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As the most populous country and largest economy in Europe, Germany has always played a central role in post-World War II European and international politics. Legacies of World War II, the Third Reich and especially the Holocaust heavily influenced Germany’s foreign policy during the second half of the twentieth century. The identity of Germany’s foreign policy for much of the last decades has been characterized by multilateralism (EU, NATO, UN and other international organizations), diplomacy and civic power strategies within European, transatlantic and global institutional frameworks. However, geostrategic transformations in the last 15-20 years such as the end of the Cold War, new challenges such as international terrorism, and the shift from the second to the third postwar generation in Germany’s political elite have resulted in a markedly new dynamic in German foreign and security policies that could lead to a “normalization” of these policies in the future. Germany has increasingly assumed leadership in international multilateral efforts and is solidifying itself as a major international political player. This project analyzes how German foreign policy has evolved since 1945, how this has impacted Germany’s position in the international system, and what this means for future policies.

The thesis focused on the cyclical interdependence of German foreign policy and national identity, and how they are impacted by international system changes. I applied three levels of analysis: individual/group, state, and systemic to better understand the cyclical relationship of identity and policy making. At the individual level I showed how German cultural and political elements are fused together in order to formulate policy. The state level highlighted Germany’s bilateral relationships and its focus on mutually beneficial relations. Analysis at the systemic
level highlighted Germany’s continued commitment to multilateral and diplomatic solutions to world problems. Each of the three chapters focuses on a major international system change that has had an impact on German politics and self-perception: post World War II Europe, the post Cold War world and German unification, and the twenty-first century and its new challenges, with a focus on the NATO Afghanistan mission.
"No Power without Accountability."

Billy Bragg

For my parents, Terry and Ingrid O’Connell, for their immeasurable support over the course of my academic pursuits.
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank all the members of my thesis committee – Dr. Fritsch, Dr. Howes, Dr. Simon and Dr. Foell – in particular for their patience and input over the course of this project. Additional thanks go to Dr. Landgraf who helped me get this idea rolling while in Salzburg, Dr. Pogacar for his patience with me while I was working on this project, and everybody else in the GREAL Department for creating a stimulating yet relatively low-stress working environment. I would also like to thank Djordje Tomic, my friend and old roommate in Berlin, for our policy discussions and his help in getting my hands on parliamentary documents. And of course my parents and family for their continued support.
TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION ................................................................................................................. 1

Methodology ..................................................................................................................... 2

Summary and breakdown of the chapters .......................................................................... 6

CHAPTER I. 1945 – 1990 ................................................................................................. 12

From total defeat to the European Coal and Steel Community (1945 - 1952) .............. 12

Further European integration and German rearmament .............................................. 16

Integration troubles and Germany’s open-wallet policy ................................................. 18

Two Germany’s: A split national identity? ....................................................................... 20

Ostpolitik: A look to the East ......................................................................................... 26

The 80s: Missile protests and Herbert Grönemeyer’s “Amerika” .................................... 28

CHAPTER II. POST UNIFICATION GERMANY ............................................................. 33

Introduction ..................................................................................................................... 33

Big surprise and a marked success for multilateralism and integration ....................... 34

Unified German identity? ............................................................................................... 36

Germany and the first Gulf War ..................................................................................... 39

A touch of unilateralism and the first experiment in military intervention ................... 40

CHAPTER III. GERMANY IN THE 21ST CENTURY ....................................................... 46

Introduction ..................................................................................................................... 46

Germany’s relationship with Afghanistan ......................................................................... 48

Germany’s multicultural make-up as foreign policy dynamic? ..................................... 50

Melding Hard and Soft Power ....................................................................................... 53
“No” to the Iraq War ................................................................. 54
Germany in the NATO Afghanistan mission as a melding of hard and soft power.. 55
Post-traumatic stress disorder and national identity........................................... 57
CHAPTER IV. CONCLUSION ............................................................. 60
WORKS CITED .................................................................................. 64
INTRODUCTION

There is no doubt that the world is growing increasingly interconnected in the twenty-first century. Examples for this can be seen anywhere one might look: the increasing integration of the European Union, and the creation of regional economical communities in other areas of the world (ASEAN, Mercosur, etc.). With interactions between states constantly increasing it is important to understand what motivates countries to follow a specific foreign policy in order to have an idea what to expect of them in the future. This project focuses on the foreign policy of Germany.

Germany in some form or another has lain in the center of Europe for centuries, and due to this geographic location it has long had an impact on the development of Europe as a continent. In the last 60 years Germany has undergone amazing changes. It has gone from a nation bent on European domination, to utter destruction, endured a 45 year long division and emerged from all of it as one of the world’s premier economic powerhouses.

With Germany’s economic might has also come increased responsibility on the world stage. Since unification in 1990 Germany has been slowly becoming aware of its international responsibility and is beginning to become more and more involved in international politics. In this project I will focus on how German policy got to the point where it is today, and attempt to predict where it will be heading in the future, utilizing its role in the Afghanistan NATO mission as a case study.

Germany is unique when it comes to an analysis of its foreign policy, as it, more than any other country in the world, is extremely consciousness of its war-ridden past and the desire to insure that it never happens again. My approach to this project on German foreign policy is based on how Germany perceives itself in the international system. The perception of this role
determines how Germany makes policies to deal with international phenomena such as terrorism, humanitarian crises, etc. When examining German foreign policy from this position it is important not to forget the interdependence between German national identity and foreign policy.

German national identity and foreign policy have always been tied together. It is difficult to tell which influences which. It was largely a sense of national identity that led Bismarck to first unite the various German territories under Prussia in 1871\(^1\); it was (a perverted) sense of national identity that allowed Hitler to seize power and eventually led to World War II; and in post-war Europe it was a sense of German collective guilt that led to its initial tame foreign policy and adoption of its current values set.

Methodology

In order to analyze the nature of this mutual relationship I have adopted a model of cyclical causality. This model depends heavily on how international events affect Germany on the domestic level. In this model international system changes affect German identity and self perception, which in turn impact German foreign policy, the ramifications of which then affect national identity, which goes on to impact policy again and so forth. With respect to this model I have divided my paper into three chapters, each focusing on a specific era of German identity and foreign policy conflicts dictated by a particular international system change. Each system

\(^1\) This ignited the nationalism of the Wilhelmine period in Germany. Imperial Germany felt they should be accorded all the prestige and rights enjoyed by the other world powers during this time. However, the country lacked a national identity. Lacking this sense of identity resulted in Germany not really knowing what to do with its new found world power status and culminated in the “‘ideas of 1914’ which amounted to little more than a romantic conglomerate of conservative, authoritarian and militaristic ideas” (Wolf, 12-13). Ideas which helped set the tone for World War I.
change posed a unique set of challenges to Germany. The international system changes I focus on are post World War II and Cold War realities and the current changes in the international system (i.e. globalization, international terrorism, etc.).

To analyze German national identity I will apply three levels of analysis: individual/group, state and systemic. This approach of using three levels of analysis will show the effect that system change has on both foreign policy and national identity and highlight their cyclical nature. The individual/group level includes the parties represented within the Bundestag, their internal conflicts, and inter-party conflicts as well as conflicts with the government, but particularly focuses on the various ministers who are the faces of policy. These conflicts lead to the compromises or dismissals of strategies that lay the foundation for policy decisions.

At this level it is particularly important to look at specific politicians and ministers to see how they embody German identity and foreign policy. The chancellors Konrad Adenauer and Gerhard Schröder, for example, exemplify not only conflicting politics, but due to their generational differences they both came to power in a different Germany.²

The state level includes an examination of German foreign policy in relation to its neighbors and allies, in particular to see if Germany is adopting unilateral and bilateral policies that lead to a dominant role in the relationship. Applicable at this level would be the Franco-German relationship. France and Germany were the driving forces for initial European integration – it was largely under their direction that the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) came into being in 1952 (Dinan 40) - and their long lasting friendship was solidified with the Elysee Treaty in 1963 (Dinan 155).

² Gerhard Schröder was the first German leader of the post war generation.
At the systemic level I will analyze Germany’s policy within international organizations, such as the EU (and its predecessors), the UN, NATO and others. This analysis will show how Germany uses multilateralism, regional integration and membership in international organizations to influence world politics and advance its own agenda, as well as allowing it to take a leadership role internationally when it comes to peacekeeping and foreign aid missions. This level is of special importance because it takes into account the factors that affect system change such as international terrorism, economic globalization, the general globalization of security policies, etc.

Not only does this level of analysis show how Germany interacts in international systems, it also shows how regional integration has led to a more independent Germany in Europe, allowing it to exercise unilateral policies when the need arises. It is also through the avenues of this level that Germany approaches the vast majority of problems such as terrorism or other international phenomena. From the systemic level we also learn how increased regional integration has affected its identity (European vs. German identity).

Combining insights from these three levels of analysis will show where Germany’s foreign policy is headed in the future. These levels of analysis will also explain the shift Germany is experiencing from being a pure “civilian power” that uses international institutions and a heavy emphasis on diplomacy to execute “soft power” in the international system, to its current policy in Afghanistan which I view as a fusion of “soft” and “hard” power – hard power being a form of foreign policy that utilizes more coercive means, such as the military. Hanns

---

3 “...Germany’s traditional fixation on international prestige [like in Wilhelminian Germany] was gradually replaced by insistence on a distinctive European role in world politics. No doubt, such a transfer of national identity to the European level held special attraction for a nation that was both politically divided and confronted with an ugly past” (Wolf 19).
Maul defines the foreign policy elements of a civilian power as being centered on three principles:

1. The exercise of power in ways to designed to promote a more ‘civilized world.’
2. The willingness to transfer sovereignty to supranational institutions.
3. The promotion of efforts to secure the realization of norms and values of a civilized international order even if this does not provide direct material benefits. (Maul, Germany and the Use of Force 103)

Throughout the course of the paper, I will examine these traits of German foreign policy in particular, because these are what make German foreign policy unique. They provide the theoretical and values background to Germany’s role within the international system and shed light on the evolution of German foreign policy in the post World War II world. These traits also explain why Germany has so consistently been averse to the use of force in order to affect foreign policy goals.

I have chosen to describe German identity in the eras my chapters cover through a selection of German literature. The works of specific German authors will offer a lens through which to view German culture and its socio-political motivations and values. Particularly in Germany are political values and interests reflected in literature. The authors I have chosen range from Goethe to Günter Grass, to Günter Gaus and Wladimir Kaminer, each offering a unique perspective on aspects of German identity.
Summary and breakdown of the chapters

After World War II, Germany was left poor and weak in the middle of Europe with virtually no say in international politics and with a severe restriction on sovereignty\(^4\), as it was occupied by the allied powers. In this post war period Germany followed a relatively stable foreign policy strategy until unification and had a relatively constant sense of national identity, largely due to the bipolar nature of international affairs during the Cold War and the generation of decision makers in power.

