FROM GUILT TO RESPONSIBILITY AND BEYOND?

FROM GUILT TO RESPONSIBILITY AND BEYOND?

CHANGE IN GERMAN STRATEGIC CULTURE AFTER THE END OF THE COLD WAR

Antti Seppo

ABSTRACT

This study focuses on aspects of change in German strategic culture, i.e. on the changes in ways of thinking about and pursuing security and defence policy and the views on the questions of peace, war and the use of military force, in particular after the end of the Cold War. The overarching aim of the study is to provide a novel reading on German strategic culture, and this has been done by shifting the focus of research on strategic culture from the study of continuity to the study of change. This enables us to tell better stories about strategic cultures – both in terms of how internal and external challenges – leading to questions about the continuity of strategic cultural patterns and how strategic culture is shaped by the social and political reality of the strategic actors.

The first main contribution of the study is to question the mantra of continuity that has been the primary object of study in the existing strategic culture research. This mantra has ultimately led to a rather stale and static state of affairs in terms of the contributions that strategic culture research is able to make in the field of International Relations. Instead, the study argues for a research agenda that identifies the nature, mechanisms and outcomes of strategic cultural change. The study achieves this by critically assessing the existing accounts of strategic cultural change and creating an analytical framework that stresses both the processes and outcomes of strategic cultural change. This framework is informed by critical realist metatheory since it enables us to move ahead of the epistemological impasse of the existing studies by focusing on the ontological aspects of strategic culture. This framework identifies the 'experience of warfare' as the primary mechanism of change in strategic cultures.

The second key contribution of the study is to apply this analytical framework in the study of German strategic culture. The empirical case studies cover the German strategic cultural track record since the end of World War II, with a clear focus on the developments after the end of the Cold War. These case studies show, firstly, how shifts within the normative structure of German strategic culture have shaped German views on the use of military force, and, subsequently, how they led to shifts and changes in German strategic practices. Secondly, the case studies underline the role of external shocks (e.g. the massacre at Srebrenica) in triggering change within German strategic culture. Thirdly, the case studies also provide a basis for a critique of some of the more widely accepted claims regarding German security and defence policy, such as the notion of 'normalisation' or 'Sonderweg' (special path). Finally, the analysis also suggests that counterfactual argumentation can be a useful analytical tool in assessing the importance of some of these developments in the evolution of German strategic culture.

The third primary contribution of the study is a critical assessment of the process of coming to terms with the German past and how this affects German strategic culture. The study stresses the importance of socio-cognitive factors in the evolution of strategic cultures and identifies the shift from guilt to responsibility as one of the key changes in post-Cold War German strategic culture. Furthermore, the study recognizes the continuing impact and relevance of the German past on the further development of German strategic culture, even though the focus of the German debate has partly shifted from whether Germany can use military force to a discussion on the means and ends of the use of military force.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Assistant Professor Kai Oppermann (Sussex University) and Professor Pekka Visuri acted as the premilinary examiners for the dissertation. I wish to thank them for a thorough and careful reading of the manuscript and the constructive comments and criticism they have provided.

I am mostly indebted to Professor Tuomas Forsberg whose support throughout the years has been invaluable. The thesis has greatly benefited from his in-depth knowledge on Germany and German foreign and security policy. Tuomas has not only been the supervisor of my thesis, but a boss, a colleague and a friend. Tuomas is, indeed, one of the good guys out there and I consider myself lucky for having been supervised by him.

Director of the Finnish Institute of International Affairs Teija Tiilikainen and Professor Henri Vogt have also had a considerable impact on the way things turned out for me. I wish to thank Teija for giving me the opportunity to work in her EU research project for a couple of years and hone my skills as a researcher under her guidance. I also wish to thank Henri, who is really skilful at listening to your rants and incomplete ideas regarding the dissertation and giving you really useful advice. I am also grateful to the custos of the public examination, Professor Heikki Patomäki, who has provided steadfast support, guidance and critical commentary especially in the final stages of the process. In addition, I wish to express my gratitude to Dr Juha Vuori and university lecturer Riikka Kuusisto for their insightful commentary on the manuscript. Dr Bastian Giegerich and Dr Heiko Biehl have also been invaluable contacts during my PhD studies, and provided me with the opportunity to be part of an international research group on strategic cultures in Europe.

More generally, I am grateful to the staff of the Department of Translation Studies for providing some of the most useful courses I have attended during my studies at the University of Helsinki and keeping my German at a reasonably understandable level. Similarly, I am thankful to the staff of the Department of Political and Economic Studies for providing me the conceptual and analytical skills to engage in social scientific research. I want especially to thank Education Planning Officer Marjukka Laakso for her benevolent attitude towards an MA student who, while being in Germany, had her print out the whole MA thesis and deliver it for examination!

The Network for European Studies, also known as the 'corridor', deserves a special commendation. The corridor provided 'the scientific bedrock' for me especially early on in my PhD studies. I wish to express my warm thanks

to everyone with whom I had the pleasure to share the experience. I want especially to mention Mikko Tyrväinen with whom we tried to figure out the intricacies of how the EU uses its power and Marie-Louise Hindsberg, whose presence in the corridor was indispensable for all of us. I also want to flag the role of the corridor's directors (Teija, Henri and Research Director Juhana Aunesluoma) during those years. All three were incredibly skilled at crafting an academic atmosphere in which a particular accent was put on the fruitful and constructive interaction between junior and senior researchers. I have especially fond memories of the monthly 'in-doors picnics' that provided a nice platform for catching-up and chatting about all things related to the PhD process and beyond.

Apart from colleagues I am lucky to have been blessed with friends, who have stood by me through the whole PhD endeavour. While it is not possible to thank them all here, a few words need to be said. Dr Iain Ferguson shared with me the ups and downs of the life of a PhD student. Iain is a great conversationist and there is nothing better than to chat about politics, science and life with Iain in the sauna heat. Henri Purje and Tommi Wallenius, whom I got to know during the early stages of my MA studies, are a couple of cool dudes whose cultivated company I've enjoyed immensily. I hope the feeling is mutual. I've been friends with Juhani Horelli as long as I can remember. We've shared so much during the past 20 years that capturing all of it would require a book of its own. I'm sure it would become a best-seller. I want to thank all my friends for their support, humor and understanding throughout the years.

Last but not least, there is my family. I want to thank my big sister for being generous with her time and designing the elegant covers for this thesis. I want to thank my big brother for donating me all his unused clothes and shoes over the years. I've managed to acquire a lot of books thanks to him. I want to thank my dear parents, Pirkko Seppo and Juha Seppo for their unconditional support and love. This thesis is dedicated to them.

In Punavuori, Helsinki
10 April 2017

Antti Seppo

CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS

ACTORDS	Activation Orders (NATO)
AWACS	Airborne Warning and Control System
BRIC	Brazil, Russia, India, China
CDU/CSU	The Christian Democratic Union of Germany/ The Christian Social Union in Bavaria
CFE	Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe
CFSP	Common Foreign and Security Policy
COIN	Counterinsurgency
EMP	The Euro-Mediterranean Partnership
ENP	European Neighbourhood Policy
ESDP	European Security and Defence Policy
ESS	European Security Strategy
EC	The European Community
EU	The European Union
EUFOR	European Union Force
FAZ	Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung
FDP	The Free Democratic Party
FPA	Foreign Policy Analysis
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GDR	The German Democratic Republic
IR	International Relations
ISAF	International Security Assistance Force
KdB	Conception of Bundeswehr
KFOR	The Kosovo Force
KLA	The Kosovo Liberation Army
MBFR	Mutual and Balanced Force Reduction
MENA	The Middle East and North Africa region
NATO	North Atlantic Alliance
NPT	Non-Proliferation Treaty
NSDAP	National Socialist German Workers Party
OEF	Operation Enduring Freedom
OSCE	The Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
PDS	The Party of Democratic Socialism
PRT	Provincial Reconstruction Team
R2P	Responsibility to Protect
RoE	Rules of Engagement
SALT	Strategic Arms Limitation Talks
SFOR	The Stabilization Force
SED	The Socialist Unity Party of Germany
SPD	The Social Democratic Party of Germany

UN	The United Nations
UNIFIL	United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon
UNOSOM	United Nations Operation in Somalia
UNPROFOR	The United Nations Protection Force
UNSC	The United Nations Security Council
USSR	The Soviet Union
VPR	Defence Political Guidelines
WEU	Western European Union
WMD	Weapon of mass destruction

1 GERMANY AND STRATEGIC CULTURE: THE PROPHECY OF CONTINUITY

In general, strategic culture refers to the ways of thinking about and pursuing security and defence policy. It conveys a picture of how a country's political elite approaches questions of peace and war, in particular the question of the use of military force and the responses that can be found to these questions given the specifics of the national past(s) and lessons learned therefrom. It is important to stress, however, that strategic culture is not some randomly emergent collection of ideas, beliefs and practices but a social and political entity that has developed over time. In global international politics, the issues of peace and war have always been fundamental in terms of not only state survival, but also what comes or should come thereafter. Hence, they touch upon the very conditions of sustainable political life that is either possible or desirable in a given historical context. Therefore, the ability of strategic culture to provide answers (which implies that there is a strong normative aspect to strategic culture) is not only connected to the set-up of its inner structure (societally transmitted ideas, beliefs and related practices) but also to its ability to adapt to emerging challenges and security threats. Adaptation, in turn, might require considerable changes in strategic culture, depending on the nature of the external challenges.

