, “Press Release (2002) 142”, 16 December 2002, <http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/2002/p02-142e.htm> (accessed on 17.08.2012)

Final Communiqué of the Ministerial Meeting of the North Atlantic Council Berlin, 03 June 1996, “Press Communiqué M-NAC-1(96)63”, <http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/1996/p96-063e.htm> (accessed on 10.08.2012)

“Presidency Conclusions, European Council Meeting in Laeken, 14-15 December 2001”, SN/300/1/01 REV 1, http://ec.europa.eu/governance/impact/background/docs/laeken_concl_en.pdf (accessed on 24.08.2012)

Resolution of the United Nations Security Council of 23 September 1998, “Resolution 1199 (1998) (S/RES/1199 (1998))”, <http://www.un.org/peace/kosovo/98sc1199.htm> (accessed on 22.08.2012)

Resolution of the United Nations Security Council of 10 June 1999, “Resolution 1244 (1999) (S/RES/1244 (1999))”, [http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N99/172/89/PDF/N9917289.pdf?OpenElement](http://daccess-dds.ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N99/172/89/PDF/N9917289.pdf?OpenElement) (accessed on 22.08.2012)

Resolution of the United Nations Security Council of 12 September 2001, “Resolution 1368 (2001) (S/RES/1368 (2001))”, [http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N01/533/82/PDF/N0153382.pdf?OpenElement](http://daccess-dds.ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N01/533/82/PDF/N0153382.pdf?OpenElement) (accessed on 29.08.2012)

Resolution of the United Nations Security Council of 20 December 2001, “Resolution 1386 (2001) (S/RES/1386(2001))”, [http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N01/708/55/PDF/N0170855.pdf?OpenElement](http://daccess-dds.ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N01/708/55/PDF/N0170855.pdf?OpenElement) (accessed on 27.08.2012)

Resolution of the United Nations Security Council of 8 November 2002, “Resolution 1441 (2002) (S/RES/1441(2002))”, [http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N02/682/26/PDF/N0268226.pdf?OpenElement](http://daccess-dds.ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N02/682/26/PDF/N0268226.pdf?OpenElement) (accessed on 29.08.2012)

Resolution of the United Nations Security Council of 22 May 2003, “Resolution 1483 (2003) (S/RES/1483(2003))”, [http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N03/368/53/PDF/N0336853.pdf?OpenElement](http://daccess-dds.ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N03/368/53/PDF/N0336853.pdf?OpenElement) (accessed on 29.08.2012)

“Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe”, Cologne, 10 June 1999, <http://www.stabilitypact.org/constituent/990610-cologne.asp> (accessed on 22.08.2012)

Treaty of Amsterdam, “Consolidated Version of the Treaty on European Union”, *Official Journal*, C 340/02, 10 November 1997, <http://eur->

lex.europa.eu/en/treaties/dat/11997M/htm/11997M.html#0145010077 (accessed on 08.08.2012)

Treaty of Lisbon, “Consolidated versions of the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union”, *Official Journal*, C 115/01, 9 May 2008, <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/JOHtml.do?uri=OJ:C:2008:115:SOM:EN:HTML> (accessed on 29.08.2012)

Treaty of Nice, “Consolidated Version of the Treaty on European Union”, *Official Journal*, C 325/5, 24 December 2002, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/en/treaties/dat/12002M/pdf/12002M_EN.pdf (accessed on 08.08.2012)

United Nations Juridical Yearbook 1994, Part Three, Chapter VIII, “Press release issued by the Federal Constitutional Court No. 29/94”, <http://untreaty.un.org/cod/UNJuridicalYearbook/pdfs/english/ByVolume/1994/chpVIII.pdf> (accessed on 07.08.2012)

United States Department of State, *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1952-1954, Germany and Austria, Vol.VII*, edited by William Z. Slany, <http://digicoll.library.wisc.edu/cgi-bin/FRUS/FRUS-idx?type=turn&entity=FRUS.FRUS195254v07p1.p0148&id=FRUS.FRUS195254v07p1&isize=M> (accessed on 23.07.2012)