The major goal of German foreign policy after World War II was the successful integration into (Western) international institutions\(^5\) in order to facilitate a normalization of its international affairs. However, this goal couldn’t be pursued too zealously due to the breakup of Germany into Eastern and Western halves in 1949: getting too close to its Western European neighbors and the United States could run the risk of antagonizing the Soviet Union and jeopardize any possible unification with East Germany, while becoming too friendly with Eastern Europe could alienate Germany’s western neighbors and prolong regaining its sovereignty. West Germany’s close relationship with the West and its heavy reliance upon funds from the U.S. Marshall Plan offered the interesting juxtaposition of Germany as a Western satellite state in opposition to the Soviet Union’s Eastern European satellites.

This means that West Germany, in essence, tried to practice as little unilateral policy making as possible, and relied on its membership in various institutions to advance policy goals.

\(^4\) Viotti and Kauppi define sovereignty as “[a] claim to political authority based on territory and autonomy…. Internally it is the right claimed by states to exercise exclusive political authority over a defined geographic space or territory; it also includes the claim to a right to autonomy. No external actor such as another state enjoys authority within the borders of the state. A sovereign state claims a right to exercise *internal* sovereignty over its territory and *external* sovereignty in terms of relations with other states.…. (Viotti 567)”

\(^5\) An international institution can be defined as any regional or international organization or supranational organization of states (examples: EU, ASEAN, UN, NATO, NAFTA, Mercosur, etc.).
This corresponded (according to neofunctionalist integration theory) to a slow shift from national loyalty to one of belonging to something greater, something supranational; the European community. Additionally, this offers insight into the increasingly valid question of whether German (and EU) citizens should feel European or local loyalties. While West German integration into this regional institution meant that it would end up relinquishing sovereignty in certain policy areas, it provided Germany with a venue to slowly expand its role and standing in the post 1945 world.

In the time since unification Germany has developed its own way of dealing with an increasingly interconnected international system, as well as a way to gain influence in international politics without being a great military power. For most of the post-war period it was largely Germany’s militaristic past that led it to place restrictions on itself and its international involvement. It was only after unification, during the last 15 or so years that Germany has begun to take on a leading role in international politics beyond the European sphere.

Now as the most populous country and largest economy in Europe, Germany has an important role in European and world politics; it is already a dominant player in the region and is expanding its role internationally. Germany has slowly been asserting itself more and more on the world stage, both bilaterally and through its NATO and UN missions. Currently Germany is involved in Afghanistan through NATO. To illustrate changes in its foreign policy and identity

---

6 “[T]he process of whereby political actors in several distinct national settings are persuaded to shift their loyalties, expectations and political activities toward a new centre, whose institutions possess or demand jurisdiction over the pre-existing national states” (Eilstrup-Sangiovani) is how Ernst Haas described the idea of changing loyalties during the process of regional (in this case European) integration. This description holds particular relevance with regard to Konrad Adenauer’s initial post-war policy of Western integration.

7 Neofunctionalism is a theory based on David Mitrany’s theory of functionalism, whereby in neofunctionalism “what drove functional cooperation was the work of important political groups whose interests favored integration. (Ginsberg, 69)”
since unification, an exploration of its role in Afghanistan will be undertaken. This will shed light on the development of German foreign policy from an Entwicklungshilfe role – one that sees Germany contributing the vast majority of its foreign aid resources to development projects, i.e. “soft power” – to a more active, military role, “hard power” – which applies to its current role in Afghanistan.  

The NATO mission and the presence of foreign troops in Afghanistan has been a contentious international issue, not only in the context of Afghan history, but also because the Afghan mission is a pivotal example of the evolution of German foreign policy. While there are German soldiers on the ground in Afghanistan, most of them are stationed in the relatively peaceful North, doing peacekeeping and civilian reconstruction work, and not in the more dangerous South, where there are fire fights on a daily basis involving mostly British, Dutch, Canadian, and American soldiers.

Afghanistan is also only the second time since World War II that Germany has been militarily involved in a foreign conflict. The first time was the NATO mission to Kosovo, which some saw as a direct result of Germany’s unilateral recognition of Croatian and Slovenian independence in 1991. Germany’s role in Afghanistan is constantly changing and evolving. Currently, Germany is the third largest supplier of soldiers to Afghanistan, and recently it has agreed to expand the number of its soldiers there by 600 (Der Spiegel “US-Regierung lobt 

---

8 The term soft power originated from Joseph Nye, who according to its institutionalized nature also coined it co-optive power. According to Joseph Nye soft or “[c]o-optive power is the ability of a country to structure a situation so that other countries develop preferences or define their interests in ways consistent with its own. This power tends to arise from such resources as cultural and ideological attraction as well as rules and institutions of international regimes.” (Nye 168) His explanation of the term soft power refers to strategies and techniques exemplified by the diplomatic and civic power strategies of German foreign policy. For further information on the application of soft power in today’s international system with particular reference to Barak Obama’s current foreign policy strategies please see Philadelphia Inquirer foreign policy columnist Trudy Rubin’s interview with Joseph Nye (video available online at http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=F8udhM8QKxg).
Deutschland für Truppenaufstockung”), from 3500. This shows Germany’s increasing engagement in missions that involve the use of both hard and soft power.

In the first chapter I will describe West Germany’s post World War II policies and its post war image of itself. With respect to foreign policy this means West German integration into Western regional and international systems such as the European Community and NATO, its Western-oriented foreign policy, and Germany’s “blank check”\(^9\) regional policies. To explain West German national identity after World War II, I examine how Germany’s collective Holocaust guilt has influenced its foreign policy and perception of itself. I will use writers such as Günter Grass and Peter Schneider to explain German post-war identity.

The second chapter will discuss Germany after unification\(^10\) and the disappearance of Cold War structural constraints. This chapter is important not only because we now enter into contemporary German politics and issues, but also because the 1990s marked a time when Germany began to become aware of its regional and international capabilities. Post-unification Germany marked a slight change from its previous purely multilateral policy making, to one of increased self-awareness and occasional unilateralism – as exemplified by Germany’s unilateral recognition of Croatian and Slovenian independence. This is interesting not only because this recognition came under Helmut Kohl and his CDU-led administration, and Germany’s subsequent military role in the Kosovo NATO mission happened under a Social Democratic (SPD) and Green coalition, but also because Germany had to come to terms with unification and the conflicting mindsets and identities of Eastern and Western Germans.

\(^9\) This is a self-coined term referring to Germany’s willingness to consistently cover EU finance gaps and fund international military missions it is not involved in.

\(^10\) I use “unification” instead of “re-unification” because I find the term “re-unification” to be misleading, since the Germany created in 1990 had never existed in that form before. To quote Günter Grass: “I’d really like to avoid the word reunification, because it implies a return to what existed before” (Grass 46).
My third and last chapter explores today’s internationally engaged and self-aware Germany. It will discuss how Germany has increasingly taken to exerting and expressing unilateral policies and ideals. It begins at the turn of the century and shows how Germany has learned from both its past mistakes and its successes in the international arena. I argue that it was Germany’s successful participation in the Kosovo mission and its desire to move beyond its guilt-ridden past that allowed Gerhard Schröder to dismiss German involvement in America’s war in Iraq and become one of the world’s largest critics of this mission, another case of external factors shaping German foreign policy and self-perception.

The current German administration’s view that the war in Afghanistan is one worth fighting is also a culmination of the lessons it learned during the time covered in the first two chapters. Here I will explain why Germany finds the Afghan war so important and detail Germany’s century long relationship with that country. I will also show how current German foreign policy is the result of twenty-first century challenges such as international terrorism – an important factor for supporting the war in Afghanistan. This chapter will rely heavily upon newspaper articles and other sources of current events due to the contemporary and constantly changing nature of the events discussed.

To conclude the chapter I will try to explain German identity today and how this impacts its foreign policy. What motivates this Einwanderungsland of 82 million citizens? (Europa size and population chart). How does this affect Germany’s perception of and role in the world? The answers to these questions taken in tandem with the evolution and current state of German foreign policy should provide insight into how Germany’s international role will change and the direction its foreign policy will take in the future.
It is my argument that due to Germany’s increasingly multi-cultural and cosmopolitan make-up and its constantly increasing economic and civil strength, Germany will stop shying away from military intervention in foreign countries. However, because of its national consciousness of the crimes it perpetrated during World War II and its heavy integration into international institutions, Germany will not go about such intervention unilaterally. Rather, it will continue to operate multilaterally under the auspices of organizations such as NATO or European Union peacekeeping missions.
CHAPTER ONE: 1945-1990

From total defeat to the European Coal and Steel Community (1945 - 1952)

Due to the broad nature of this chapter and the length of the time frame discussed, I relied heavily on a number of textbooks that offered detailed summaries of the time period. For this, the content is heavily indebted to Desmond Dinan’s political textbooks.

The end of World War II marked a major international system change, as borders around the world were redrawn and a bi-polar world order was born in the aftermath. After the war Germany was left utterly defeated and discredited in the center of Europe and viewed as an international pariah due to its aggressive, militaristic culture. Its unconditional surrender also meant that it no longer had a say or influence in regional or international relations, something compounded by the fact that it was also occupied by the allied powers (United States, Great Britain, France and the Soviet Union).

This, along with the beginnings of the Cold War, formed the first challenge of reconstructing post-war Europe. The Allies were largely divided over what the new Germany should look like, with France initially calling for Germany to be “demilitarized, decentralized, and deindustrialized” (Dinan *Ever Close Union* 20). That is to say, they, especially France, wanted a complete dismantling of the German state, because France had suffered grievously from German militarism and expansionism, far more than either Britain or the United States. The humiliation and horror of World War II – defeat and occupation, deportation and enslavement, pillage and destruction – would not quickly be forgotten. (Dinan *Ever Closer Union* 20)
However, reason quickly triumphed over revanchist policies, and the Allies – particularly France – realized that in order for Europe to be rebuilt strong, stable and secure, there must be a strong, revitalized Germany at its center, especially in the face of an increasingly antagonistic Soviet Union. To understand how Germany reacted to this new world order the systemic level of analysis needs to be applied first.

Initially (however unsuccessfully) European integration was actually jumpstarted by the United States. In order to re-energize the European economy the U.S. set up the European Recovery Program – more commonly known as the Marshall Plan – by which it infused billions of dollars in hard currency and loans into the European economy. In order to foster cooperation (both political and economic) the U.S required that the nations of Europe set up an umbrella organization through which the funds would be divided among them.

What the U.S. hoped to create here was Europe’s first voluntary supranational organization11, something that would hopefully set the tone for further integration. Unfortunately for the Americans this hope never came to fruition, and the Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC) remained a weak umbrella body whose sole function was as a stage for the nations of Europe to squabble over Marshall Fund monies (Dinan 57-8).

It did, though, set the tone for more integration efforts down the line, embodied in particular by early Franco-German state level cooperation under Charles de Gaulle and Konrad Adenauer – who also dealt with de Gaulle’s successors until he returned to power – as they spearheaded moves for European integration, which initially culminated in the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) in 1952.

---

11 Unlike the previous more forced versions: The Holy Roman Empire, Napoleon’s Empire, etc.
The rationale for creating the ECSC was rooted in the belief that through economic integration in key areas member state well-being would necessarily depend upon that of other member states, thus if not eliminating the possibility for future war, then at least lessening the desire for it due the drastic consequences that would arise.\textsuperscript{12} The downside of this, however, as briefly mentioned earlier, was that this form of integration requires the creation of supranational organizations to assure that the institution functions smoothly, something that not all European nations were too keen on.