This thesis focuses on the aspect of change in strategic cultures in general, and in German strategic culture, in particular. It attempts to draw a comprehensive picture of German strategic cultural change after the end of the Cold War by devising an analytical framework that is based on an understanding of strategic cultural change as a causally non-linear process and a synthesis of the arguments on change within strategic cultural studies. This is an important aspect, one which has hitherto been largely ignored in scholarship on strategic culture. By underlining the aspect of non-linearity in the process of change, this thesis attempts to go beyond an understanding of strategic cultural change as a fixed, linear and unidimensional process.[1] This is necessary because strategic cultural change and continuity often co-exist to some degree (at least in the 'world out there') and that it is therefore hardly tenable to describe the processes of continuity and change solely in terms of linear causal functions.

In order to be able to grasp strategic cultural change as a causally non-linear process, this study utilizes critical realist metatheory, particularly the

---

[1] Linearity, which in itself is a theoretical construct, can be expressed as a situation where a dependent variable has a linear relationship with one or more independent variables. Thus, linearity can be understood as the linear function of independent variables. An example would be that of a 'plot' following a simple linear structure, which involves ideas and events that are always directly connected and follow one after the other.

arguments relating to the causal properties/powers of directly unobservable, yet detectable entities.[2] By so doing, the thesis seeks to question the well-established assumptions regarding the theoretical and analytical importance and prevalence of the aspect of strategic cultural continuity in strategic cultures that inevitably lead to a rather static view of strategic culture. It also seeks to offer a better way of looking at strategic cultures as inherently dynamic social and political entities that may draw upon specific socio-cognitive features embedded in the national past(s) and its reinterpretations, exhibiting an important causal role in terms of explaining strategic cultural change. Accordingly, if we accept the notion that strategic cultures are essentially dynamic social and political entities, it can be argued that the principal aim of German strategic culture has been not only to adjust to but also to shape the emerging post-Cold War political reality ever since the fall of the Berlin wall.

The definition of strategic culture used in this study can be outlined as follows: strategic culture consists of *specific strategic thinking and strategic practices the purpose of which is to establish clarity regarding the potential policy outcomes of questions and choices related to peace and war and the use of military force*. Strategic thinking and practices, in turn, are embedded within the normative framework of strategic culture that draws from lessons from the past. In the German case, this framework evolved after the end of World War II and culminated in the lessons of 'never again'.[3] It is important to point out, however, that norms do not necessarily determine the outcomes of any strategic culture or policies pursued; they are better understood as 'reasons for action', enabling or constraining the realm of options for political actors in their strategic contemplation.[4]

In terms of methodology, this thesis proceeds as follows. The overall aim of the thesis is to contribute to general understanding regarding the concept of strategic culture via theoretical reflection on the existing scholarly debate. Another aim of the thesis is to reinvigorate the debate on strategic culture by digging deep into the processes of strategic cultural change by introducing an analytical framework that builds on insights from critical realist metatheory and existing accounts on strategic cultural change. This is supported by an analytical empirical analysis on the evolution of German strategic culture since the end of World War II. However, it needs to be noted that since the scope of the analysis covers developments that reach from the aftermath of World War II to the conflict in Ukraine, an in-depth analysis of each turn of events, debate or related specifics is beyond this thesis. Therefore, the empirical focus is specifically on post-Cold War developments. The thesis provides a rich and varied account in terms of the evolution of German strategic culture by elaborating primarily but not only on the questions of peace and war

---

[2] For a detailed discussion, see Chapter 2.

[3] See Chapter 3.

[4] See Chapter 1.3.

and the use of military force (the core of strategic culture). Indeed, another purpose of the analysis is to pit the introduced analytical framework against theoretical claims that operate on the level of the international system. Instead of attempting to cover a multitude of theoretical claims that operate at the system level, this thesis focuses especially on Alexander Wendt's account of cultures of anarchy (Hobbesian, Lockean and Kantian culture)[5] since it can be argued that it provides interesting contrasts to the theory of strategic culture and can hence be treated either as a critique on some of the claims that this thesis puts forward or as a supplementary account that highlights international and global dynamics in explaining strategic cultural change.

The research proceeds as follows: Chapter 1 discusses in depth why it is necessary to shift the focus of research from strategic cultural continuity to strategic cultural change. It will delve into the scholarly debates and existing theoretical frameworks on strategic culture and assess their impact on the study of German strategic culture. Chapter 2 discusses the existing accounts of strategic cultural change and constructs an analytical framework for the study of strategic cultural change. It also discusses Wendtian cultures of anarchy that provide alternative/supplementary accounts in terms of strategic cultural change. Chapters 3 and 4 portray the evolution of German strategic culture since the end World War II and Cold War, respectively. This is provided in the form of an analytical historical narrative that focuses particularly, but not exclusively, on the question of the use of military force and the German debate in terms of so-called out-of-area operations *(Auslandseinsätze der Bundeswehr)*[6]. Chapter 5 shifts the discussion to re-interpretations of the German past, because they play a pivotal role in grasping the essence of strategic cultural change. In Chapter 5, the thesis also elaborates on and provides a critical analysis of some of the 'grand' schemes or claims on German strategic culture, such as that of a German special path (*Sonderweg*) and the debate on 'normality', because they play an important role in terms of strategic cultural evolution in Germany. It is also suggested in this thesis that counterfactual argumentation can prove to be useful in not only stressing the aspect of causal non-linearity instead of linearity in the evolution of strategic culture, but also the inherent contingency in terms of external shocks such as wars, conflicts and crises, which all pose a challenge to strategic cultures. Chapter 5 concludes with a counterfactual thought experiment on the case of the Srebrenica massacre.

The empirical material used in thesis consists mainly of a selection of Bundestag debates in the form of plenary protocols that provide not only a comprehensive picture of the process of how German strategic thought is

---

[5] See Wendt, Alexander 1999, *Social Theory of International Politics, Cambridge University Press*, 1999, (Chapter 6).

[6] Out-of-area operations refer to those military operations conducted under the auspices of collective systems of security of which Germany is a part, such as those of NATO which go beyond the territorial boundaries of the member states of these systems.

constructed at the level of the German political elite, but also of how Germans respond to the emerging issues of peace, war and the use of military force in terms of particular Bundeswehr (German armed forces) out-of-area operations. In addition, this thesis utilizes a wide range of other textual material, defence and security policy related documents such as White Books (*Weissbuch*) and Defence Political Guidelines (*Verteidigungspolitische Richtlinien*), a wide selection of media and press coverage mainly on the deployment of the Bundeswehr in out-of-area operations but also more widely on security and defence policy. It also utilizes other literary sources and existing research on strategic culture and international relations, security and defence policy.

The argument put forward in this thesis is that strategic cultural change needs to be grasped in terms of social and political processes, as well as outcomes at the level of policy practices in order to do justice to the complex cultural and social reality 'out there'. This view allows us to move from an understanding of strategic cultural change in terms of historical evolution that is rooted in essentialism and guided by strict path-dependency to an understanding of strategic cultural change as a causally non-linear process which may become empirically observable as verifiable outcomes, such as in terms of institutionalized patterns of behaviour. Perhaps more importantly, this thesis also suggests that the debate on strategic cultural change needs to go beyond the notion of observable, verifiable outcomes because strategic cultures possess significant socio-cognitive qualities that do not always become empirically observable the way we might expect them to.[7]

As will be discussed in detail in the empirical analysis, in the German case this pertains particularly to the process of coming to terms with the German past and the evolving perceptions thereof, the understanding of which is imperative if we want to understand and explain the changes that took place in German strategic culture after the end of the Cold War.

However, the importance of studying the aspect of change in strategic cultures should not be underestimated from either a more policy-oriented view, or from a popular view, for that matter. For instance, regardless of how the changes that took place within the US strategic culture that led to the war against terrorism during the Bush administration in the early 2000s were evaluated within the research community, these changes have had a considerable impact not only on the functioning and purpose of NATO and the transatlantic security community, but also on the way as individuals and

---

[7] This is not to say that processes are essentially 'unobservable' (which they are not) but merely to highlight the fact that research on strategic culture needs to shift its focus from clearly observable and detectable 'outcomes' to entities such as 'processes' which may not always become empirically manifest to the degree that 'outcomes' do. According to Heikki Patomäki, what is observable and what is not is essentially a complex and relative question. For more on observation, see e.g. Patomaki, Heikki 2014, 'On the Reality of Causes: A Response to Ned Lebow', Qualitative & Multi-Method Research, Fall 2014, Vol. 12, No.2, pp. 11-16.

peoples we contemplate the issues of peace and war and the use of military force. Hence, by attempting a systematic look at the process of strategic cultural change, we might be in a better position to understand how and why we wage war against terrorism the way we do. Similarly, an in-depth look at the process of change in German strategic culture not only provides us with an account of why and how German strategic culture has changed, but also it offers an explanation of why Germany might often seem reluctant to take the lead in terms of issues regarding international security (for instance). Hence, the observations we draw from studying the process of strategic cultural change can have important social and political implications that go beyond the notion of interest shown among the professional circles in the field of International Relations (IR).

1.1. THE INITIAL THEORETICAL PREMISE: GERMAN STRATEGIC CULTURE AS A CULTURE OF STRATEGIC CONTINUITY

In his seminal work on German and Japanese post-World War II foreign and security policy cultures, Thomas U. Berger admits that he was surprised that Germany and Japan had not begun to act more assertively in military terms since the end of the Cold War. This was contrary to all the expectations of students of international relations, as Berger says. He claims to have had trouble in facing an empirical reality in such disarray and at odds with his theoretical premises: "I felt like Sherlock Holmes in the Hound of Baskervilles: The puzzle was not that the dog barked, but rather that it did not."[8] Berger was not alone in his bafflement. Indeed, this seemed to be one of the more perplexing topics among the observers of German politics after the end of the Cold War: why did Germany not choose to act more aggressively?[9] Berger argued that this was because of a deeply rooted anti-militarism and pacifism in German society and politics. Others claimed it was due to Germany's internalized role as a civilian power that underlined the traditional practice of restraint in issues regarding the use of military force.[10] This was

---

[8] Berger, Thomas U. 1998, *Cultures of Antimilitarism: National Security in Germany and Japan*. Johns Hopkings University Press 1998, (preface).