Western European Union Council of Ministers Bonn, 19 June 1992, “Petersberg Declaration”, <http://www.weu.int/documents/920619peten.pdf> (accessed on 11.08.2012)

Books and Articles

Ash, Timothy Garton, *In Europe's Name: Germany and the Divided Continent*, (New York: Random House, 1993)

Black, Cyril E., Jonathan E. Helmreich, Paul C. Helmreich, Charles P. Issawi and A. James McAdams, *Rebirth: A History of Europe Since World War II*, (Boulder; Oxford: Westview Press, 1992)

Borchardt, Knut, *Perspectives on Modern German Economic History and Policy*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991)

Bowker, Mike, "European Security" in *Contemporary Europe*, 2nd ed., edited by Richard Sakwa and Anne Stevens, (Hampshire; New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2006)

Cameron, Fraser, *An Introduction to European Foreign Policy*, (Oxon; New York: Routledge, 2007)

Carchedi, Guglielmo, "The Military Arm of the European Union", *Rethinking Marxism*, 18/2, April 2006, pp.325-337

Clemens, Clay, "Opportunity or Obligation? Redefining Germany's Military Role Outside of NATO", *Armed Forces & Society*, 19/2, Winter 1993, pp.231-251

Costigliola, Frank, "An 'Arm Around the Shoulder': The United States, NATO and German Reunification, 1989-90", *Contemporary European History*, 3/1, 1994, pp.87-110

Craig, Gordon A., *Germany, 1866-1945*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978)

Croft, Stuart, "The EU, NATO and Europeanisation: The Return of Architectural Debate", *European Security*, 9/3, Autumn 2000, pp.1-20

Dalgaard-Nielsen, Anja, "The Test of Strategic Culture: Germany, Pacifism and Pre-emptive Strikes", *Security Dialogue*, 36/3, 2005, p.339-359

Dwan, Renata, "Jean Monnet and the European Defence Community, 1950-1954", *Cold War History*, 1/3, 2001, pp.141-160

Dettke, Dieter; *Germany Says "No": The Iraq War and the Future of the German Foreign and Security Policy*, (Washington, D.C.: Woodrow Wilson Center Press; Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2009)

Erb, Scott, *German Foreign Policy: Navigating a New Era*, (Colorado; London: Lyenne Rienner Publishers, 2003)

Fischer, Fritz, *Germany's Aims in the First World War*, (New York: W.W. Norton&Company, Inc., 1967)

Forster, Anthony and William Wallace, "What is NATO for?", *Survival: Global Politics and Strategy*, 43/4, 2001, pp.107-122

Forsberg, Tuomas, "German Foreign Policy and the War on Iraq: Anti-Americanism, Pacifism or Emancipation?", *Security Dialogue*, 36/2, 2005, pp.213-231

Fürtig, Henner, "Playing the muscle-man or new self-assuredness? Germany and the Iraq War", *International Journal of Contemporary Iraqi Studies*, 1/3, 2007, pp.311-329

Geiss, Imanuel, *German Foreign Policy, 1871-1914*, (London: Routledge, 1976)

Geiss, Imanuel, "German foreign policy in the Weimar Republic and the Third Reich, 1919-1945", in *Weimar and Nazi Germany: Continuities and Discontinuities*, edited by Panikos Panayi, (Essex: Pearson Education, 2001)

Green, Simon, Dan Hough, Alister Miskimmon and Graham Timmins, *The Politics of the New Germany*, (Oxon; New York: Routledge, 2008)

Haftendorn, Helga, *Coming of Age: German foreign policy since 1945*, (Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield, 2006)

Haftendorn, Helga, "The Unification of Germany, 1985-1991", in *The Cambridge History of the Cold War, Vol.3 Endings*, edited by Melvyn P. Leffler and Odd Arne Westad, (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010)

Hardach, Karl, *The Political Economy of Germany in the Twentieth Century*, (Berkeley; Los Angeles; London: University of California Press, 1980)