This was seen as undesirable for nations like France or Great Britain – although France later acquiesced to a watered-down version of supranationalism, as is seen by their participation in the ECSC – because it required them to relinquish sovereignty in key policy areas. But, for a nation such as Germany which was already occupied by outside powers and only had limited domestic sovereignty anyway, passing authority to a supranational organization in certain policy areas wasn’t such a problem. In fact it had the double benefit of allowing Germany to integrate itself into Western institutions\textsuperscript{13} as well as provide it with a location where its voice could be heard in matters affecting its national interests and allow it to start exerting regional influence in certain policy areas.

The ECSC started in 1950 as the Schuman Plan, named after the French Foreign Minister Robert Schuman. In it he proposed that “The Six,” Germany, France, Italy and the Benelux countries – Belgium, Luxembourg and the Netherlands – pool strategic resources and manage them jointly in order to foster lasting peace. The key members in this quest for regional integration were Germany and France, and this marked the beginning of Franco-German postwar

\textsuperscript{12} Largely according to neofunctionalist theory put forward by Ernst Haas
\textsuperscript{13} Adenauer also viewed integrating Germany into Western institutions like the ECSC, NATO, etc. as Germany’s European reintegration. Interestingly enough he didn’t see improved relations or integration with Eastern European countries in the same light.
cooperation. These two were arguably the two most important players in the creation of the ECSC, as coal, one of the key resources that were to be pooled, rested in large deposits along the Franco-German border.

Germany especially was enthusiastic about this idea:

… keenly aware of the depth of French distrust toward the new Federal Republic, Adenauer realized that shared sovereignty pointed the way to Germany’s international rehabilitation. Only by integrating closely with neighboring countries could Germany hope to remove the remaining controls on its domestic and foreign policies. (Dinan Ever Close Union 23)

From very early on, then, West German politicians used what few avenues were open to them to great advantage in order to regain influence in the international system. From the very moment it was able to, under Chancellor Konrad Adenauer – who also acted as his own Foreign Minister –, West German foreign policy emphasized multilateralism and integration in (Western) international organizations and institutions in order to gain political influence.

A good summation of this strategy is offered by Scott Erb:

[The Germans] learned that, lacking complete sovereignty, their best strategy was to form cooperative institutional arrangements within which they could earn the trust of allies and use ‘soft power’ to pursue interests without appearing aggressive. They realized that by integrating into the West and stressing common values, they could achieve respect and policy success” (Erb 2).
Further European integration and German rearment

After the economic and political success of the ECSC the Six decided to go forward with further integration, especially given the increasing belligerence of the Soviet Union\textsuperscript{14} and other Communist nations. In 1950 North Korea invaded South Korea, setting off the Korean War, which was essentially a proxy war between the United States and the Soviet Union. Many in Europe thought the Korean War was merely a warm-up, to be followed by an invasion of Europe by the Soviet Union.

The desire for further integration first manifested itself in the European Defense Community (EDC) that was proposed as a European military force with integrated German units that could function as a European alternative to NATO. The reason behind the EDC was U.S. pressure to re-arm Germany, once again in particular with relation to the Korean conflict, and an integrated European military was all that the French were initially willing to accept. It was also intended to make Europe contribute more to continental defense, rather than rely solely on U.S. military support.

However, French and European fears of a resurgent Germany due to rearment became evident during negotiations on the make-up of the EDC. At first the other members of the Six were hesitant about allowing Germany to rearment itself, with France openly hostile to the idea, and once it conceded to German rearment as an inevitability, France did not want to allow large German military units in the EDC, nor allow Germans into any leadership positions. This incensed Adenauer, who demanded equal treatment of Germany in all integration and diplomatic

\textsuperscript{14} The 1948 coup in Czechoslovakia and the Berlin Blockade (which resulted in the Berlin air lift), for example (Erb 23).
efforts. “If shared sovereignty was good enough for German industry, Adenauer asked, why was it not also acceptable for German rearmament?” (Dinan Ever Closer Union 28).

Eventually, the EDC was signed into power, with Germany on equal footing with the other ECSC members. Ultimately though, the EDC failed after being rejected by the French parliament in 1954, ironically not due to German membership in the organization, but due to the possibility of British membership. Despite its ultimate failure in terms of European security integration, the short life of the EDC showed that West Germany was succeeding in integrating and rehabilitating itself into Europe on equal footing with its neighbors. “Through the mechanism of Europe, West Germany had taken a significant step toward full sovereignty and military revival” (Clay Large 152).

Additionally, bringing West Germany and its military into the fold of the EDC was also strategically targeted to achieve long-term German sovereignty goals. Adenauer “… also claimed that Bonn’s participation [in the EDC] would help bring about German re-unification because the Soviets would be ‘ready to talk’ once they could not forcefully expand their empire” (Clay Large 152).

Regardless of the presumed benefits for EDC and eventual NATO membership, both required overcoming a major post-war hurdle: the question of German rearmament. The horrors of World War II and the German military’s annihilation at the hands of the Allies put a severe political and societal damper on the Germans’ desire for rearming. Nevertheless, Adenauer and many of West Germany’s allies saw rearmament as a necessity not only for rehabilitating and integrating the FRG into Western institutions, but also in the larger European context of continental overreliance on the United States for security.
Once the EDC failed, the question still remained of how to integrate Germany into Western European security. The only viable answer to this question was German membership in NATO. At first rearmament was only supported by the United States and Britain, with the rest of Europe still hesitant to see Germany with a new national army so soon after another World War, but Korea and other international factors, and the United States’ staunch support, soon warmed Germany’s other neighbors up to the idea as well. For Adenauer and West Germany, rearming and joining NATO was less about rebuilding the Germany army, and more about further equal integration into Western institutions. On May 5, 1955, Germany became a full member of NATO and then on November 12, 1955, Germany rearmed and created the Bundeswehr (the German army), which with 400,000 soldiers came to be the largest standing army in Europe after the Soviet Red Army (Erb 29-32). Thus West Germany went from using integration as a tool for rehabilitation and legitimization of the West German state to one for attaining sovereignty and as a tool for exerting regional and international power.

Integration troubles and Germany’s open-wallet policy

Germany’s first great challenge to integration in the European system came during negotiations for the creation of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) that was put forward by Charles de Gaulle and France in order to protect its large, rural agricultural sector. By instituting the CAP France hoped to guarantee a regional market (the members of the ECSC or the European Community) where French farmers could sell their goods at stable prices and not have to compete with cheaper international agricultural imports.
This, of course, was unfortunate for Germany,\textsuperscript{15} who could take advantage of international markets and import its food from countries such as the United States much more cheaply. Although the CAP did end up entering into force, it remained a heavily contested issue of European integration, especially when it came to its funding. When the European Commission, then chaired by the West German Walter Hallstein, attempted to adopt a supranational approach to CAP funding, against de Gaulle’s wishes, de Gaulle had the political equivalent of a hissy fit.

He demanded that the CAP continue to be funded by national contributions which were agreed upon through intergovernmental negotiations. In protest of the Commission’s vehement desire to retain for itself and the European Parliament control of the budget, de Gaulle withdrew France’s permanent Commission representative, causing the Empty Chair Crisis, which in essence crippled the Commission’s job because every member state had to be involved for measures to be passed or adopted.

European arm-wrangling and French nitpicking aside, what is important about the initial CAP debates is how Germany wound up in its funding net. The budget for the CAP can be seen as the first instance of the German “open wallet” policy. Because the CAP was principally targeted at French farmers, it can be readily postulated that it would be detrimental to the Germans, as they would be required to buy agricultural goods at higher prices than previously. Not only were the prices of goods regulated, but the French farmers also needed help in their production. The result was that Germany had to pay for French goods twice over: they paid for the initial subsidies, and then got hit again by having to purchase their subsidized goods at above world market prices.

\textsuperscript{15} Germany couldn’t produce enough food for its entire population, so it imported a significant amount of it.
One reason Germany did this was for the overall benefit of the European Community, since this was their main venue for regional influence and postwar validation. No one in the European Community at the time could agree on a satisfactory solution to the problem, so Germany, then already one of the strongest economies in Europe, decided to just dump money on the problem and move forward; something which it would do with increasing frequency in later years.\textsuperscript{16}

Two Germanys: A split national identity?

To explore German national identity, I want to focus on a few contemporary authors; the writers Günter Grass, Peter Schneider, and Timothy Garton Ash, and the politician Günter Gaus, as well as on a poem by the quintessential example of the German \textit{Kulturnation}, Johann Wolfgang von Goethe. The dramatic International System change after World War II had an enormous impact on German national identity and how it went about affecting its foreign policy goals. It is through the examples of these writers that I hope to demonstrate the changes and norms of German national identity.

Günter Grass is one of the more prolific and celebrated writers of the German post-war period, and arguably, one of the most referenced authors when it comes to defining Germany’s national identity. Grass is probably most famous for his book \textit{The Tin Drum} in which the questionable parentage and passage to maturity of the main character are supposed to symbolize postwar Germany. In 1999 he won the Nobel Prize in literature. He is proponent of the German idea of collective guilt concerning the Holocaust and espouses it continuously in \textit{Two States} –

\textsuperscript{16} E.g., funding of the first Gulf War without being actively involved in it as well as other international crisis situations to be discussed later in the paper.
One Nation?, a collection of his speeches, interviews, and conversations published in 1990. He also focuses on the notion of German unification, its ramifications and the differences in the mindsets of East and West Germans.

When discussing how German history should weigh on all Germans’ minds, especially with consideration for unification, Grass writes:

We [Germans] should be aware – as our neighbors are – of how much grief this unified state caused, of what misfortune it brought to others and to ourselves as well. The crime of genocide, summed up in the image of Auschwitz, inexcusable from whatever angle you view it, weighs on the conscience of this unified state. Never before in their history had the Germans brought down upon themselves such terrifying shame. Until then, they were no better or worse than other peoples. But the megalomania born of their complexes led them to reject the possibility of being a cultural nation within a federation and to insist instead on the creation of a unified state in the form of a Reich – by any and all means. This state laid the foundation for Auschwitz. (Grass 6)

While Grass’ personal idea of self-loathing and shame as a manifestation of German national identity seems extreme, a milder version of it did pervade German society in the postwar period, and still clings to the German subconscious today, as evidenced by ongoing parliamentary debates concerning German soldiers abroad.

He then issues lessons learned from this experience and Germany’s mission in the new international system: “… both states have an obligation to prevent future wars, to contribute more than other countries to the reduction of tensions, the tensions first of all in their own house, between Germans” (Grass 38).
In context with West Germany’s post war foreign policy and its hesitation to rearm itself, it is clear that the sense of collective guilt prevalent in Grass’ idea of German identity significantly influenced German policy making. West Germany’s preference for multilateralism and close European integration can be seen as a direct byproduct of learning its lesson from the shame it brought upon itself in World War II. The FRG learned that overly nationalistic policies and aggressive unilateral policies can have very adverse side effects. Indeed, Germany’s past has made it unique in comparison to other large, influential countries, in that it doesn’t engage in policies without intense self-reflection. “To nations with happier pasts, this relentless self-examination may seem excessive or even faintly comical; but we would really start worrying if Germany stopped worrying,” writes Garton Ash in *The Uses of Adversity* (73).