[9] This seemed to be a question particularly bothering the realist camp of IR scholars, see Duffield, John 1998, *World Power Forsaken. Political Culture, International Institutions and German Security Policy After Unification*, Stanford University Press, 1998; Waltz, Kenneth 1993, 'The Emerging Structure of International Politics', International Security 18:2 (Fall), 1993.

[10] See e.g. Berger 1998; Maull, Hanns W. 1990, 'Germany and Japan: The New Civilian Powers', Foreign Affairs, Vol. 69, No. 5, pp. 91-106; Maull, Hanns W. 1992, 'Zivilmacht Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Vierzehn Thesen für eine neue deutsche Außenpolitik', Europa Archiv, Vol. 47, No. 10, pp. 269-278; Kirste, Knut & Maull, Hanns W. 1996, 'Zivilmacht und Rollentheorie', Zeitschrift für Internationale Beziehungen, 3:2, 1996, pp. 283-312.

the prevalent situation in the field of IR regarding the study of German politics at the end of the bipolar era and well into the 1990s. However, challenges in terms of security policy that appeared due to the outbreak of crisis and conflicts in Europe and beyond put Germany under constant external pressure that revealed the degree to which German strategic culture was at odds with the emerging post-Cold War political reality. The puzzling thing about this, however, is not that we have witnessed considerable change in German strategic culture since the end of the Cold War, but the fact that there have been few serious studies which would have focused on the aspect of change in German strategic culture.[11]

Indeed, the following assumptions have dominated studies on German strategic culture ever since German re-unification: 1) German strategic culture functions according to strong continuity in the underlying ideational/normative structure; 2) this continuity translates into equivalent, pattern-oriented state behaviour in terms of foreign, security and defence policy; 3) German strategic culture is especially resistant to change due to the troubled German past, its strong inclination towards multilateral frameworks and global governance, its deeply-rooted antimilitaristic political identity and its preference for status quo security and defence policy and finally its reluctance to take lead in issues of international/global security 4) all the above points contribute to the understanding of Germany's international foreign and security policy role as a normative civilian power.[12]

The puzzling thing is that the overwhelming majority of these assumptions are still taken for granted despite the track record of Germany's foreign and security policy since the Balkan wars in the mid-1990s and especially since the war in Kosovo at the end of the 1990s telling a rather different story. Taken together, the above assumptions essentially lead to a line of argumentation which posits that German strategic culture remains largely immune to pressures towards change in an international security environment that has undergone a major transformation since the end of the Cold War. As this study will show, this is simply not the case. German strategic culture may be resilient but it is not immune to change. Its major tenets have undergone a more comprehensive change as proposed by the above assumptions. In essence, this study scrutinizes the existing mantra of cultural continuity by digging deeper into the dynamics of strategic cultu-

---

[11] Hilpert's case-study of German strategic culture in Afghanistan (Enduring Freedom/ISAF) is a welcome exception. See Hilpert, Carolin 2014, *Strategic Cultural Change and the Challenge for Security Policy. Germany and the Bundeswehr's Deployment to Afghanistan,* Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.

[12] See Maull, 1990; Kirste & Maull, 1996; Maull, Hanns W. 2000, 'German foreign policy, PostKosovo: Still a 'civilian power?', German Politics, Vol.9, No. 2, pp.1-24; Berger, 1998; Dalgaard-Nielsen, Anja 2005, 'The Test of Strategic Culture: Germany, Pacifism and Pre-Emptive Strikes', Security Dialogue Vol. 36 (3), pp. 339-359; Malici, Akan 2006, 'Germans as Venutians: The Culture of German Foreign Policy Behaviour, Foreign Policy Analysis, Vol. 2, Issue 1, pp. 37-62; See also Schmitt, Olivier 2012, 'Strategic Users of Culture: German Decisions For Military Action', Contemporary Security Policy, Vol, 33:1, pp. 59-81.

ral change as well as by questioning some of the convenient truths about German strategic culture that are so well represented by the above assumptions.

There is almost unanimous scholarly consensus that Kosovo marked a watershed in German foreign and security policy because it was the first time that Germany took part *militarily* in an international conflict management operation under the auspices of the NATO Allied Force –operation, meaning that it was directly involved in the fighting itself (albeit without deploying any ground troops).[13] Yet perhaps even more importantly, the experiences from Kosovo did not set up a specific strategic pattern – neither ideational nor behavioural for that matter – in German security and defence policy. Because there was no hard evidence to the contrary, scholars such as Maull argued that in terms of German strategic culture after Kosovo, very little had changed.[14] However, the general conclusion was that Kosovo did set an important precedent for Germany to be able and at least remotely willing to use military force in defence of human rights (hence building on the legacy of the Bosnian war and the massacre at Srebrenica in particular) but it was far from the milestone of a wholesale change towards more interventionist policies in terms of peace-enforcement via the use of military force.[15]

The terrorist strikes against the US in September 2001 culminated in another puzzle for the existing accounts of German strategic culture. At first, these events seemed to confirm both Germany's stance towards antimilitarism and the notion of Germany as a civilian power and, hence, they support the assumption of continuity in German strategic culture. Yet by declining to abide by 'American adventurism' Germany was perceived as parting from one of its most important foreign and security policy principles since the end of World War II – the alliance with the US.[16] Furthermore, although Germany participated in and contributed to the war effort against international terrorism in Afghanistan for 14 years, there existed a clear gap between the dis-

---

[13] During NATO's 78-day air campaign over Kosovo in early 1999, the purpose of which was to compel the Serbian President Slobodan Milosevic to accept the terms of the Rambouillet agreement, Germany deployed 10 Tornados which played an important part in shutting down Serb radar systems. The Germans, together with the Italians, delivered over 35% of the munitions expended in suppression of Serb air defence missions. See Peters, John E. 2001, *European Contributions to Operation Allied Force*, Santa Monica, CA: Rand, pp. 32-33.

[14] See Maull, 2000.

[15] See Berger, Thomas U. 2002, 'A Perfectly Normal Abnormality: German Foreign Policy after Kosovo and Afghanistan', Japanese Journal of Political Science, Vol. 3, No. 2. (Nov. 2002), pp. 175-177; Leithner, Anika 2009, *Shaping German Foreign Policy. History, Memory and National Interest*, FirstForumPress, Boulder, London 2009, pp.45-47; Rudolf, Peter 2005, 'The Myth of the 'German Way': German Foreign Policy and Transatlantic Relations', Survival, Spring 2005, Vol. 47, Issue 1, p. 140.

[16] Forsberg, Tuomas 2005, 'German Foreign Policy and the War on Iraq: Anti-Americanism, Pacifism or Emancipation?', Security Dialogue, Vol. 36 (2), pp. 213-231.

cursive formulation of the political elite about the operation and the reality of the Bundeswehr deployment on the ground. This meant that the elite discourse about 'defending German security at the Hindukusch' – a famous quote by the former German defence minister Peter Struck[17] that signalled a *normalization* of German foreign and security policy and Germany's credibility as a partner in NATO. However, this did not overlap with the reflections of German soldiers and the general public, who became increasingly confused and perplexed about the purpose of German deployment there on the whole. Similarly, if we look at more recent examples, the assumptions regarding German strategic cultural continuity led to inconsistent argumentation about German security and defence policy. In the wake of the Arab Spring in 2011 and the conflict in Libya, Germany chose not to take part in the NATO Unified Protector military operation, although it can be argued that the more crucial preconditions for German military participation since the massacre at Srebrenica in 1995 were fulfilled in Libya, namely, the possibility of ethnic cleansing, possibly even genocide.[18] Therefore, to explain Germany's recent security and defence policy by the professed continuity of its strategic culture is – in the light of the given examples – rather contradictory because in this assessment, cultural continuity becomes an all-encompassing explanatory 'repository' that can explain anything by stretching the argument. One could argue in favour of the culture of restraint and civilian power -concept by stating that exceptions confirm the rule or that Germany tends to favour a civilian approach to conflict resolution whenever possible or feasible. However, it would only contribute to the already waning explanatory power that the civilian power approach still wields and, most importantly, actually delegitimizes the original idea of the 'civilianness' of the approach in its normative understanding.

In the mainstream strategic cultural scholarship it is more often than not taken for granted that strategic culture culminates with the premise of cultural continuity. First, this claim is often backed by the fact that we have very little evidence on actual strategic cultural change and that scholars regularly agree that strategic cultural change is not worth studying because it takes place only after a long period of time, if at all.[19] Moreover, it could be stated that this line of argument leads to the conclusion that strategic cultural change is simply something that cannot be directly observed and/or can only

---

[17] Declaration of the German Federal Government, issued by Defense Minister Peter Struck, 11.3.2004. Available at: (http://www.bmvg.de).

[18] See Bellamy, Alex. J 2011, 'Libya and the Responsibility to Protect: The Exception and the Norm', Ethics & International Affairs, Vol. 25, No. 3 (Fall 2011), pp. 263-269. The massacre of Srebrenica refers to the events in the UN safe-enclave of Srebrenica in Bosnia and Herzegovina in the summer of 1995, when Serb forces, under the command of General Ratko Mladic, committed a massacre of around 8000 Muslim boys and men.