Hennessey, Peter, *Whitehall*, (London: Secker and Warburg, 1989), p.412, quoted in *The Origins of the Cold War in Europe: international perspectives*, edited by David Reynolds, (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1994)

Hitler, Adolf, *Mein Kampf*, translated by Ralph Manheim, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1943)

Hobsbawm, Eric J., *The Age of Extremes: the short twentieth century, 1914-1991*, (London: Abacus, 1995)

Howorth, Jolyon, “The European Security Strategy and military capacity: The first significant steps”, in *The EU and the European Security Strategy: Forging a global Europe*, edited by Sven Biscop and Jan Joel Andersson, (Oxon; New York: Routledge, 2008)

Hyde-Price, Adrian, *European Security beyond the Cold War: Four Scenarios for the Year 2010*, (London; California, New Delhi: SAGE Publications, 1991)

Hyde-Price, Adrian, *Germany and European order: Enlarging NATO and the EU*, (Manchester; New York: Manchester University Press, 2000)

Hyde-Price, Adrian, “Germany and the Kosovo War: Still a Civilian Power?”, in *New Europe, New Germany, Old Foreign Policy?: German Foreign Policy since Unification*, edited by Douglas Webber, (London; Portland, Oregon: Frank Cass, 2001)

Kernic, Franz, “European Security in Transition: The European Security Architecture since the End of the Second World War – An Overview”, in *European Security in Transition*, edited by Gunther Hauser and Franz Kernic, (Hampshire; Burlington: Ashgate, 2006)

Keukeleire, Stephan, “European Security and Defense Policy: From Taboo to a Spearhead of EU Foreign Policy?”, in *The Foreign Policy of the European Union: Assessing Europe’s Role in the World*, edited by Federiga Bindi, (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2010)

Lantis, Jeffrey S., *Strategic Dilemmas and the Evolution of German Foreign Policy since Unification*, (Westport: Praeger Publishers, 2002)

Mauil, Hanns W., “Germany’s foreign policy, post-Kosovo: still a ‘Civilian Power’?”, in *Germany as a Civilian Power? The foreign policy of the Berlin Republic*, edited by Sebastian Harnisch and Hanns W. Mauil, (Manchester; New York: Manchester University Press, 2001)

Merkel, Peter H., “The German Janus: From Westpolitik to Ostpolitik”, *Political Science Quarterly*, 89/4, Winter 1974-1975, pp.803-824

Miskimmon, Alister, *Germany and the Common Foreign and Security Policy of the European Union: Between Europeanisation and National Adaptation*, (Hampshire; New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2007)

Missiroli, Antonio, "Between the EU and US: The Enlarged Union, Security and the Use of Force", in *The Strategic Implications of European Union Enlargement*, edited by Esther Brimmer and Stefan Fröhlich, (Washington, D.C. : Center for Transatlantic Relations, The Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies, Johns Hopkins University , 2005)

Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, *OSCE Handbook: 20 Years of the Helsinki Final Act, 1975-1995*, (Vienna: Secretariat of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, 1995)

Overhaus, Marco, "Civilian Power under Stress: Germany, NATO, and the European Security and Defense Policy", in *Germany's Uncertain Power: Foreign Policy of the Berlin Republic*, edited by Hanny W. Maull, (Hampshire; New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2006)

Philippi, Nina, "Civilian Power and war: the German debate about out-of-area operations 1990-1999", in *Germany as a Civilian Power? The foreign policy of the Berlin Republic*, edited by Sebastian Harnisch and Hanns W. Maull, (Manchester; New York: Manchester University Press, 2001)

Pinson, Koppel S., *Modern Germany: Its History and Civilization*, (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1954)

Piris, Jean-Claude, *The Lisbon Treaty: A Legal and Political Analysis*, (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010)

Porter, Ian and Ian D. Armour, *Imperial Germany: 1890-1918*, (London: Longman, 1991), quoted in William Simpson, *The Second Reich: Germany, 1871-1918*, (Cambridge: New York; Melbourne: Cambridge UP, 1995)