The division of Germany into Eastern and Western halves also had a strong impact on the Germans’ perception of themselves. West Germany adopted a Western European social market economy and democracy, while East Germany turned into a communist dictatorship. Each Germany claimed to represent the “true Germany,” which added a whole new layer to the perpetual search for a German national identity. The side of the wall a German lived on shaped his view of the outside world and countries like the United States, with West Germans being significantly more pro-American than the East Germans.  

---

17 Garton Ash makes an interesting statement that goes a long way toward explaining West Germany’s pro-western stance and policy of integrating into Western political institutions as well as its close relationship with the United States: “The Americanization of the Federal Republic goes far deeper than the Sovietization of the GDR” (Garton Ash *The Uses of Adversity* 80). With this statement he is also referring to how little the country has changed in East Germany, and that when a traveler is passing through the Mark of Brandenburg for example, it looks “… still much as Theodor Fontane described it a century ago” (Garton Ash *The Uses of Adversity* 79). This also rationalizes the East German idea of being the “true Germany” and gives further insight into the identity conflict faced by Germans in a divided Germany.
This feeling of being German, but at the same time being enclosed within either Eastern or Western borders, is illustrated in the novel The Wall Jumper by Peter Schneider. Concerning himself and his friend Pommerer from East Berlin, Schneider writes:

The first English sentence Pommerer learned: Ami, go home.
My first English sentence: Have you chewing gun?
Thirty-five years later, these differences are the cornerstone of defense budgets.

(qtd. Garton Ash Uses of Adversity 91)

In these three sentences Schneider captures the duplicity of identities of the two Germanys and their perception of a world power, the United States, as well as their socio-political perceptions of themselves.

By using the example of a second language Schneider portrays the differences in national ideologies in the two Germanys as dictated by their regional hegemons – in West Germany the United States was viewed as a liberator and its closest ally, but in East Germany the United States was to be viewed with suspicion because its capitalist society was the antithesis of the Soviet interpretation of the Communist model. This exchange also offers a reflection of world politics, as Germany was at the center of the Cold War due to its geographic location in Europe, and since it was split between the two super powers it was also the site of an ideological battle between capitalism and communism.

I want to conclude this section on German and East/West German identity perceptions with a remark from Günter Gaus involving a poem from Goethe. I’ve decided to focus on this specific aspect of Gaus’ memoir Wo Deutschland liegt: Eine Ort Bestimmung \(^\text{18}\) because it

---

\(^{18}\) It is on the dust jacket of the book.
involves Gaus, the first head of intra-German relations, on a visit to Weimar, East Germany, and because Goethe is one of the most well-known German writers of all time.

On the sleeve of his book Gaus recounts how he and his wife were visiting the Goethe-Haus in Weimar, when another visitor to the house – an East German – approached his wife and gave her a leaf from the famous gingko biloba tree that is said to have been tended by Goethe himself. Upon handing her the leaf and reflecting on the coalescent nature of the ginkgo leaves, the East German recited the last two stanzas of Goethe’s poem Gingko Biloba:

Ist es ein lebendig Wesen,

Das sich in sich selbst getrennt?

Sind es zwei, die sich erlesen,

Daß man sie als eines kennt?

Solche Frage zu erwidern,

Fand ich wohl den rechten Sinn:

Fühlst du nicht an meinen Liedern,

Daß ich eins und doppelt bin?19

The East German was using the gingko leaf as a metaphor for the current state of German affairs. I find this encounter important for several reasons, not the least of which is Goethe’s status as the ultimate figure in German literature. There is also the importance of the physical location of Weimar in East Germany, part of a communist bloc not exactly well-known for its liberal attitudes towards literature and cultural heritage sites, and the use of the gingko leaf as a metaphor for a divided Germany.

19 Quoted from the dust jacket of Wo Deutschland liegt: Eine Ortbestimmung.
The significance of the East German reciting a Goethe poem is that while Germany may be split into Eastern and Western halves, Germans still had a common literary or cultural identity that had been alive and evolving for hundreds of years. And while they may find themselves on opposite sides of walls and barbed wire fences, there is still an underlying, all-encompassing sense of unity or togetherness that transcends the boundaries of things such as the Cold War.

The fact that this encounter happened in the town of Weimar, considered the historic center of German literature and culture, is also important. During the Cold War it was part of East Germany and little if anything was done to preserve its rich cultural heritage. The recitation of the poem by an East German in this town is laden with importance, since it shows retention of this cultural idea despite the lack of official state preservation. This is where the metaphor of the leaf comes in. The shape of the leaf looks like a fusion of two separate leaves, something that can be viewed as a symbol of the hopeful unification of the two Germanys.²⁰

The ideas of these writers suggest that while a divided Germany did exist and followed its respective post-war policy strategies and trajectories, there always seemed to be an underlying sense of common identity no matter how different the two nations looked to be. This sense of common identity was manifested in the slow harmonization of German policies with respect to their bilateral relations with one another, a harmonization that came to be embodied by a former West Berlin mayor, when he came to office in the German parliament in Bonn and began to shape West German foreign policy not only towards East Germany, but also to the Eastern bloc and the Soviet Union as a whole.

²⁰ Although, if looked at from a different perspective it could also should the growing apart of the two Germany’s.
The first great ideological shift from Konrad Adenauer’s policy of intense integration into Western and regional institutions came when Willy Brandt entered office as German Chancellor in 1969 after he had been Vice-Chancellor and Foreign Minister in a grand CDU/CSU/SPD coalition from 1966-1969. While Adenauer and his successor Erhard’s administrations had been making overtures to the Soviet Union and the Eastern Bloc for a while, it wasn’t until Willy Brandt took office as Chancellor that improving relations with East Germany (GDR) and the East became a central policy point. Brandt’s policy of Ostpolitik marked a pivotal shift in German politics and was seen by contemporary politicians as an equivalent of Adenauer’s reconciliation with the West (Garton Ash In Europe’s Name 33).

Brandt’s Ostpolitik can be explained as laying the groundwork for the normalization of West Germany’s relations with East Germany. It refers to Willy Brandt’s and his Social-Liberal coalition’s specific policies, since it deviated significantly from any previous administration’s approach to the East (Garton Ash In Europe’s Name 36).

The construction of the Berlin Wall in 1961 while Willy Brandt was mayor of West Berlin showed him the necessity of improving relations with East Germany, and by extension, Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. Brandt’s Ostpolitik was not only a deviation from previous German foreign policy due to its eastward orientation, but also because it involved a number of bilateral agreements with Poland, Czechoslovakia, and the Soviet Union, something that previous administrations were hesitant to do because of Germany’s strong policy of multilateralism and regional integration (aside from the Elysee Treaty signed with France).
While it did involve a certain degree of bilateralism, this was done in order to “…normalize relations and pledge adherence to the status quo as a first step toward building wider cooperative structures such as the [Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe] CSCE” (Erb 47). Brandt did balance his Eastern policies with further integration efforts in Western institutions such as supporting the membership of Great Britain in the European Community in 1972.

Ostpolitik also harkened back to German foreign policy strategies of the past, since “Germany had always had trouble balancing its interest in the West with those in the East” (Erb 41). This is important, because try as hard as it might, West Germany simply couldn’t separate itself from certain aspects of its past. And arguably, balancing interests between East and West wasn’t always bad, as that is how Otto von Bismarck managed to insure peace and keep the status quo in late nineteenth-century Europe. So even in a new century with new challenges and a bipolar international system, Germany was still on the fault lines of Central Europe, much as it had been for hundreds of years. It still faced the same geopolitical challenges to its identity and foreign policy.

Willy Brandt also personified the political aspects of Grass’s Two States – One Nation? Günter Grass was also a member of the SPD. Brandt realized the necessity of accepting the existence of the GDR, which was another departure from the policies set out by Adenauer and his successor administrations. Willy Brandt’s embodiment of the political aspects of literary figures such as Günter Grass shows the cyclical interdependence of German national identity and foreign policy.
The 1980s were a turbulent time for West Germany. The Soviets’ modernization of their intermediate nuclear arsenal in the 1970s was seen as an antagonistic move in Europe and set in motion a series of international and regional responses. The modernization of these missiles was extremely worrying for Western European countries since they were the intended target. Europe would either turn into a battleground for World War III if the Soviet Union decided to pursue a conventional invasion or into a total wasteland if the Soviets decided to launch its arsenal of intermediate nuclear missiles at European targets. Being located right in the center of Europe, this was particularly worrying for West Germany as it once again found itself at the forefront of Cold War tensions.

The then-Chancellor of West Germany Helmut Schmidt adopted a two-prong approach to counter this new move from the Soviets. He convinced the United States and NATO to modernize their own intermediate nuclear arsenal in Europe, and NATO to negotiate with the Soviet Union to reduce the number of intermediate nuclear missiles (Erb 56). The United States agreed to update the Pershing I missiles stationed in Europe and Germany with the more modern Pershing II’s, which also had a greater range.

Across-the-board missile modernization was not viewed in a very positive light by the German public. These modernizations made the possibility of a localized (European) nuclear war breaking out seem extremely probable as West Germany would then become a very viable military target, and anti-missile protests and peace protests erupted all over West Germany. Since the United States was the provider of the new Pershing II missiles and seen as antagonistic

21 And the world as, among other things, the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan in 1979 and the Shah of Iran fell.
under the aggressive leadership of Ronald Reagan, many Germans began questioning America’s friendship and its resolve to insure West Germany’s safety in the face of a Soviet nuclear attack as well as its commitment to international arms control.

As a result of these policies anti-American sentiment sprouted in West Germany, a sentiment that found a voice in the popular West German singer from the 1980s, Herbert Grönemeyer, and his song *Amerika* showing the cyclical nature of foreign policy and national identity. It was very critical of the U.S. role and its militaristic policies in the bi-polar world:

*Amerika*

\begin{verbatim}
du kommst als retter in jeder not
zeigst der welt deinen sheriffstern
schickst sattelschlepper in die nacht
bringst dich in stellung, amerika

oh amerika
du hast viel für uns getan

oh amerika
tu uns das nicht an

viele care-pakete hast du uns geschickt
heute raketen, amerika
\end{verbatim}

\footnote{You can listen to the song here: http://www.last.fm/music/Herbert+Gr%C3%B6nemeyer/_/Amerika}
In this song is a reflection of Germany’s post war identity as well as the public criticism of Ronald Reagan’s presidency encased in a literary medium.

http://www.groenemeyer.de/musik/texte/a/amerika/
Being at the forefront of the Cold War, Germans were extremely conscious of the ramifications if hostilities ever did break out between the United States and the Soviet Union. For many Germans these fears took ever more real shape in response to Ronald Reagan’s presidency. Reagan followed a hard-line policy – earning him a reputation as a gun-slinging cowboy - with the Soviet Union that made Germans fear the possible outbreak of war.

The suspicion of Reagan and his policies and the allusion to him as a cowboy are expressed in the first few lines of the song: “zeigst der welt deinen sheriffstern / schickst sattelschlepper in die nacht.” This shows the West German peoples’ growing discontent with their utter reliance upon the United States for national security in the bipolar system.