[19] This seems to be the general conclusion of the most influential writings within the strategic culture scholarship, see Chapter 1.4.

be grasped in retrospect or via theoretical reflection. However, regardless of whether something is essentially observable or not, most social phenomena do not show themselves to us the way we expect them to (either by conforming with our senses or with our theories), and this is no different in case of strategic culture. Second, the problem often lies with the definition of strategic culture, or, rather, in its ambivalent delineation from concepts such as foreign and security policy identity or role. In constructivist analyses, identities are usually treated as being more malleable than cultures even though at the same time, identities are thought to be the expressions of the underlying culture. Hence, change is often detected on the level of identity or role yet it remains unclear how changed identities or roles affect the very culture within which they operate. Wendt, for instance, solves this dilemma by arguing that identity essentially defines the contents of culture because if identities don't change, neither do cultures. This corresponds with Wendt's conception of culture as a self-fulfilling prophecy (once in place, culture tends to reproduce itself).[20] This position is vulnerable to post-structuralist critique which maintains that Wendtian constructivism takes identities as given (which would hence indicate that cultures are given, too), which can be argued to be problematic if constructivism is about trying to seize the middle-ground between rationalism and interpretivism.[21]

In any case, this state of affairs in strategic culture research is unsatisfactory not only because of the lamentations about the relative scarcity of empirical evidence, but even more so because it endorses a view of strategic culture that is inherently static within, regardless of whether the point is to argue for continuity, change or some other aspect of (strategic) culture. Consequently, the accounts of strategic culture usually lack a systematic assessment on the preconditions for strategic cultural change. As a result, they are unable to provide accurate descriptions or explanations as to why states with similar strategic cultural backgrounds opt for different strategies or policy choices, or why state behaviour seems to go beyond what is considered 'appropriate' in the given strategic cultural circumstances that underlie the normative structure of strategic culture.[22] To stress this point, although all of this is connected to the crucial matter of whether cultures are considered to matter at all in terms of policy or strategy or whether they function only as some abstract points of reference or as secondary explanations to approaches highlighting the role of power, the fact remains that by underlining the aspect of

---

[20] See Wendt 1999.

[21] For a poststructuralist critique, see e.g. Zehfuss, Maja 2001, 'Constructivism and Identity: A Dangerous Liaison', European Journal of International Relations, Vol. 7, No. 3, pp. 315-348.

[22] Christoph O. Meyer's study (2006) on the convergence of European norms about security and defense provides a welcome exception. Meyer addresses the question of causal mechanisms for normative change referring to the proclivity to use military force among the EU member states. Meyer's account will be discussed in detail in Chapter 2.

continuity at the cost of a more nuanced assessment on the aspect of cultural change, strategic culture falls short of much of its explanatory potential.

Hence, the idea of continuity is integral to the way strategic culture is often conceived. For one, the very idea (or any idea) of culture requires social patterns which imply continuity in some form in order to be able to understand culture as a constant, substantial relationship between institutions, principles, actions and ideas. This is highlighted in the traditional usage of culture in anthropology, for instance, as 'a category of social life' that is expressed i.e. in an understanding of culture as 'learned behaviour' or as a 'system of symbols and meanings', both of which build on the idea of cultural continuity.[23]

And yet, this in-built necessity of continuity actually tells us very little about how particular cultures work and how they shape social and political reality. Indeed, if we opt for this kind of simple definition for political (or any) culture, then the analytical value of culture becomes redundant for it is overly deterministic. For instance, if we understand a political culture as a continuation of given social, political and historical patterns promoting certain policies then we make the assumption that the sole existence of a political culture leads to certain kind of policies which originate in these given patterns, even if we entrusted the notion of culture with the smallest amount of explanatory power. This is a problem with essentialist accounts that build on the idea of path-dependent historical progress based on historical institutionalism that is traditionally at odds with ideational change[24] and it seems to form the basis of an understanding of history in the mainstream accounts of strategic culture. However, we could also argue that precisely since culture is often defined as a continuation of social, political and historical patterns, we cannot entirely escape the notion of causal relations as something more than just effective causes between the ideational structure and observed behaviour. Indeed, the overall argument about cultural continuity can hardly mean that the evolution of culture occurs in a socially linear fashion or as a result of some deterministic historical and social forces only. Instead, this study suggests that we adopt a more non-linear view on the evolution of culture, because it enables us to make more advanced arguments regarding both strategic cultural continuity and change.

---

[23] For a conceptual history of culture in human sciences, see e.g. Sewell Jr., William H. 2005, 'The Concept(s) of Culture', Spiegel, M. Gabrielle (ed.) *Practicing history: New directions in historical writing after the linguistic turn*, Routledge 2005, pp.76-95. Sewell argues that two conceptions of culture are currently vying for dominance: 'culture as a system of symbols and meanings', which was hegemonic in the 1960s and 1970s and 'culture as practice', which has become increasingly prominent in the 1980s and 1990s.

[24] See Sayer, Andrew 1997, 'Essentialism, social constructionism and beyond', The Sociological Review, Vol.45, No. 3, pp. 453-487; Peters-Pierre-King 2005, 'The Politics of Path Dependency: Political Conflict in Historical Institutionalism', The Journal of Politics, Vol. 67, No. 4 (Nov. 2005), pp.1275-1300.

As Beverly Crawford observed a few years ago, "(t)he debate over continuity and change in foreign policy emerged because of Germany's rise in the traditional sources of power that caught the world's attention when unity and full sovereignty were restored in 1990. This particular debate emerged because the paradigm of power politics is still dominant in both analytic and policy circles."[25] However, while military power is the central credo of all the different strands of realism, there are clear differences between the classical realist and neorealist research on German foreign and security policy. Visuri, for instance, has argued that military-geopolitical factors were indispensable in an explanatory framework aimed at a long-term view on German security policy and in particular military strategy during the Cold War. This stemmed from Germany's central geopolitical status as a frontline state as well as the fact that for the most part of the Cold War, NATO military doctrine considered the West-German state territory as the primary defensive operational area vis-à-vis the Warsaw Pact.[26] Geopolitical considerations reappeared in the aftermath of the fall of the Berlin Wall in particular in the writings of conservative German historians and publicists in terms of the linkage between geographical space and political development (space as fate) and the role of geography in defining state's a priori national interests. Indeed, this was premised on a classical realist view that the highest level of 'normality' for a state was to rise to its 'natural' position vis-à-vis other states. In particular, this was in relation to the concept of Germany's central position (*Mittellage)* in Europe. The concept of *Mittellage* was accompanied by the idea of a new geopolitical assessment of Germany in post-Soviet Europe, where the interests revolved not around territorial annexation but around the conditions necessary for Germany to act as a benign, stabilizing hegemonic power.[27] However, these views were clearly in the minority in Germany, as the general view on Germany's Western orientation that was supplanted by European integration after the end of the Cold War was considered not to be instrumental in managing the question of *Mittellage* (as some of the conservatives claimed) but a fundamental prerequisite for a transcendence from *Mittellage* to a Europe sharing a common fate (*Schicksalsgemeinschaft).*[28]

Neorealists, in turn, predicted that Germany would presume a more assertive stance in its foreign and security policy and pursue dominance over its European partners after it had been granted full state sovereignty and that other European states would again seek to balance against a resurgent Ger-

---

[25] Crawford, Beverly 2007, *Power and German Foreign Policy. Embedded Hegemony in Europe*, Palgrave MacMillan 2007, p. 179.

[26] Visuri, Pekka 1989, *Totaalisesta sodasta kriisinhallintaan. Puolustusperiaatteiden kehitys läntisessä Keski-Euroopassa ja Suomessa vuosina 1945-1989*, Otava 1989.

[27] See e.g. Bach, J & Peters, S 2002, 'The New Spirit of German Geopolitics', Geopolitics, Vol. 7, No.3, pp. 1-18.

[28] Ibid., pp. 9-10.

man military power.[29]   However, German policies after the end of the Cold War and German reunification seemed to go against every key (neo)realist premise of state behaviour and support the constructivist approach on strategic culture.[30]   Firstly, and most importantly, Germany did not aspire to become a 'normal' state in terms of military power. The concept of Germany as a civilian power, which had taken firm root in German strategic culture during the 1980s, remained very strong in German strategic thought in the early years of the reunited Federal Republic, and reified the notion of Germany acting under a 'culture of military restraint'.[31] Secondly, compared to the armies of its European peers, German armed forces were fairly modest and remained firmly embedded within NATO command structures. Thirdly, if measured solely based on Kenneth Waltz's classic categorization of power, which covers the "size of population and territory, resource endowment, economic capability, military strength, political stability and competence"[32], it might seem plausible to assume that a reunified Germany had every reason to begin acting according to the neorealist understanding of states as rational, egoistic actors steered by the notions of national interest and power maximization as their raison d'état.[33] Yet this was a bold assumption that had more to do with the realist fixation about the aspect of military power, balancing and dominance than the actual situation and political reality in Germany at the end of the bipolar era. Indeed, what one might call the then 're-unification euphoria', not uncommon within academia at the time, ensured that there was barely any reflection on the fact that the Germans did not actually have a meaningful and comprehensive debate on what the national interests of the reunified nation entailed, let alone reach some definite state of political normality. This was also reflected in the fact that a constitutional debate did not take place in Germany after the end of the Cold War. Moreover, the famous Historians' Controversy (Historikerstreit) in the mid-1980s[34] ultimately echoed the different attitudes within the German society towards

[29] See Waltz, Kenneth 1993, 'The Emerging Structure of International System', International Security, Vol.18, No.2 (Autumn 1993), p. 50 ; Mearsheimer, J. John 1990, 'Why We Will Soon Miss the Cold War', Atlantic Monthly, Vol.266, No.2, p. 39.