Rendall, Matthew, "A Qualified Success for Collective Security: The Concert of Europe and the Belgian Crisis, 1831", *Diplomacy and Statecraft*, 18/2, 2007, pp.271-295

Research Institute for Military History (ed.), *Germany and the Second World War: The Build-up of German Aggression, Vol. I*, translated by P.S. Falla, Dean S. Mc Murry, Ewald Osers, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000)

Röhl, John C.G., *1914: Delusion or Design: The testimony of two German diplomats*, (London: Elek, 1973)

Scheck, Raffael, *Germany, 1871-1945: A Concise History*, (Oxford; New York: Berg, 2008)

Schmidt, Gustav, "Europe and the World", *Contemporary European History*, 9/3, 2000, pp.355-366

Schmidt, Manfred G., *Political Institutions in the Federal Republic of Germany*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003)

Schulz, Brigitte H., "Globalisation, unification, and the German welfare state", *International Social Science Journal*, 52/163, 2000, pp.39-50

Sennholz, Hans F., *How Can Europe Survive*, (New York; Toronto; London: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1955)

Simpson, William, *The Second Reich: Germany, 1871-1918*, (Cambridge: New York; Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1995)

Snyder, Louis Leo (ed.), *Documents of German History*, (Rutgers: Rutgers University Press, 1958)

Soutou, Georges-Henri, "Was there a European Order in the Twentieth Century? From the Concert of Europe to the End of the Cold War", *Contemporary European History*, 9/3, 2000, pp.329-353

Türkeş, Mustafa, "New vs. Old Europe": Contested Hegemonies and the Dual-Guarantee Strategy of the East European Countries", *International Problems*, No.3, 2005, pp.229-244

Van Ham, Peter, "EU, NATO, OSCE: Interaction, Cooperation, and Confrontation", p.25 in *European Security in Transition*, edited by Gunther Hauser and Franz Kernic, (Hampshire; Burlington: Ashgate, 2006)

Van Ham, Peter, "The EU's War over Iraq. The last Wake-Up Call", in *European Foreign Policy: From Rhetoric to Reality?*, edited by Dieter Mahncke, Alicia Ambos and Christopher Reynolds, (Brussels: P.I.E.-Peter Lang, 2006)

Verola, Nicola, "The New EU Foreign Policy under the Treaty of Lisbon", in *The Foreign Policy of the European Union: Assessing Europe's Role in the World*, edited by Federiga Bindi, (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2010)

Wagener, Martin, "Normalization in Security Policy? Deployments of Bundeswehr Forces Abroad in the Era Schröder, 1998-2004", in *Germany's Uncertain Power: Foreign Policy of the Berlin Republic*, edited by Hanns W. Maull, (Hampshire; New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2006)

Wagner, Wolfgang, "Missing in Action? Germany's Bumpy Road from Institution-Building to Substance in European Security and Defence Policy", in *Germany's EU Policy on Asylum and Defence: De-Europeanization by Default?*, edited by Gunther Hellmann, (Hampshire; New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2006)

Wenger, Andreas and Doron Zimmerman, *International Relations: From the Cold War to the Globalized World*, (Colorado; London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2003)

Williamson, David G., *Germany since 1815: A Nation Forged and Renewed*, (Hampshire; New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2005)

Zehfuss, Maja, "Constructivism and Identity: A Dangerous Liaison", *European Journal of International Relations*, 7/3, September 2001, pp.315-348

Electronic Sources

Auswärtiges Amt, "Operation Enduring Freedom", http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/DE/Aussenpolitik/RegionaleSchwerpunkte/AfghanistanZentralasien/OEF_node.html (accessed on 29.08.2012)

Börner, Karl-Heinz, “The Future of German Operations Outside NATO”, *Parameters*, Vol.XXVI, Spring 1996, <http://www.carlisle.army.mil/usawc/parameters/Articles/96spring/borner.htm> (accessed on 07.08.2012)

Bush, George W., “Bush Announces Strikes Against Taliban”, *The Washington Post*, 7 October 2001, http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/nation/specials/attacked/transcripts/bushaddress_100801.htm (accessed on 26.08.2012)