Furthermore, Grönemeyer shows the still not forgotten German war consciousness in telling the U.S., that if they really need to fight a war, they should do it on their own territory. Also prevalent in the song, as it was in the minds of Germans, was the possibility of complete destruction in a nuclear war, so, Grönemeyer suggests, the U.S. and Soviet Union should take their war to the moon and duke it out there, since it is uninhabited. This sentiment, as well as the desire for East-West unification, is also echoed in a conversation Günter Grass had with Stefan Heym in 1984 where Heym remarks “[we] don’t want to be reunified in death” (Grass 46), meaning that if Europe gets destroyed in a nuclear war, Eastern and Western divisions will no longer matter.24

This is another example of the cyclical relationship of foreign policy and national identity. The realities of the international system necessitated that Willy Brandt adopt his Ostpolitik, a policy which reflected the literature and ideals of Günter Grass. In the 1980s the

---

24 Stefan Heym was from East Germany.
system necessitated a policy of missile modernization which affected identity perceptions to the point that significant anti war and anti military protests broke out all over West Germany.

This chapter covered the German time frame from 1945 (the end of World War II) until 1990 and the lead-up to German unification. The chapter examined West German foreign policy as a vehicle for West German integration into Western regional institutions and its postwar rehabilitation. A major shift in foreign policy priorities occurred when Willy Brandt became Chancellor in 1969 and he began executing his Ostpolitik in order to improve relations with East Germany, the Eastern bloc and the Soviet Union. Willy Brandt also provided a concrete example of the interdependence of national identity in foreign policy as he personified the political aspects of literary writers such as Günter Grass.

The main theme in postwar German national identity was the sense of collective guilt that the population faced as a result of the atrocities of World War II and the Holocaust. This guilt and West Germany’s war consciousness helped lead it to its policy of integration in Western institutions, a policy which then firmly entrenched Germany in organizations such as NATO, the European Union and the U.N. By the time German unification was achieved in 1990 Germany had become a rehabilitated member of the international system.
CHAPTER TWO: POST UNIFICATION GERMANY

Introduction

This chapter focuses on Germany’s perception of itself internationally after unification and the strategies it adopted in order to attain a state of normalization. During the postwar period Germany’s role as lying between the Soviet Union and the West as well as its collective war and Holocaust guilt strongly impacted how it defined itself. However, after the Cold War ended and Germany was unified it faced not only foreign policy challenges, but also an identity struggle which is examined through the perspective of the film Das Versprechen, whose screen play was written by Peter Schneider. Germany had never been united like this – in the form of an advanced Western democracy – before, and its unification as a world economic powerhouse in the center of Europe led many scholars and world leaders to worry that Germany would return to pre-World War II power politics.

In particular this chapter addresses how Germany used its integration in international institutions and soft power strategies to address international issues such as the first Gulf War and the Balkan crises of the 1990s. It shows that even after unification Germany continued on its track of institutional entrenchment and emphasis on multilateral efforts to solve international problems. Germany’s role in the Balkan crises as well as its relatively unilateral recognition of Croatian and Slovenian independence in 1991 show that while Germany was indeed remaining in its multilateralist fold, it wasn’t shying away from promoting its own views of the international system or from assuming leadership in international missions.
The chapter then concludes with Germany’s role in the NATO Kosovo mission in 1999. It is argued that German participation in this peacekeeping mission solidified its role as an equal in international and regional institutions such as NATO, and paved the way for Germany to begin assuming leadership roles in these institutions.

Big surprise and a marked success for multilateralism and integration

The second major international system change that deeply impacted German national identity and foreign policy was German unification and the end of the Cold War. On 3 October 1990, forty-five years of German division came to an end when the Unification Treaty took effect – it had been signed on 30 August, 1990 (Article 45 of The Unification Treaty). It was a momentous occasion and would play a dramatic role in the way Germany would behave and perceive itself in world politics. Gone were the days of a bi-polar system where Germany had to toe the line between Western and Eastern spheres of influence.

Unification came largely as a surprise, with few people predicting or even expecting it, and was remarkable for its peaceful nature. “If the first unification of Germany was made with blood and iron, the second took only words and money” remarks Garton Ash (Garton Ash History of the Present 53), referring to Bismarck’s unification of Germany under Prussia.

In the late 1980s the “West German elite had accepted the post-World War II status quo as legitimate, in at least the middle term” (Erb 92). This meant that while West Germany was still actively pursuing unification with East Germany it would continue doing so in its traditional multilateral diplomatic style, an approach that moved forward very slowly, with the goal of unification being something that would likely only occur in the distant future. In fact, even as
late as 1988 Helmut Kohl, who was German Chancellor during unification, mentioned that he probably wouldn’t “live long enough to experience reunification” (Erb 92).

German unification had a number of changes in store for the German people and government. While Germany was still a divided country the four Allied powers had ultimate sway over German sovereignty, since it was still technically an occupied country. After unification, however, Germany became fully sovereign thanks to the Treaty on the Final Settlement with Respect to Germany – also known as the Two plus Four Treaty. In this treaty the Allied powers rescinded all their rights to control over Germany. Germany also recognized its border with Poland – the Oder-Neisse Line –, relinquished claims to pre World War II territories, and reduced the size of its military, which after unification absorbed the East German army as well (Articles 1 and 3 of the Two Plus Four Treaty).

Additionally, this treaty reaffirmed Germany’s preference to work with and through international institutions as well as its departure from its militaristic past:

The Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic reaffirm their declarations that only peace will emanate from German soil. According to the constitution of the united Germany, acts tending to and undertaken with the intent to disturb the peaceful relations between nations, especially to prepare for aggressive war, are unconstitutional and a punishable offence. The Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic declare that the united Germany will never employ any of its weapons except in accordance with its constitution and the Charter of the United Nations (Article 2 of the Two Plus Four Treaty).
Of course with full sovereignty came greater responsibility for its foreign policy, and article two of the Two plus Four Treaty confirmed that Germany would not begin to follow a series of unilateral foreign policies, as many in Europe initially feared once unification became a possibility. In reference to this treaty Scott Erb writes:

> on September 12, 1990, the four powers signed over their residual postwar rights, allowing Germany to regain sovereignty. Adenauer’s Westpolitik had combined with Brandt’s Ostpolitik to achieve everything either of them wanted: prosperity, integration with the West, peaceful unification, and an end to the Cold War (Erb 102).

With these developments in mind, Germany’s 45 year long strategy of integration and multilateralism had been a fantastic success.

Unified German identity?

The shock and surprise experienced during the fall of the Berlin Wall and German unification wasn’t relegated solely to the political sphere. The end of the East German state and (re)creation of a unified Germany had very real cultural and societal impacts on the German people, especially those from the East. Gone was their socialist state of guaranteed employment and housing, they now had to contend with a free market economy and compete for jobs. Unfortunately, the East German system didn’t prepare the majority of its citizens for this type of reality, and many of its citizens had a difficult time coming to terms with their situation in a unified Germany. The disparity between East and West is something that can still be seen today,
where unemployment rates and economic wellbeing tend to be worse in the former East German states.

Insight into the cultural and societal challenges raised by unification can be provided by a variety of literary mediums. As before, it is imperative to approach this concept from a literary angle because examination from this perspective gives insight into the political motivations and interdependence of national identity and politics. For the sake of brevity I will focus on the film *Das Versprechen* (screen play written by Peter Schneider and directed by Margarethe von Trotta). The film follows the paths of two lovers, Sophie and Konrad, who spend their lives on opposite sides of the wall. In the fall of 1961 Sophie escapes into West Berlin via the sewers with her friends from school, while Konrad ends up staying behind, promising to meet her on the other side. The political upheavals and increasing tensions of the Cold War make it so that Konrad never actually leaves the GDR, causing him and Sophie to grow apart and eventually marry other people.

Throughout the course of the film the schisms between East and West are brought to light. When Sophie and her friends emerge from the sewers in West Berlin one of her friends rushes to and hugs a car: a Ford Taunus, exclaiming “Ich liebe Ford Taunus!” (*Das Versprechen*), since these are apparently unavailable in the East. But on a deeper level this exemplifies exactly what Garton Ash mentioned as a difference between the East and West: “[t]he Americanization of the Federal Republic goes far deeper than the Sovietization of the GDR” (Garton Ash *The Uses of Adversity* 80). If this was a shock and great surprise to a group of young students who purposefully risked their lives in order to reach this country, one can only imagine the scale of shock and bewilderment that would have been encountered by the millions of East Germans when the Berlin Wall came down and they “emigrated” to the West en masse.
The film portrays how the identities of the two Germanys are disparate and highlights their respective value sets and how they conflict with each other. However, despite their differences, a common thread seems to permeate German consciousness on both sides of the wall, an overarching sense of common Germanness that rises above political ideologies. This is shown throughout the film when Germans on both sides of the Wall either discuss the Wall not lasting for very long or comment on the inhumanity of separating families due to political tensions.

At the end of the film, when the Wall finally falls, this is met with euphoria by most Germans from both countries. But while this was a momentous occasion in German history, it wasn’t met without sorrow. As the camera pans through the celebrating crowds of Berlin it rests on several older, middle aged Germans who have dazed expressions on their faces, and aren’t partaking in the celebration surrounding them:

1. Reporter: Und Sie jubeln nicht?
   Frau: Für mich kommt es zu spät.

1. Reporter: Aber Sie freuen sich doch?
   Frau: Wenn nach dreißig Jahren der Käfig aufgemacht wird, kann man nicht mehr fliegen. (Schneider and von Trotta 128)

This shock and how it is personified in the German psyche is summed up in the last scene of the film. When after years of separation Konrad and Sophie glimpse each other across a mass of celebrating people in a united Germany, the film ends. There is no resolution for their relationship. It is left open.

This symbolizes the uncertainty of a unified Germany, an uncertainty that was feared by many of Germany’s European neighbors as no one was quite sure what Germany would do once
it was unified into a single state in the center of Europe. It was feared that Germany, which was by then one of the leading economic powers in the world, would try and turn some of its economic power into military might, and perhaps – in a worst-case scenario – try to regain some of the territory it had lost after the war. However, as has become evident and was also set down in the Two Plus Four Treaty, these fears proved to be unfounded as Germany continued on its multilateral, soft power-wielding path of being a civilian power.

Germany and the first Gulf War

Almost immediately after unification Germany faced its first foreign policy challenge as a united, sovereign state. Saddam Hussein had invaded Kuwait and the UN and Germany’s NATO allies were set to liberate the country. With all the domestic upheaval caused by absorbing East Germany, Berlin was in no position to become involved in this conflict. However, with the military intervention in Iraq receiving a UN mandate and NATO committing troops to the invasion of Iraq, Germany realized that it had to jump on board at least symbolically in order to prove to its neighbors and allies that Germany intended to be a reliable member of the international community. As in the past, Germany’s contribution to the mission was financial\textsuperscript{25}, at first about $2 billion – eventually around $12 billion plus logistical support - in economic aid (Erb 149-51).