[30] (Neo)realism or structural realism and (neo)liberalism as well as constructivism are considered the three 'grand' theories in International Relations.

[31] See Maull, W. Hanns 1990, 'Germany and Japan: The New Civilian Powers', Foreign Affairs, Vol. 69, Nr. 5, pp. 91-106; Kirste, Knut & Maull, Hanns W. 1996, 'Zivilmacht und Rollentheorie', Zeitschrift für Internationale Beziehungen, 3:2, 1996, pp. 283-312; Harnisch, Sebastian & Maull, Hanns W. (eds.) 2001, *Germany as a civilian power? The foreign policy of the Berlin Republic*, Manchester University Press, 2001.

[32] Waltz, Kenneth 1979, *Theory of International Politics*, Mc-Graw Hill, 1979, p. 131.

[33] See Baumann, Rainer, Rittberger, Volker & Wagner, Wolfgang 2001, 'Neorealist foreign policy theory', Rittberger, Volker (ed.), *German Foreign Policy Since Unification: Theories and Case Studies*, Manchester University Press, 2001, pp. 37-67.

[34] For more detail, see Chapter 5.1.3.

questions pertaining to the lessons of the Nazi past – attitudes, which quite astutely revealed the problematic nature of the argument that the reunified Germany had firmly defined 'national interests' which it egoistically followed according to some ultimate rationalist logic.

Neorealist predictions didn't hold much water elsewhere, either. In a telling example from correspondence between realists and their critics in *International Security* (1990-91), J.J. Mearsheimer argued that

> *"(i)f the Germans cause trouble in the new Europe, it will not be a consequence of peculiar aggressive traits. Germans are not born to aggress. An acute sense of insecurity is instead likely to be the source of trouble. The root causes of it will be Germany's exposed location in the center of the Continent and its non-nuclear status. Telling the Germans they cannot ameliorate their security concerns with nuclear weapons because they are not trustworthy is certain to infuriate them and will only serve to worsen relations between Germany and its neighbors. It is time to face up to the fact that permitting the Germans to acquire nuclear weapons is better than the alternative."[35]*

The above passage is a prime example of neorealist logic according to which possessing nuclear weapons automatically makes the world a safer place because they decrease the sense of insecurity. The story has been told as if the process of European integration did not exist before the Treaty of Maastricht or as if the Cuban Missile Crisis had never taken place in 1962, when the world stood at the brink of an all-out nuclear war. Mearsheimer's notion is based on the realist premise that systemic shifts cause irregularities in the relative power between states; irregularities, which will be brought to balance through war. This was the reason why Cold War order was regarded as being more stable than what came thereafter. However, the Paris protocol to the Treaty of Brussels from 1954 already forbade Germany from possessing nuclear, biological and chemical weapons.[36] While Germany had a vital security interest in the nuclear balance during the Cold War, it can hardly be taken as evidence that this was somehow a preferred state of affairs for Germany, which, quite literally, stood at the frontline of potential nuclear escalation despite not having a nuclear arsenal of its own. In fact, the fear of nuclear war was a lot higher than the trust German policymakers put in nuclear arsenals and their ability to provide security, which is reflected in very strong criticism from Germany towards its allies' nuclear plans as well as the regular and popular peace marches in West-Germany during the 1980s. In addition, both German states signed the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) before Ger-

---

[35] Russett, Bruce M, Risse-Kappen, Thomas and Mearsheimer, John J. 1990, 'Back to the Future, Part III: Realism and the Realities of European Security', International Security, Vol. 15, No. 3 (Winter, 1990-1991), p.222.

[36] Müller, Harald 2000, 'Nuclear Weapons and German Interests: An Attempt at Redefinition', PRIF-Report No. 55/2000, Peace Research Institute Frankfurt, p. 5.

man re-unification in 1990. Contemporarily, Germany remains one of the more skeptical countries towards nuclear energy in general. Indeed, the Federal Republic has been the forerunner in nuclear phase-out (to be completed in 2022) since the nuclear catastrophe in Fukushima in 2011.[37]

If the desire to acquire nuclear weapons is to be considered an essential feature of a 'normal' (Hobbesian) state, then it is safe to say that post World War II Germany never abided by the realist logic of military power in the sense of attempting to acquire a status of a great power.[38] Realists would argue that this occurred because German power was curtailed during the Cold War, but, as we have witnessed, the developments after the end of the Cold War did not lead to a Teutonic shift in the middle of Europe understood in crude realist terms. Essentially, acceleration in the process of European integration after the end of the Cold War seemed to indicate that the neorealist model of a normal state would have very little room among the EU member states. This can further be witnessed in the development of common foreign and security policy (of which defence policy was to be a part after the Western European Union (WEU) had been incorporated into the Maastricht framework) at the European level, traditionally the domain of normal nation states. While the approach on strategic culture can be argued to be diametrically opposed to crude realism in the sense of questioning the validity of the argument regarding the normal state and its aspiration for the accumulation of military power, there is no *a priori* reason to assume that the issue of military power would be foreign to a cultural view on security and defence. Instead, the way this thesis grasps the approach on strategic culture in terms of military power is that it matters but that the way it matters is defined largely by the specifics of the strategic cultural tenets in question, not by unmalleable systemic traits of an anarchic international structure imposed on state actors. Hence, and even though this study does not share Wendt's position on cultures as "self-fulfilling prophecies that tend to reproduce themselves"[39], it seems to be principally in line with Wendt's formulation of different 'cultures of anarchy' where the realization of any one form of anarchy (Hobbesian, Lockean or Kantian) depends not on the existence of either enmity, rivalry or friendship but rather on the level of how deep the respective cultural internalization of these traits is thought to be.[40] While neorealism's structural foundation is ill-suited for contemplating the significance of unit-level variables and therefore strategic culture, other forms of realism such as neoclassical realism might be more promising in this regard. While neoclas-

---

[37] ‚Deutschland beim Atomausstieg allein auf weiter Flur', Die Welt, 11.3.2015. Available at: (http://www.welt.de/wirtschaft/energie/article138288809/Deutschland-beim-Atomausstieg-allein-auf-weiter-Flur.html).

[38] A good example is the so-called NATO double-track decision; see Chapter 3.

[39] Wendt, Alexander 1999, *Social Theory of International Politics*, Cambridge University Press 1999, p. 309.

[40] See ibid., Chapter 6.

sical realism has not abandoned the realist roots in terms of power (increase in relative power leads to a more ambitious foreign policy and vice versa) it does highlight the decisive role played by policy-makers' perceptions on the external, structural constraints as well as the political elites' constrained ability to harness the national power resources.[41]

Yet realists were not the only ones to argue strongly about Germany and her politics. Liberalist and institutionalist accounts considered Germany to be firmly embedded in the multilateral and global framework of institutions based on interdependence, which was portrayed first and foremost as a constraint on the expansion of German power.[42] Constructivists, in turn, were more interested in how German national identity was constructed based on commonly shared ideas, norms and principles and how it affected the foreign and security policies Germany aimed to pursue.[43] Indeed, general scholarly interest towards strategic culture studies partly increased because of the so-called constructivist turn in social sciences and International Relations studies in the late 1980s and early 1990s. The most influential writings on culture in the field of security have undoubtedly come from IR constructivist scholarship, since constructivists have mostly had an interest in the workings of culture and the link between culture, security and identity. For instance, Peter Katzenstein's seminal volume Culture of National Security (1996) takes issue on how norms – rather than strict material conditions – shape state identity, interests and policy action.[44] However, the focus of strategic culture studies – in contrast to the plethora of security studies conducted under the constructivist label – lies in how strategic thought and practices shape and are shaped by the alliance policies of states, threat assessment, images of war and peace, the form and content of military doctrines, grand strategy, civil-military relations and perhaps most importantly, the inclination to use or abstain from the use of military force in solving international crises and conflicts. Hence, strategic culture scholarship is primarily interested in the question of how cultural attributes such as interpretations of the past and the specific normative framework related to the fundamental question of peace and war affect the practices regarding the use of military force and how these

---

[41] See e.g. Rose, Gideon 1998, 'Neoclassical Realism and Theories of Foreign Policy', World Politics, Vol. 51, No. 1 (October 1998), pp. 144-172.

[42] See Anderson, Jeffrey J & Goodman John B. 1993, 'Mars or Minerva? A United Germany in a Post-Cold War Europe', Keohane. Robert, Nye, Joseph & Hoffmann, Stanley (eds.) (1993), *After the Cold War: International Institutions and State Strategies in Europe 1998-1991*, Harvard University Press, 1993, pp. 23-62; Duffield, John 1998, *World Power Forsaken: Political Culture, International Institutions and German Foreign Policy after Unification*, Stanford University Press, 1998.

[43] Boekle, Henning, Rittberger, Rainer & Wagner, Wolfgang 2001, 'Constructivist foreign policy theory', Rittberger, Rainer (ed.) 2001, *German Foreign Policy Since Unification: Theories and Case Studies*. Manchester University Press, 2001, pp. 105-140.

[44] See Katzenstein, Peter J. (ed.) 1996, *The Culture of National Security. Norms and Identity in World Politics*, Columbia University Press, 1996.

practices, in turn, affect the functioning of strategic culture. However, while this study embraces the constructivist ontology in general, this does not mean, in turn, that there would not be anything to criticize about the constructivist take on strategic culture – in particular with regard to the aspect of change – as will be discussed later in this chapter.