Bush, George W., “State of the Union address”, *CNN*, 29 January 2002, <http://edition.cnn.com/2002/ALLPOLITICS/01/29/bush.speech.txt/> (accessed on 29.08.2012)

Bush, George W., “George Bush’s address on the start of war”, *The Guardian*, 20 March 2003, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2003/mar/20/iraq.georgebush> (accessed on 29.08.2012)

European Security and Defence Assembly-Assembly of the Western European Union, “The EU-NATO Berlin Plus agreements”, *Assembly Fact Sheet No:14*, November 2009, [http://www.shape.nato.int/resources/4/documents/14E_Fact_Sheet_Berlin_Plus\[1\].pdf](http://www.shape.nato.int/resources/4/documents/14E_Fact_Sheet_Berlin_Plus[1].pdf) (accessed on 17.08.2012)

Garamone, Jim, “Germany Offers America “Unlimited Solidarity””, *American Forces Press Service*, 19 September 2001, <http://www.defense.gov/news/newsarticle.aspx?id=44857> (accessed on 29.08.2012)

German Bundestag, “The influence of the Defence Committee on international missions of the Bundeswehr outside national and Alliance defence”, http://www.bundestag.de/htdocs_e/bundestag/committees/a12/aufgaben/aufg06.html (accessed on 01.08.2012)

Haftendorn, Helga, “Germany’s Accession into NATO: 50 years on”, *NATO Review*, 1 June 2005, <http://www.nato.int/docu/review/2005/Peace-Building/Germany-accession-NATO/EN/index.htm> (accessed on 17.07.2012)

Hatzigeorgopoulos, Myrto, “The Role of the EU Battlegroups in European Defence”, *European Security Review*, ESR 56, June 2012, <http://www.isis->

europe.eu/sites/default/files/publications-downloads/esr56_EUBattlegroups-June2012%20MH_0.pdf (accessed on 29.08.2012)

NATO, “Invocation of Article 5 confirmed”, 2 October 2001, <http://www.nato.int/docu/update/2001/1001/e1002a.htm> (accessed on 29.08.2012)

Organization Security and Cooperation in Europe, <http://www.osce.org/who> (accessed on 31.07.2012)

“Press Conference by US President George W. Bush and Vaclav Havel, President of the Czech Republic”, <http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/2002/s021120b.htm> (accessed on 29.08.2012)

U.S. Department of Defense, “Secretary Rumsfeld Briefs at the Foreign Press Center”, 22 January 2003, <http://www.defense.gov/Transcripts/Transcript.aspx?TranscriptID=1330> (accessed on 29.08.2012)

Western European Union, <http://www.weu.int/> (accessed on 17.07.2012)

Whitman, Richard G., “Amsterdam’s unfinished business? The Blair government’s initiative and the future of the Western European Union”, *Occasional Papers of the Institute for Security Studies for the Western European Union*, 7, January 1999, p.8, <http://www.deutsche-aussenpolitik.de/resources/seminars/gb/g&bpeu/document/occ7x.pdf> (accessed on 13.08.2012)

ENSTİTÜ

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü

Enformatik Enstitüsü

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü

YAZARIN

Soyadı : Çiyan

Adı : Deniz

Bölümü: Avrupa Çalışmaları

TEZİN ADI (İngilizce) :

The Evolution of the German Stance Towards European Security

TEZİN TÜRÜ : Yüksek Lisans

Doktora

1. Tezimin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılsın ve kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla tezimin bir kısmı veya tamamının fotokopisi alınsın.
2. Tezimin tamamı yalnızca Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi kullanıcılarının erişimine açılsın. (Bu seçenekle tezinizin fotokopisi ya da elektronik kopyası Kütüphane aracılığı ile ODTÜ dışına dağıtılmayacaktır.)
3. Tezim bir (1) yıl süreyle erişime kapalı olsun. (Bu seçenekle tezinizin fotokopisi ya da elektronik kopyası Kütüphane aracılığı ile ODTÜ dışına dağıtılmayacaktır.)

Yazarın imzası

Tarih