While the mission in Iraq was ostensibly supported in order to reaffirm peace in the region, the German people only supported it as long as the Bundeswehr didn’t become militarily involved. As Erb further points out, while there were a significant number of peace protests in

\textsuperscript{25} A reversion to the open wallet policies of post World War II integration, like with the CAP.
Germany following the government’s decision to support and go along with the UN Iraq mission, they weren’t representative of society as a whole (Erb 150).

The reason for the protests hinges on Germany’s perception of the world – as well as its place in it – after the international system change that was caused by the end of the Cold War and unification. This combined with traditional West German aversion to using the military to achieve policy goals and the controversy surrounding its rearmament in the 1950s made German military involvement unthinkable, and the act of supporting a war left a bad taste in many mouths. While Germany’s war-scarred past played a major role in its rejection of military involvement in Iraq, it also helped plead the case for supporting the mission with comparisons of Saddam Hussein to Adolf Hitler, legitimizing a war against him (Erb 151). This resurgence of imagery from World War II was also prevalent when Germany had to decide what to do about the wars in ex-Yugoslavia.

The fact that Germany agreed to provide support to a UN and NATO sanctioned military operation proved to its regional and international allies that Germany would be a reliable friend and ally in the new international system, laying to rest many of the concerns that heads of state had about a unified Germany. ²⁶ It also showed that Germany had come to terms with itself after unification. Germany would continue to remain in the multilateralist and integrationist fold.

A touch of unilateralism and the first experiment in military intervention

Germany wasn’t the only European country that had to cope with major change in the early 1990s. With the fall of communism and the disintegration of the Soviet Union a number of

²⁶ i.e. that Germany would try to play power politics in order to become a regional hegemon, or experience a resurgence in pre World War II militaristic tendencies.
new European countries sprang into being. One particular case of post-Soviet disintegration was an area of Europe that had a long history with Germany and the German speaking realm: the Balkans.

Germany’s connection with the Balkan region goes back over 100 years to when parts of the area belonged to or were controlled by the Austro-Hungarian Empire. In 1914 it was also the assassination of Austria’s heir to the throne by a Serbian that caused Europe to erupt into the First World War. German literature and culture has had and still has an immense impact particularly on the culture of Slovenia, where for a long time works by German authors were the most translated into Slovene (Gabrič 251). It was, therefore, no surprise that Germany lent them a ready ear when during the disintegration of the Soviet Union and the pending collapse of Yugoslavia after Tito’s death, Slovenia and Croatia decided to go the route of independence due to the country’s political instability (Erb 167). Slovenia and Croatia had initially pleaded for a confederate system to replace the Yugoslav state, but after Serbian refusal and evidence of Serbian repression they declared unilateral independence (Libal 1).

Additional validation for the German receptiveness to Slovene and Croatian independence was provided by the breakdown of the tenuous ethnic stability that Tito provided with his federative policies and the nationalistic stance of Serbian President Slobodan Milošević (Libal 3), a breakdown which essentially led to the massacres in Srebrenica in 1995. This brought to the fore traditional postwar German ideologies of protecting human rights and preventing genocide such as they themselves had committed during World War II – also a motivating factor in backing the Gulf War – and led Germany to demand EU-wide recognition of the two breakaway states in order to prevent ethnic cleansing and bloodshed. Through its promotion of recognizing Slovenian and Croatian independence based on human rights and
through its efforts in organizations such as NATO, Germany followed all three role concepts of a civilian power.

Germany became extremely concerned about the development of events in the Balkans through television footage and the visits of individual parliamentarians far sooner than the other big members of the European Community. Additionally, Germany had a very close relationship with Yugoslavia – personally fostered by Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher – which allowed it to perceive the direction events were taking in Belgrade earlier than other countries did. During the first instances that Serbia used its military to consolidate its hold on the break-away republics of Slovenia and Croatia, Germany was convinced that Belgrade no longer put any stock in peaceful negotiations. This is the main reason why Germany was ready to recognize Slovenian and Croatian independence before the majority of the EC was. It was done in an attempt to avoid bloodshed (Libal 12-16).

Despite the misgivings of other European nations27 Germany recognized Slovenian and Croatian independence on 19 and 23 December, 1991 (Libal 86), respectively. This was done in a largely unilateral fashion, but not in order to expand German influence or power, as would be expected under the realist paradigm. Rather, Germany went forward in recognizing these nations while working with the various international institutions it was a part of. And, as Scott Erb explains: “[m]ultilateralism does not require a state to simply join in an existing consensus, but rather to act to persuade and convince others to go along should they be outside the consensus. Germany did that” (Erb 159). However, an unfortunate side-effect of Germany’s rapid recognition of Slovene and Croatian independence was that it arguably led the way for ethnic

---

27 Italy and Austria, though, were also prepared to recognize Slovenian and Croatian independence (Erb 158).
cleansing in the Balkans. The Serbians, who were trying to remain the regional hegemon, began
to go about eliminating opposition.

Germany’s next step in normalizing its position in the international community was its
participation in the NATO Kosovo mission in 1999. The decision to intervene militarily in a
foreign conflict was significantly inspired by what the Germans saw as parallels between the
ethnic cleansing being committed by the Serbs and their own National Socialist past. Thus the
Germans were strongly motivated to prevent human rights violations abroad and promote human
dignity. One of the rallying calls of the public in the 1990s for intervention in the Balkans was
“Nie wieder Auschwitz!” - Never again Auschwitz. Domestically, the ethnic cleansing in the
Balkans caused the various political parties to re-examine their foreign policy values, causing
parties like the SPD and the Greens, however painfully, to shift in the direction of the CDU camp
when it came to discussing participation in out of area NATO missions (Erb 155-6). For them,
the promotion of human rights and other pillars of civilian power foreign policy values
outweighed the debate of using the military to affect policy goals.

Thus, in June of 1999, 10 years after the fall of the wall, a unified Germany was
participating as a full NATO member in Kosovo with a force of 5000 German soldiers deployed
at the front lines of the conflict (Erb 168) in order to promote stability and human rights. This
was the first time since World War II that German soldiers were deployed in this manner.
Germany had proven to its allies that it was a reliable member of the NATO institution and
would start to carry its weight in the international system. Its deep integration into the EU and
other international organizations as well its continued policy for further European integration
also laid to rest any fears Germany’s neighbors may have had about a resurgent, power hungry
Germany in the center of Europe. This mission also reflected a certain generational shift in
German politics. While it was under Helmut Kohl and Hans-Dietrich Genscher that Slovenian and Croatian independence was recognized, it was under Gerhard Schröder and Joschka Fischer – the first post war generation of politicians in power – that Germany first committed troops to a foreign conflict zone. This is something that might well never have happened under the previous administration where the generation of the elites still retained personal experiences from World War II.

It would seem that Germany’s policies of multilateralism and regional integration in combination with the lessons it had learned from its past set it on a trajectory of unification in 1990, and this unification laid the groundwork for Germany to be fully integrated into international institutions as an equal, exactly what Konrad Adenauer tried to accomplish with his immediate postwar policies. He might be glad to know that 54 years after he exploded at French attempts to keep Germany down and not recognize it as an equal during its accession into NATO, Germany was now operating in the institution with the same respect and responsibility accorded to the others.\footnote{It might be ironic to consider that Adenauer’s goals were finally accomplished under an SPD/Green coalition while his CDU was in opposition.} Not only that, but it was also beginning to take on a leadership role as was exemplified by its early recognition of Slovenia and Croatia and its leadership in promoting the NATO Kosovo mission.\footnote{Unfortunately Germany’s haste in recognizing Croatian and Slovenian independence may have hastened and actually increased the bloodshed in the Balkans. With the breakaway republics of Croatia and Slovenia receiving international recognition and thereby legitimacy, Serbia feared more states would follow suit. In order to avoid this from happening Serbia tried to retain regional hegemony by clamping down forcefully on any moves for independence.}

Through soft power and its civilian power status, which were very much impacted by German postwar perceptions of itself, Germany was taking the lead in organizations where it had fully integrated itself and was beginning to set the stage for further regional integration.
Germany’s efforts at further integration and the strengthening of international institutions were realized in the 1992 Maastricht Treaty on European Union.

Germany’s increased engagement in international affairs went hand in hand with a German national identity that was slowly coming to terms not only with its war guilt, but also the fact of unification. German unification, while a huge success in terms of the long term strategies set by German political elites throughout the postwar period and its successful policy of Western institution integration, was an enormous drain on Germany’s economy and challenge to German national identity.

For years West Germany had striven to become a shining example of a Western democracy in the center of Europe, as offering an antithesis to the Communist Eastern bloc. But with the fall of the Wall, it had to absorb Communist East Germany and forge ahead with a new, united German identity, something which found political embodiment in Germany’s refusal to participate in the Gulf War, but then taking a leadership role in the Balkans. Germany would continue to remain in the multilateralist fold, but in accordance with post-unification self-confidence it wouldn’t shirk leadership roles.
CHAPTER THREE: GERMANY IN THE 21ST CENTURY

Introduction

With the September 11 terrorist attacks against the United States, the international system once more began undergoing dramatic changes. While the current system hasn’t offered concrete new realities like the end of World War II or the Cold War did, it is changing the makeup of the international community. It is no longer easy to differentiate between friend and foe when new challenges such as international terrorism target both civilian and military targets indiscriminately.

During the post 9/11 time frame Germany has adapted its policy of soft power and multilateralism to cope with new challenges in the international system. During the same period—in part due to Germany’s role in the Balkans, its policy of importing foreign labor in the 1970s, post Cold War migrations, as well as liberalization of its immigration and citizenship laws—Germany’s national identity shifted more and more to a cosmopolitan multi-cultural one. This came to a point in 2000 when Germany was officially called a country of immigration. The fact that Germans are increasingly accepting the multi-ethnic aspects of their society as a fact is also having an effect on German foreign policy and where it places its priorities.

The attacks on September 11 and the realization that some if not all of their logistics were planned on German soil forced Germany to come to the unfortunate realization that they too could become a target of international terrorism.30 In the aftermath of the attacks the Schröder

---

30 While Germany already had some experience with domestic terrorist attacks (i.e. the Baader-Meinhof gang, aka the Rote Armee Fraktion [RAF], and the Black September attacks at the Munich Olympics in 1972) this new generation of Islamic fundamentalism was fairly new to the world stage. This new breed of terrorism required countries around the world to adapt their foreign and security policies accordingly—in particular the United States.
government expressed solidarity with the United States, and when “the UN Security Council passed Resolutions No. 1368 and 1373 which authorized member states to exercise the right of individual and collective self defense” (Maull 99) and NATO invoked Article V of the NATO Treaty - whereby an attack on one member of the alliance is considered an attack on all the members (Article 5 of NATO Treaty) - the stage was set for Germany to take part in and contribute soldiers to the coalition against international terrorism.

Despite traditional German postwar reluctance to use force, the response to the terrorist attacks against the United States could be justified by the value based foreign policy pillar of a civilian power (Maull 103). This marked a continuation of Germany’s multilateral foreign policy while also balancing the greater expectations concerning international involvement that were placed on it after unification. Additionally, “Germany found the political counterweight to its engagement of troops by hosting the conference on forming an interim government” (Nabers 58).