In any case, since the mid-1990s, cultural approaches to German foreign and security policy have become increasingly popular and influential. This has mostly had to do with the fact of constructivism becoming a valid alternative for realism/liberalism in the study of foreign and security policy in the field of IR but also with the fact that German foreign and security policy has been considered fertile empirical ground for testing and comparing the claims of different IR theories. This is because German unification and the fall of the Berlin Wall, together with the collapse of the Soviet Union, marked an end to the existing world order of bipolarity and balance of power and, therefore, seemed to hint at the deficiencies of rational theories in explaining some critical aspects of state behaviour and the functioning of the international system. Critical approaches have also made their mark in the study of German foreign and security policy in the form of post-structuralism and pragmatism based on the ideas of scholars such as Jacques Derrida, John Dewey and Richard Rorty, but rather surprisingly, have dealt less directly with the question of continuity and change.[45]

Now, importantly, this is not to say that the aspect of continuity in German strategic culture is devoid of any explanatory merit. It is merely to argue that there is something missing when we discuss continuity and change solely in the historically linear, essentialist fashion, when these are portrayed as the two opposing poles of social reality. In fact, continuity and change often coexist in strategic (or any) culture in one form or the other – and this is a precondition of social and political life, not social or political theory – an aspect which is not very clear if one looks at the state of the existing research. Crucially, as much as it is important to understand cultural 'continuity' and 'change' in terms of outcomes (for how else could we draw any meaningful distinction between them), it is also necessary to understand them as sometimes complementary, sometimes contradictory social and political processes, that have socio-cognitive qualities that do not always reveal themselves in the form of empirically verifiable outcomes. Therefore, throughout this study, I will also stress the processual nature of both continuity and change, albeit without the claim that these processes are always guided by linear, path-dependent historical forces. As we shall discuss in detail in Chapter 5, history matters greatly in terms of strategic culture, but as interpretations of the past evolve, so does the way in which history matters.

---

45 Here I refer to accounts critically posed to both mainstream constructivism and rationalism. See e.g. Zehfuss 2001; Hellmann 2009, 'Fatal attraction? German foreign policy and IR/foreign policy theory', Journal of International Relations and Development, Vol. 12, No. 3, pp. 257-292.

Essentially, the line of argumentation presented above maintains that the initial, almost taken-for-granted theoretical premise of cultural continuity within the strategic culture studies does not live up to its promise against the backdrop of the empirical track record of German security and defence policy after the end of the Cold War as this study will show in detail. Hence, for instance, there is a plausible case to be made that the famous notion of Germany as a civilian power – which stands as the ideal typical characterization of German strategic cultural continuity – has not been able to evolve into a concept that could incorporate the aspect of change but rather, as mentioned, remains a borderline tautological ideal type because of its foundation in the idea of cultural continuity. Importantly, this can be quite astutely observed in terms of evolving German security and defence policy within the EU institutional framework and the shifting expectations thereof. Germany has actually come a long way in this regard, even though it was commonplace – at least during much of the 1990s – to compare the 'civilian' or 'soft' EU foreign and security policy identity and the notion of Germany as a civilian power, highlighting the similarities between the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP), European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) and the German stance in terms of stressing the civilian approach to hard security issues such as military conflict management and the related policy practices. The ensuing problem, as Adrian Hyde-Price framed it more than ten years ago, was that "European strategic culture reflects the experience and security environment of the second half of the 20th century" and that "(t)he preference of most Europeans since the end of the Cold War for deterrence, containment and soft power has increasingly proven inadequate in the face of new security challenges".[46] This has led to "a pressing need for new thinking about the use of military force as an instrument of statecraft within a comprehensive approach to the evolving international security agenda"[47] that can be argued to be as relevant in the age of war against terror as it ever was. However, as the developments in international security policy since the Georgian War in 2008 and the conflict in Libya in 2010 over to the current crises in Ukraine and Syria indicate, the issue of 'the use of military force as an instrument of statecraft' cannot simply be coined as a matter of Cold War vs. post-Cold War strategic practices, because military and security threats posed by *states* or *regimes* have not vanished but rather have been supplemented by asymmetric threats to our security, such as terrorism or climate change. Furthermore, if we look at the current strategic cultures of the EU member states, there is neither a consensus regarding the purpose of the use of military force nor agreement as to what really constitutes strategic culture at the EU level.[48]

---

[46] Hyde-Price, Adrian 2004, 'European Security, Strategic Culture, and the Use Of Force', European Security, 13(4) 2004, p. 324.

[47] Ibid.

[48] See e.g. Biehl-Giegerich-Jonas (ed.) (2013), *Strategic Cultures in Europe. Security and Defence Policies Across the Continent*, Springer VS. 2013.

While Hyde-Price's above argument regarding the legacy of the Cold War strategic culture in Europe is convincing, we have also witnessed tangible change both in terms of a broadening and a deepening of the scope of security itself as well as the ways in which and the purpose for which the use of military force has been applied since the end of the Cold War.

Indeed, current accounts about Germany as a civilian power – a concept which is still quite popular within some circles of the research community – should at least try to answer the question about why civilian power is still a fitting description of the Federal Republic. Indeed, while one can still detect a certain red line in terms of German reluctance to participate *directly* in any kind of combat, German soldiers fought and died for their country in Afghanistan, the longest NATO operation in its history, spanning the period from 2001 to 2014. Perhaps the popularity of the civilian power –concept has more to do with the fact that it took years for German politicians to acknowledge the fact that the German forces were operating under 'warlike' circumstances in Afghanistan, as German soldiers were engaged in ground combat and actually labelled as 'soldiers' instead of 'aid-workers' or 'well-diggers'.[49] Indeed, as the example of Afghanistan and the German participation in the US-led Operation Enduring Freedom and the NATO-led ISAF (International Security Assistance Force) show, the German army was transformed from a static, conscript army to a professional armed force 'in action' (*Bundeswehr im Einsatz*).[50] As a broader European phenomenon, the specialization and professionalization of the armed forces does not limit itself to Germany, but the change is particularly pertinent in the Federal Republic, where conscription ended in 2010. Overall, the case of Afghanistan illustrates not only the sometimes relatively wide gap between strategic discourse and strategic practice but also the extent of the attempts of the German political elite to preserve the status quo (i.e. the notion of civilian power) in German strategic culture. Indeed, the case of Afghanistan is a prime example of how continuity and change co-exist in German strategic culture.

To sum up the discussion so far, in this thesis it has been argued that we need an account of strategic culture that takes the study of change in strategic culture seriously since, as indicated above, the existing accounts culminating almost entirely in the idea of cultural continuity are rather ambivalent in terms of their explanatory power. These approaches are facing the same problem as faced by Berger with his study, namely, that reality often strikes back at our conceptualizations of it. The study at hand has no immediate remedy for facing an utterly complex social reality, other than the claim that it will paint a more comprehensive picture of the dynamics of strategic cul-

---

[49] For more detail, see Chapter 5.3.3.

[50] The German term 'Bundeswehr im Einsatz', which literally means 'in deployment' is broadly used in German and it captures well the change of Bundeswehr from a static, conscript army the purpose of which was territorial defence to a dynamic armed force, deployable in crisis and conflicts around the globe. For more detail on Bundeswehr and change, see Chapter 5.3.3.

ture, including an attempt to identify and discuss the changes in post-Cold War German strategic culture some of which, as we shall see, had actually been under way long before the fall of the Berlin Wall.

As this study seeks to illustrate with the example of the changes in German strategic culture after the end of the Cold War, Germany was slowly but surely coming to terms with the fact that the world had not been transformed into a Garden of Eden as a result of the fall of the Berlin Wall and that the emerging post-Cold War global order would pose difficult questions for a country whose historical experience in particular with regard to the issue of the use of military force was deeply problematic. Indeed, ever since the first Gulf War (1990-1991), the post-Cold War Federal Republic was discovering the new political reality in terms which had been deemed a thing of the German past. As will be discussed in detail later in this study, it was precisely the combination of the nature of emerging external challenges, the ever-changing internal constraints and windows of political opportunity that initially set the pace for the evolution of German strategic culture after the end of the Cold War. This study focuses particularly on the issue of how and why the German past continues to exert influence on contemporary German strategic culture. The impact of this issue is more often than not taken for granted given the traditionally strong assumptions regarding continuity in German strategic culture. A detailed study of the interpretations of the German past is imperative for an understanding of German strategic culture, because they are part of the German 'experience of warfare', which is one of the main mechanisms that can bring about change. This will be discussed in the next chapter.

1.2. ORIGINS OF STRATEGIC CULTURAL STUDIES

In terms of strategy and military history, the classic works of Sun Tzu and Thucydides stand out as major influences on the development of Western strategic thought.[51] Sun Tzu's classic *The Art of War*, written in the 6th century B.C., has influenced studies of war and strategy for the past 2500 years. Sun Tzu lived during a time of great conflict in China called The Age of the Warring States in which a number of major states vied for control of the country. Sun Tzu served as a general in the army of the state of Ch'i and

---

[51] However, it needs to be noted that these are by no means the only influential classical texts on culture and strategy. Consider e.g. Xenophon's *The Persian Expedition* (400 B.C), a detailed narrative of Greeks confronting a 'barbarian' world or Miyamoto Musashi's *The Book of Five Rings* (1643), an analysis of a master Japanese swordsman and the process of struggle and mastery over conflict that underlies every level of human interaction. Sun Tsu's essay is the only one that is widely known in the West among the early texts on the matters of state governance and politics, leadership, peace, war, military and tactics in ancient China. The rest are well known in Asia, however. See e.g. Sawyer, Ralph D. 1993, *The Seven Military Classics of Ancient China,* West View Press, Colorado 1993.