Germany’s realization of the international threat of terrorism and its constantly adapting foreign policy has now caused Germany to become actively involved in its third (and furthest from home) international theater since World War II: initial post-war German foreign policy was largely restricted to European and transatlantic relations, after unification Germany became involved somewhat further away from home in South Eastern Europe in response to Serbian ethnic cleansing, and now in response to the threat posed by international terrorism Germany has become involved in Afghanistan.

which adopted increasingly unilateralist and aggressive policies under the Bush administration. It was then also policy changes from allies such as the United States that Germany had to take into consideration at the beginning of the 21st century when it was trying to decide how to respond to the terrorist threat.
Germany’s relationship with Afghanistan

This section is largely indebted to Susan Zerwinsky’s Lessing in Kabul, a collection of articles and essays on the presence of German language, literature and culture in Afghanistan for the last 100 years. The edition was published last year, and as far as I’ve been able to find, it is the only book to cover in-depth and with personal accounts the rich relationship between Germany and Afghanistan.

Germany’s relationship with Afghanistan is an example of cultural influence on foreign policy. Germany and Afghanistan have long had cultural ties with one another, with almost 90,000 Afghans calling Germany home, more than in any other European country (Fischer UN Afghanistan Conference). In fact, the Goethe Institute, which reopened its doors in Kabul in 2003, was the first foreign cultural institute in Kabul after the fall of the Taliban (Qantara.de Goethe Institute in Kabul). It had been operating since 1965, and only ceased its work in 1990 when the Taliban came to power (Goethe.de History of Goethe Institute).

After World War I Germany became one of the first and most important European countries with which Afghanistan took up political relations, and in 1924 the Amani-Oberschule became the first school in Afghanistan to teach courses in German. This, in tandem with the large number of German technical experts and engineers that were helping to develop Afghan infrastructure, brought Afghanis into contact with German language and culture. Afghanistan’s demand for experts on infrastructure development led to a blossoming in the German-Afghan relationship in the 1960s and 1970s (Behbud 18).

In addition to German expertise on the ground in Afghanistan, the opening of schools offering German language instruction had the extra benefit of allowing Afghanis educated at
home to go on to study at a German university in order to return and contribute to the
development of their country. Also due to the close relationship between these two countries,
schools for girls were opened for the first time in Afghanistan (Behbud 17).

Later, the plight of women in Afghan society would play a major role in German
motivation to take part in NATO’s Afghanistan mission, as women were seen to be repressed
under the Taliban regime (Fischer UN Afghanistan Conference).

The traditional role of German development assistance in Afghanistan and its focus on
improving the Afghan education system by offering German courses and building schools has
manifested itself in Germany’s current policy towards Afghanistan; there is a strong belief that
the future of Afghanistan depends on the education of its younger generations. Aside from the
3500 German soldiers who are serving in the Afghan north, German assistance is still focusing
on improving the livelihoods of Afghans.

In 2002 when Afghanistan began rebuilding its education and university system Germany
was the only country that pledged assistance on a large scale. In this context German assistance
included renovating and rebuilding war-torn buildings, expanding university enrollment
capacities and developing world-class computer systems at the Universities of Kabul and Herat
(Fayez 65-6).

Once again one of the main ways Germany goes about achieving these goals is through
monetary assistance, a continuation of previous policies, such as German monetary support for
the first Gulf War. During the UN conference on Afghanistan held outside of Bonn in 2001
German Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer and the German government pledged 80 million Euros
per year for the social and economic reconstruction of Afghanistan (Fischer UN Afghanistan
Conference).
Germany’s multicultural make-up as foreign policy dynamic?

With unification and the Cold War over, the question of German national identity entered a new stage. Germany was no longer a divided country at the heart of Europe, nor was it still steeped in the quagmire of unification that required it to reconsider its international role. The Germany of today is more cosmopolitan and multi-cultural than ever before, and this is having a significant impact on how German policy is formed. With more and more people of immigrant background living in Germany, it is much more sensitive to international issues than it would be if its society were more homogenous. It is important to analyze the societal impacts of culture on foreign policy from a humanities perspective, because a focus on current writers and cultural trends gives insight into political motivations as well as their interdependent nature.

Aside from its relationship with Afghanistan, traditional and historical cultural ties between Germany and other countries have influenced the way it reacts to them in international relations, as was seen in the case of Germany’s unilateral recognition of Croatia and Slovenia. Furthermore, Germany’s influx of immigrants and people of immigrant background has led to a change in its perception of itself. It was only eight years ago that Germany officially claimed itself to be an Einwanderungsland, a land of immigration, another hallmark of the generational change ushered in by the Schröder Administration. This idea of being defined through immigration has had a serious impact on its domestic and foreign policies, as well as its national identity.

The influence of immigrant culture on national identity has reached such a degree that migrant writers are beginning to be regarded as international symbols of Germanness, as in the
case of the Russian-German writer Wladimir Kaminer and his works about Germany and Berlin. In her article “Changing Concepts of Citizenship in Postwar and Reunited Germany” Naomi Lubrich writes “Kaminer acts as an ambassador for Berlin” (Lubrich 31), an odd concept considering he is a Russian immigrant. “Rather ironically, the German authorities are indeed beginning to recognize the value of showing Kaminer abroad as an emissary of German culture. He has been invited several times already by the Goethe Institute to read from his works in foreign countries, including in Russia and the United States ...” (Wanner 594), Adrian Wanner states in his article “A Russian Picaro conquers Germany.” So, while Kaminer is actually Russian, he has adopted many of the customs and traditions of his host country to a point where he can be considered German, issuing a challenge to the notion of an official Leitkultur. And while Kaminer is only one example of this trend of German cosmopolitanism, it offers an insight into how modern Germany defines its national identity, and this in turn helps explain the direction that German domestic and foreign policy is taking in the twenty-first century.

It is also through the lens of immigrants that German domestic policy is often viewed and debated. In 2008 the Federal Government of Germany was debating whether or not to amend the Basic Law to include that German should be the official language of Germany. An interesting take on the effect this would have on society, as well as on exactly what the German language is, was offered by Wladimir Kaminer. Humorously, he breaks down regional language differences, but with the serious request that if German is written into the Basic Law, that it be stipulated as Hochdeutsch, High German. 31

31 The video: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wMCiqyvKqbU
The domestic debate over listing German as the official language of Germany shows the multiplicity of cultural and societal factors that go into shaping German politics and identity. This is paralleled by the factors that go into making Germany’s foreign policies.

In the same way that Willy Brandt personified the political aspects of Günter Grass’s works to show the cyclical and interdependent nature of German politics and national identity, there is a contemporary German politician who plays the same role in the multicultural makeup of German society today, offering a political face to the writings of Wladimir Kaminer. Cem Özdemir is a member and chairman of the German Green party as well as a Member of the European Parliament. In 1994 he became the first Member of the German Parliament with Turkish heritage (oezdemir.de). Being the son of an immigrant factory worker and a tailor (Amann FAZ) he has come to personify exactly what Wladimir Kaminer discusses in his writings: even though Özdemir comes from immigrant parents, he is now considered German and has even made his way into the parliamentary halls of power in Berlin.

In a 16 March 2009 article about him in the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung Özdemir tells journalist Melanie Amann “Erst die Politik hat mich reethnisiert“ (Amann FAZ), a slogan which helped get him elected to the Bundestag. This slogan and his focus on migration and integration issues at both the national (Bundestag) and systemic (European Parliament) levels show a clear cyclical relationship between German identity and politics/foreign policy. Much as Wladimir Kaminer has come to be considered a symbol of Germanness through his writings, Cem Özdemir puts a political face to Germany’s cosmopolitan and multicultural makeup. This also shows that accepting and dealing with cultural problems is of interest to Germany as multicultural interactions offer its society many benefits.
Melding Hard and Soft Power

Where German foreign policy “grew up” in the 1980s, and reached a state of normalization after unification in the 1990s, the twenty-first century has seen Germany evolve into a more central and pivotal player in the international system. While a full system change – in the sense of the post World War II and post Cold War realities - seems to be lacking, the system is changing. Globalization, the increasing interdependence of the world economy, and the dangers posed by international terrorism represent an era where the lines between both friend and foe and economic versus political priorities are becoming increasingly blurred.

As a result of increased international interconnectedness Germany has turned and will continue to turn to multilateral policies. The new challenges posed by this century and the lack of a clearly identifiable “national enemy” – as there was in the bi-polar system of the Cold War – have led Germany to develop its civilian power status to allow for more military interventions abroad. What is meant by this is not a shift to focus on policies of coercion and military force. Rather, what this means is that Germany will be less inclined to avoid participation in multilateral military operations sanctioned by organizations such as the UN and NATO.

As Auschwitz and Germany’s history of genocide helped build the case for participating in the NATO Kosovo mission, this experience also laid the groundwork for future German participation in military deployments abroad, especially those that can be ethically and morally validated. Today, Germany is at a crossroads with its foreign policy. It is developing its traditional policy of “soft” power to a point that allows melding it with a form of “hard” power, but in doing so is still keeping with its postwar value based tradition of multilateralism (Maull 93-109, Pfeil 88-105).
“No” to the Iraq War

Another example of how Germany is adapting to the new international system and becoming aware of its position was “the very public and unprecedented disagreement between Washington and Berlin over the spring 2003 war to oust Saddam Hussein” (Karp 61). This instance does not necessarily mean that Germany is becoming increasingly aggressive or unilateral in its policy making. Rather, the negative reaction to the U.S. invasion of Iraq was unique and the result of previous U.S. policies, as well as how Germany understands the international system and how its problems should be approached – another example of changes in the international system affecting German foreign policy and self-perception.

Speaking at Georgetown University in 2000 Joschka Fischer explains German hesitance to follow America’s lead in the Iraq war and how that war conflicts with Germany’s policy of multilateralism: “[w]e note with concern, all the voices in the United States that favor American unilateralism” (Karp 67). Additionally, the Basic Law expressly forbids “even the preparation for an offensive war” (Bender 5). For these reasons it is a good example of Germany adapting itself to an ever changing world. In summation, “Berlin’s refusal provides clear evidence that Germany’s contemporary foreign policy has departed from the reflexive, Altanticist multilateralism of the Cold War in favor of a multilateralism that takes its cues from Germany’s own assessment of the nature of international politics” (Karp 67).
Germany in the NATO Afghanistan mission as a melding of hard and soft power

A pivotal case in point for this new foreign policy philosophy is Germany’s participation in the NATO Afghanistan mission, where “[o]fficials have routinely portrayed the military presence in Afghanistan as an armed development assistance mission” (Klimisch 1-2).

While Afghanistan demonstrates the new direction that German foreign policy is taking, it also shows that Germany’s traditional tendencies of regional integration and multilateralism are still alive and well. In Joschka Fischer’s opening speech at the 2001 U.N. conference on Afghanistan he reiterated Germany’s commitment to multilateral solutions and its tendency for economic assistance as well as its new moral and ethical foreign policy motivations, as witnessed by the emphasis he placed on the protection of women’s rights (Fischer UN Afghanistan Conference).

As mentioned before, regional integration and international cooperation shape how Germany reacts to events around the world. Integration also impacts the country’s national identity as being “… part of the larger enterprise of European integration” (Karp 67). More importantly,

[t]he focus on integration also explains Germany’s commitment to NATO, not only as a vehicle that provides security but also as an essential building block of Germany’s civilian identity. What matters most is not the alliance’s military capability but the role the alliance plays in shaping the political environment in which Germany acts. Within NATO and, in a complimentary fashion, in the EU, countless exchanges between national civilian and military officials takes place; and member states jointly plan, negotiate, and resolve the future of crisis.
management as well as where and to what end the alliance should get involved.

(Karp 70-1)

It is through this institution and its values that Germany has decided to confront and deal with the new challenges of global terrorism as well as its new and evolving role in the international system. Under the auspices of NATO and the UN, the Bundeswehr is actively deployed in the northern territories of Afghanistan (Weissbuch der Bundeswehr), a mission which brings it under fire from Taliban and insurgent forces. This is dangerous in the context of German public opinion, as “the nation remains wary of the German military’s participation in combat” (Klimisch 2) because “[f]or Germany, force must never again become a normal part of politics” (Karp 74).

Initial German participation in the NATO Afghan mission was met with widespread support from the German public, coming, as it did, after the September 11 attacks against the United States. In the meantime, however, German public support has waned, with one poll showing 58% of Germans in favor of a troop withdrawal from Afghanistan (Der Standard “Umfage”). This can largely be attributed once again to Germany’s war-ridden past, even 60 years after the end of World War II.

As pivotal a change in foreign policy as the Afghanistan mission is, it shows that Germany still has a lot of work to do in order to effectively participate in these sorts of aid missions. The mission has set an admirable and respectable precedent, and will lead the way for further similar deployments. One thing that sheds light on the direction that German foreign policy is heading as well as its increasing readiness to use military means is offered by an examination of the evolution of the Bundeswehr since the end of the Cold War.
Peter Bender mentions that the end of the Cold War placed Germany in a position it had never been in before: it no longer had to fear the outbreak of war, and it wouldn’t face any military confrontation in the immediate future. At least that is Germany’s conviction; otherwise the Bundeswehr wouldn’t be restructured from a defensive army to an intervention troop (Bender 3). The fact that Germany is actively restructuring its military into an intervention force is a significant sign of its intentions to engage in more missions like the Afghan one. And as scholars point out (Karp 2005-6, Weiss 2008, Maull 2001 and 2006, Link 2004), any future mission of military intervention will be done on the basis of multilateral mandates.

Post-traumatic stress disorder and national identity

Militarily and socially, Germany is preparing to engage more actively in world affairs. In the social aspect the NATO Afghan mission once again plays an important role. For the first time since World War II Germany is dealing with a problem that so far has only plagued nations which actively participate in international military deployments: post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) (Sadigh “Afghanistan im Kopf”).

This issue seems to be almost a rite of passage for a country that plays a major role in the international system and is an example of German foreign policy affecting the fibers of German society and identity. It marks countries that have placed their militaries in the line of fire, and impacts how a nation identifies itself. When a country places its soldiers in the line of fire, it likely feels it has earned the respect of its neighbors and peers by risking its citizens in order to protect those less fortunate – another reflection of Germany’s value based foreign policy. This is
something that is currently running through the German psyche and it stands in stark contrast to previous German reluctance to use its military for anything other than defense.

The fact that the German people have thus far tolerated the deaths of their soldiers in Afghanistan, and are likely to continue to do so – if not exactly enthusiastically – also attests to the possibility of future German military deployments abroad. Also interesting, despite all the problems associated with the NATO Afghanistan mission and its stark departure from peaceful German foreign deployments, it is not met with full scale aversion by ordinary Bundeswehr soldiers. In fact, Maurus Wrixel, a 27-year-old first lieutenant currently stationed in Afghanistan said “I’d go again, if I got another offer” (qtd. Deutsche Welle “German Soldiers in Afghanistan face Dangerous Challenges”), providing an indication that soldiers in the German military may also be beginning to perceive these sorts foreign combat missions, and the evolution of Germany’s military and Germany’s increasing role in international politics, as an accepted fact of the new international system.

With increasing cases of PTSD Germany is joining a club that for a long time has been dominated by world military powers such as the U.S. and Great Britain. But the fact that soldiers are coming home with this disorder is increasing the social discourse about it. According to the Deutsche Welle “[e]xperts say that while Germans are familiar with PTSD for a long time in firefighters or train drivers who witness suicides, it was taboo to talk about the disorder in connection with soldiers” (Deutsche Welle “Afghanistan Increasing Number of Traumatized German Troops”). Germany is now implementing British and American techniques to combat PTSD, something which is helping prepare it for further military missions down the road.

---

32 So far more than 30 German soldiers have died in Afghanistan (Deutsche Welle “German Soldiers in Afghanistan Face Dangerous Challenges”).
In response to the new dimension of international terrorism and the changing foreign and security policies of key allies such as the United States, Germany has been adapting its role as a civilian power – and therefore its use of soft power – to cope with the challenges of the international system. While Germany has engaged in some unilateral policy making and has taken to make its voice increasingly heard on the global level, as discussed in this and previous chapters, it continues to place an emphasis on and work in multilateral institutions. By getting involved in the NATO Afghanistan mission, Germany is developing its traditional concept of soft power – which usually avoids the use of the military – to an idea that allows it to become more involved militarily at the global level. But again, the traditional aspect of Germany’s foreign policy remains in place, in that it does not condone unilateral military action, something which Germany itself will also not engage in.

As shown first with Germany’s role in the Balkans, and now with its role in Afghanistan, historical and cultural aspects have a large impact on Germany’s policy decisions. This is further shown by the changing make-up of German society: Germany’s international engagement seems to be increasing along with its own increasing ethnic diversity. The model of cyclical causality is demonstrated in the case of Wladimir Kaminer and Cem Özdemir. Much in the same way that Willy Brandt offered a political facet to the writings of Günter Grass, Özdemir is the political embodiment of Kaminer’s work.

---

33 E.g., the American pre-emptive strike against Iraq.
CONCLUSION

Through the subheadings of my chapters and my use of the cyclical model, I have shown how international system changes impact German self perception and identity, that this then affects how Germany foreign policy is made and how that in turn once again affects German self-perception. For example: the post World War II system change placed Germany in a weak and ostracized position in Europe. Its defeat and the realities of its atrocities during the Holocaust created a sense of national guilt in the German population, whose political elite then vowed to never let that happen again. This provided the motivation for much of Germany’s policies of regional and Western integration. The example of Willy Brandt and Günter Grass provided a concrete example of the (postwar) interdependence of German national identity and its foreign policy.

By using literary examples I examined societal values and how literature reflects the prevalent idea of German national identity. I then showed how this ties into German policy making – i.e. Willy Brandt as political representation of Günter Grass’s works or Cem Özdemir as personification of Wladimir Kaminer’s works and Germany’s new cosmopolitan make-up.

As the preceding chapters have also detailed, Germany is becoming an increasingly involved player in the international system. It has learned from its past that military means are not and should not be the most effective tools to implement foreign policy goals. Through its entrenchment in regional and international institutions it has been promoting its values and foreign policy on a global level.

Its recent adoption of policies that combine both hard and soft power may be having an effect on its allies as well. Recently Barak Obama has said that the United States would be rethinking its own mission and goals in Afghanistan, with a heavier focus on development rather
than purely military aid. While it may be unfounded to say that German foreign policy values have had a direct affect on the new direction the Obama Administration wants to take in Afghanistan today, it is worth noting that historically the United States has actively accommodated German foreign policy goals and suggestions (Maull 93) – as can be seen in the examples of American support for German rearmament, membership in NATO and German unification in the postwar decades as well as U.S. solicitations for assistance and approval in missions such as the first Gulf War.

The fact that Germany has pledged to increase its own contingent of soldiers in Afghanistan signals a trend in German foreign policy that is likely continue34. This pledge to increase its presence in the Hindu Kusch shouldn’t be mistaken for a policy route that emphasizes force above humanitarian assistance, however. As German Defense Minister Franz-Josef Jung told the Munich Security Conference on 8 February 2009:

> It is absolutely necessary in Afghanistan to implement the process (of security and reconstruction) even more effectively. There can be no development without security, but there can be no security without development either. We will not win by military means alone (Deutsche Welle “Afghanistan Needs More than Military”).

The emphasis of combining development aid with security is a perfect example of Germany’s evolving foreign policy and how it is fusing soft with hard power. As Henning Tewes writes: “[a]lthough they [Civilian Powers] favour pure forms of collective security they ‘approve, in the face of real problems and deficits of such systems, the measures of co-operative security as a security-political pre-form’” (Tewes 11).

---

34 An additional observation that Germany is likely to continue using its military abroad as well how the aura of its militaristic past is still present can be seen in the 2008 parliamentary debate about instating a new military medal for honor in combat or bringing the Iron Cross medal back into use (Löwenstein “Eine neue Tapferkeitsmedaille?”).
Germany as a nation is in a unique position to be undergoing such an evolution in its foreign policy strategies and in taking on a leadership position at the global level. As Angela Merkel’s spokesman was quoted in The Economist on 30 October 2008: “[o]ther leaders trust Germany … because ‘it has no big-power ambitions’” (The Economist “The Berlin Stonewall”). In this quote the lack of big-power ambitions clearly refers to Germany’s policy of entrenchment in regional and international organizations as well as emphasis on diplomatic multilateral solutions to world problems.

The fact that other world leaders “trust” Germany, and the international reputation its exertion of value based foreign policy has earned it, has allowed it to take leadership roles and express criticisms concerning other types of international events as well. For example, when Pope Benedict XVI rehabilitated ultra conservative British Bishop Richard Williamson – who denies the scale of Jewish deaths in the Holocaust – Chancellor Merkel was the first world leader to condemn the Pope’s move and demanded that Benedict and the Vatican clarify their views on the Holocaust and its denials (Timesonline and Deutsche Welle).

While Germany’s mission in Afghanistan is becoming controversial domestically, it has set a precedent for its international involvement. In fact, there are voices in the Bundeswehr calling for Germany to do more in Afghanistan. In an article by the Deutsche Welle Hans-Christoph Ammon, head of the army’s commando section – which has about 100 rapid response soldiers based in Afghanistan right now – has been quoted as being extremely critical of current German policy in the country. Among other things he said Germany was spending “far too little” in Afghanistan and that “Germany’s efforts to establish a proper police force in Afghanistan ‘have been a failure’” (Deutsche Welle “Army General Calls German Campaign in Afghanistan a ‘Failure’”).
As a further expansion of its traditional postwar foreign policy Germany now also has warships in the Gulf of Aden as part of the NATO anti-piracy mission (Das Parlament “Piraten im Visier der Marine”) which in recent months has met with success by deterring a number of pirate attacks on cargo vessels.

Germany’s consciousness of its history will probably prohibit it from ever instigating or participating in unilateral military missions such as the United States’ pre-emptive strike against Iraq. But, I do see foresee Germany becoming involved in riskier missions in the future. For example, if the UN were to mandate a NATO operation to go into Somalia in order to finally stabilize the country and provide it with a functioning government, I think Germany would be one of the first countries to answer the call. This type of mission would mesh well with Germany’s tradition of and belief in protecting human rights and improving living conditions, so it could be morally and ethically validated as well.
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