wrote down his strategic principles in *The Art of War*. It provided detailed instructions on how to win the battle of wits and leverage tactical advantages on the battlefield. For Tzu, the art of war was of vital importance to the state hence making it a matter of life and death, a road either to safety or ruin.[52] The oldest literary connection between culture and strategy originates to the writings of Thucydides who was an Athenian historian and general in the 4th century B.C. In his *History of the Peloponnesian War*, Thucydides described in detail the conflict between Athens and Sparta, the key insight being that the respective cultures of these city-states influenced their ways of war.[53] One of the most cited works on strategy is Carl von Clausewitz's *Vom Kriege* (On War), published in 1832, in which the Prussian general and military theorist specifically stressed the moral and political aspects of warfare. For Clausewitz, war was nothing but 'a duel on an extensive scale' (*erweiterter Zweikampf*), which meant that there were rules in war that needed to be adhered to. Clausewitz argued that 'war is a continuation of politics with other means' because wars could always be traced back to political motives: " [...] die politische Absicht ist der Zweck, der Krieg das Mittel, und niemals kann das Mittel ohne Zweck gedacht werden."[54] The most prominent 20th century author on the links between strategy and culture was British military historian and Captain Basil Liddell Hart, who in *The British Way of Warfare* (1932), argued that the British traditionally avoided continental warfare and used their navy instead to exert economic pressure on their enemies, a particular strategic cultural feat of the British way of war. Hart, who argued that Britain had deviated from this strategic principle at its peril, deemed this as one of the causes for the First World War.[55]

Perhaps the most detailed classification of *strategic culture* has been provided by John Glenn as he sought to identify the differences between the post-positivist approaches to strategic culture. He identifies four different dimensions of strategic cultural research: 1) epiphenomenal; 2) conventional constructivist; 3) post-structuralist and 4) interpretivist.[56] Epiphenomenal research treats strategic culture as a supplementary explanatory tool mostly found in realist accounts, "(e)xplaining deviations of state behaviour from general patterns   predicted by neorealism".[57] Conventional constructivism generates "contingent generalizations of state behaviour with norms and culture as alternative explanatory factors", whereas post-structuralism takes a step further and aims to explain "each event as a unique concatenation of causal mechanisms eschewing any search for generalized explanations of so-

---

[52] Tzu, Sun 2009, *The Art of War*, Thrifty Books, 2009 (translated and commented on by Lionel Giles).

[53] Thucydides, *Peloponnesian War*, (ed.) Rhodes, P.J, Oxford University Press, 2009.

[54] Von Clausewitz, Carl 2015, *Vom Kriege*, Null Papier Verlag 2012, (First chapter).

[55] Hart, B.H. Liddell 1932, *The British Way of Warfare*, New York, NY: Macmillan, 1932.

[56] Glenn, John 2009, 'Realism vs. Strategic Culture: Competition and Collaboration?', International Studies Review, Vol.11, No. 3 (Sept. 2009), p. 524.

[57] Ibid., p. 530.

cial behaviour".[58] Interpretivism, in turn, focuses on "(i)mmersion of the re-searcher in other cultural groups in order to understand their worldviews".[59] Glenn purposively opts for the definitional middle-ground to highlight the flexibility of the concept of strategic culture: "Strategic culture is […] a set of shared beliefs, and assumptions derived from common experiences and ac-cepted narratives (both oral and written), that shape collective identity and relationships to other groups, and which influence the appropriate ends and means chosen for achieving security objectives."[60] Hence, the core concept – as defined here – may be flexible enough to be fitted into different research designs. However, as will be discussed in Chapter 1.4, scholars mostly agree on the ontology of strategic culture but disagree in terms of epistemology. Hence, they operate with very similar concepts of strategic culture but differ in how knowledge about it can be produced.

Strategic culture research is usually divided into three separate historical phases, or research 'generations'. The first generation scholarship emerged from a perceived lack of explanatory power of game-theoretical models and systemic and material variables in interpreting variance in Soviet strategic behaviour towards the end of the 1970's. The first published study on strate-gic culture was written by Jack Snyder (RAND Corporation) as the US Air Force requested a study of the factors affecting Soviet reactions to potential US nuclear operations. Snyder sought to 1) provide a context for a better un-derstanding of the intellectual, institutional, and strategic-cultural determi-nants that would bound Soviet decision-making process in a crisis, and 2) speculate on the dominant behavioural propensities that would motivate – and constrain – the Soviet leaders during their efforts to cope with a situa-tion where limited nuclear use by either side loomed as a possibility.[61] Snyder acknowledged that it was difficult to assess reliably the Soviet leaders' atti-tudes towards nuclear escalation because (luckily) there were no comparative data or previous case studies on the matter. However, he argued that "(i)t is enlightening to think of Soviet leaders not just as generic strategists who happen to be playing for the Red team, but as politicians and bureaucrats who have developed and been socialized into a strategic culture that is in many ways unique and who have exhibited distinctive stylistic predisposi-tions in their past crisis behaviour."[62] Snyder's conclusion was that, indeed, the differences in deeply-rooted strategic beliefs between American and Sovi-et strategic thought were able to account for the differences in preference for actual nuclear strategy in case the deterrence failed: the USSR favoured a

---

[58] Ibid.

[59] Ibid.

[60] Ibid.

[61] Snyder, Jack L. 1977, 'The Soviet Strategic Culture: Implications for Limited Nuclear Operations', A Project AIR FORCE Report prepared for the United States Air Force, Rand Corporation, Santa Monica, 1977, preface.

[62] Ibid., p. 4.

retaliatory counterstrike strategy whereas the US was inclined towards co-operative strategy of mutual restraint.[63]

The majority of texts on strategic culture published during the 1970s and the early 1980s focused on the cultural differences in superpower relations related to the question of US and Soviet strategic style.[64] However, during the 1980s, a number of works emerged that formed the core of what came to be known the second generation of strategic culture studies.[65] According to Johnston, this generation of scholarship "begins from the notion that there is potentially a vast difference between what leaders think and say they do and the deeper motives for doing what they in fact do."[66] Hence, it mostly draws on "Gramscian notions of strategic culture as a tool of political hegemony in the realm of peace and war".[67] Johnston criticized the second generation scholars for being too instrumental regarding the relationship between discourse and behaviour. He claimed that political actors were not as free as the 2nd generation scholars claimed them to be; strategic culture had a socializing effect which did constrain the actors' ability to manipulate the strategic cultural context and raised strategic culture beyond the status of a mere myth utilized in the legitimization of non-strategic policies.[68] The so-called third generation, then, epitomized in Johnston's own work, emerged after the end of the Cold War and according to Johnston, it "tends to be both more rigorous and more eclectic in its conceptualization of ideational independent variables and more narrowly focused on particular strategic decisions as dependent variables."[69] Although the proponents of the third generation operate with slightly differing concepts of strategic culture (military culture/ political-military culture/ organizational culture) they all share a deep skepticism of realist explanations relying on systemic variables in explaining state behaviour.[70]

---

[63] Ibid., pp. 38-40.

[64] See Gray, Colin 1981, 'National Styles in Strategy: The American Example', International Security, 6:2, 1981, pp. 21-47; Gray, Colin 1986, *Nuclear Strategy and National Styles*, Lanham, Md.: Hamilton Press, 1986; Lord, Carnes 1985, 'American Strategic Culture', Comparative Strategy, 5:3, 1985, pp. 269-93.

[65] See Klein, Bradley 1988, 'Hegemony and Strategic Culture: American Power Projection and Alliance Defence Politics', Review of International Studies, 14 (1988), pp. 133–48; Stuart, C. Reginald 1982, *War and American Thought: From the Revolution to the Monroe Doctrine,* Kent State University Press, 1982; Luckham, Robin 1984, 'Armament Culture', Alternatives, 10:1 (1984), pp. 1–44.

[66] Johnston, Alastair Iain 1995, *Cultural Realism: Strategic Culture and Grand Strategy in Chinese History*, Princeton University Press, 1995, p. 15.

[67] Ibid.

[68] Ibid., pp. 16-17.

[69] Ibid., p. 18.

[70] See Kier, Elizabeth 1997, *Imagining War: French and British Military Doctrine Between the Wars*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1997; Legro, Jeffrey W, 1995, *Cooperation Under Fire: Anglo-German Restraint during World War II,* Cornell University Press, 1995.

Some scholars, such as Richard Desch, refer to 'culturalism' when identifying three distinct waves of cultural theories ranging from the World War II wave to Cold War wave and to the present, post-Cold War wave. He argues that "the post-Cold War wave of culturalism in security studies is a broad research program with a wide range of research focuses, embracing a range of epistemologies (from the avowedly positivistic to the explicitly anti-positivistic) and utilizing a broad range of explanatory variables. Four strands of cultural theorizing dominate the current wave: organizational, political, strategic and global."[71] However, it should be kept in mind that these different strands are often distinctive analytical categories not representative of the complexity of social reality as such, in which all of these different elements are interwoven in a 'cultural web' including political, strategic and global aspects of culture and security.

In general, it can be argued that strategic cultural studies do not form a distinct cultural theory of security or defence policy as an explanatory framework for state behaviour in the way how neorealism does. Rather they consist of theoretical propositions that are supposed to explain 1) the nationally and historically embedded nature of strategic culture (the first generation); 2) the instrumental nature of strategic culture (the second generation); 3) variance in strategic choice by conceptualizing strategic behaviour as the dependent variable and strategic thought the independent variable in strategic culture (the third generation). Whereas the first and third generation scholars agree that culture affects behaviour by constraining it, they disagree about how this occurs. However, second generation scholarship disagrees with this fundamental point in arguing that agency shapes strategic culture, not the other way around. Hence, the only theoretical aspect which can be argued to be distinctive and formative to all three of these research generations is the argument that strategic culture matters in terms of security and defence policy. Recently, strategic culture studies (which some refer to as the fourth generation scholarship) have begun to reformulate strategic culture as an entity that consists of competing subcultures. In these studies, strategic culture is defined as a social mechanism, entailing epistemic communities which constitute the subcultures competing over hegemony in foreign and security policy.[72]

This thesis does not embrace any of these positions at face value. While they all share a constructivist ontology of strategic culture, they also entail rather entrenched epistemological claims that rest either on holistic (the first generation), instrumental (the second generation) or deterministic (the third generation) line of argumentation. While the pitfalls of holism and determinism become evident when discussing the differences in the accounts of John-

---

[71] Desch, Michael J. 1998, 'Culture Clash: Assessing the Importance of Ideas in Security Studies', International Security, Vol., 23, No. 1 (Summer, 1998), pp. 141-170.

[72] See e.g. Libel, Tamir 2016, 'Explaining the security paradigm shift: strategic culture, epistemic communities, and Israel's changing national security policy', Defense Studies, Vol. 16, No. 2, p. 138.

ston and Gray in Chapter 1.4, the instrumental view on culture is a crude simplification of the subject matter of strategic culture, because it assumes that cultural actors are 'free-standing agents' to the degree that they can actually manipulate the tenets of strategic culture without being affected by that very same culture they seek to manipulate. Moreover, the issue that there might be a potentially vast difference in what political elites think and say they do and what their deeper motivations for action are, is just pure speculation unless consistently proven otherwise in empirical fashion. Hence, there is no *a priori* reason to assume that the deeper motivations of politicians would more often than not contradict with what the politicians say or do. To claim that strategic culture can be reduced to a function of the actors' whims and wishes does not take into account that politicians may speak differently to different audiences, hence rendering the claim of discrepancy between deeper motives and actual utterances problematic from the outset.

Indeed, while the fourth generation's interest in strategic subcultures as the key sites for political struggle over hegemony provides a fresh take on strategic culture, it is not without its own problems. The shifting of research focus into sub-cultures within strategic culture does not sufficiently alleviate the problem of determinism, because while multiple epistemic communities may exist within strategic culture, it does not necessarily amount to the argument that they would form distinct 'sub-cultures' within strategic culture just because they possess differing political interests. Indeed, the treatment of epistemic communities as constituting the core of strategic sub-cultures runs the danger of instrumentalism, because in these accounts strategic culture is often reduced to the conflict of interests, which resembles the 2nd generation's instrumental treatment of strategic culture as a 'resource' for political actors.[73] Instead, what this thesis will argue is that we need an account of strategic culture that is able to incorporate the notion of strategic cultural change to the study of strategic culture without succumbing to holism, determinism or instrumentality in order to be able to tell better stories about the evolution of strategic culture.

The thesis has hitherto discussed the similarities and differences between a plethora of concepts involving culture and security in order to shed light on the heterogeneity of strategic cultural approaches in IR. Next, it will discuss some of the key constructivist claims regarding strategic culture and address the problematic nature of epistemology within strategic culture studies by revisiting the debate between the two most best-known and cited scholars on strategic culture, Iain Johnston and Colin Gray.

The following table provides a summary of the key differences within the main approaches on strategic culture:

---

[73] I will elaborate more on the 4th generation's position and the subject of strategic sub-culture in 1.4 in the context of the Gray-Johnston debate, since it is the fourth generation scholarship that claims to have the best solutions to the problems that this debate poses for strategic culture research.

Table 1. Strategic culture in the study of IR

		What does strategic culture do?
What is strategic culture?	*1st generation: strategic style, a context for evaluation*	*Strategic culture functions as the context for strategic decision-making in that it contains the attitudes and ways in which strategic beliefs and attitudes convey a picture of how a polity would act when faced with a certain crisis situation. These attitudes and strategic beliefs reveal the nationally and historically embedded nature of strategic culture.*
	2nd generation: domain of political instrumentality	*Strategic culture is essentially a myth, at best it functions as a resource in security and defence policy issues that can be instrumentally harnessed by policy actors. These actors are not 'encultured' to the degree that they actually have a hidden agenda beyond what they actually think and say.*
	3rd generation: explanatory concept that is falsifiable	*Strategic culture is a set of specific, ranked security and defence policy preferences expressed in strategic ideas and beliefs established over time, which have a direct impact on actual policy choice. Hence, strategic culture is the explanandum and policy choice is the explanans.*
	4th generation: site of struggle over political hegemony	*Strategic culture is a social mechanism, which consists of epistemic communities that constitute the core of strategic sub-cultures within strategic culture, which strive for hegemony in security and defence policy.*

1.3. BRIEF THEORETICAL OVERVIEW: STRATEGIC CULTURE IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS THEORY

When discussing strategic culture in IR theory in more detail, it is necessary to elaborate on two interrelated issues on constructivism and strategic culture: 1) IR constructivist understanding of causality and norms, and 2) the so-called Gray-Johnston debate, which concerns the connection between strategic culture and state behaviour (discussed in 1.4.). Firstly, it is imperative to consider the understanding of norms within IR constructivism, because this discussion by and large forms the essence of the ontological foundation upon which the most influential accounts of strategic culture rest. Secondly, the Gray-Johnston debate best illustrates the strengths and weak-

nesses of various accounts that deal with strategic culture. The interrelated factor between these two points is also important, since what Colin Gray and Iain Johnston are actually arguing about is whether culture can actually explain anything in causal terms.

To begin with, the IR constructivist position provides more questions than answers – a position not uncommon to 'grand' IR theories in general. IR constructivism consists of a vast and epistemologically varied pool of research in which the interest concerns international phenomena. Epistemologically, constructivism has aimed to seize what IR scholars refer to as the 'middle-ground', meaning a position between rationalism and interpretivism that is based on social ontology and scientific epistemology.[74] There are many different strands of constructivism ranging from so-called 'thin' Wendtian constructivism to more 'thick' approaches that favour post-positivism instead of positivism. According to Hay, both positions see the relationship between the material and the ideational as dialectical, but the thick constructivism prioritizes ideational factors and constitutive logics and thin constructivism prioritizes material factors and causal logics.[75] Despite these differences, however, common ground for all is found in an understanding of a socially constructed world that is fundamentally shaped by human action. For the purposes of this study, I have concentrated on a few commonly accepted positions on norms in IR constructivism, because these positions are regularly adopted in the study of strategic culture. It needs to be noted, however, that the two pivotally important scholars on norms among the constructivist scholarship, Friedrich Kratochwil and Nicholas Onuf, are largely absent from the discussion regarding norms in the accounts on strategic culture.[76]

First of all, norms are accepted as some sort of 'carriers of identity', epitomizing the socially and culturally agreed form of behaviour in some shape or form. This is something the bulk of IR constructivist scholarship would agree on. For example, Onuf would talk about the regulative and constitutive effects of norms understood as informal rules. Following on from this, the primary question for a student of strategic culture is this: Can norms function as causes or is their role solely constitutive? Can the compliance/non-compliance of norms explain policy decisions or even patterns of state behaviour? Some constructivists argue that they can while others claim they do

---

[74] See Checkel, Jeffrey 1998, 'The Constructivist Turn in International Relations Theory', World Politics, Vol. 50, No.2, pp.324-348; Hopf, Ted 1998, 'The Promise of Constructivism in International Relations Theory', International Security, Vol. 23, No. 1, pp. 171-200; Wendt, Alexander 2000, 'The Constructivist Challenge to Structural Realism', International Security, Vol. 25, No.2, pp. 187-212.

[75] Hay, Colin 2002, *Political Analysis*, Basingstoke, Macmillan 2002, p.206 (Table 6.1); see also Wendt, Alexander 2001, *Social Theory of International Politics*, Cambridge University Press, 2001.

[76] See e.g. Onuf, Nicholas 1989, *World of Our Making: Rules and Rule in Social Theory and International Relations*, University of South Carolina Press, 1989; Kratochwil, Friedrich 1991, *Rules, Norms, and Decisions: On the Conditions of Practical and Legal Reasoning in International Relations and Domestic Affairs*, Cambridge University Press, 1991.

not. The pro-argument, here advocated by Martha Finnemore and Kathryn Sikkink, for example, is based on the idea that as norms create expectations towards appropriate behaviour (i.e. norms constitute behaviour), they can be seen as reasons for certain type of action or policy behaviour.[77] Hence, this view represents those constructivists that fall under the conventional label for which it can be argued that they "subscribe to a notion of causality that takes reasons as causes".[78] The contra-argument presented by Kratochwil and Ruggie in short, is that "unlike the initial conditions in positivist explanations, norms can be thought of only with great difficulty as 'causing' occurrences. Norms may 'guide' behaviour, they may 'inspire' behaviour, they may 'rationalize' or 'justify' behaviour, they may express 'mutual expectation about behaviour', or they may be ignored. But they do not effect cause in the sense that a bullet through the heart causes death or an uncontrolled surge in the money supply causes inflations."[79] This argument is more in line with the writings of Nicholas Onuf, whose main argument remains that norms (as informal rules) simultaneously fulfil a regulative and a constitutive function because just as norms regulate conduct, they also constitute the social arrangements within which they function.[80]

However, even though constructivists such as Onuf and Kratochwil talk about 'causal explanation' as having something going about it, it is not clear why their preferred mode of 'constitutive' argumentation is not identified as causal as both seem to reject Humean empiricism and strict positivism on the basis of determinism and materialism.[81] Kurki has criticized this, and suggests that IR scholars should instead adopt an acceptance of 'philosophical realism' that operates with a deeper conception of cause (Aristotelian cause) that broadens the view of causality by departing from an understanding of cause as effective 'pushing and pulling'.[82] As Kurki argues, philosophical realism (or critical realism in terms of social inquiry) is an anti-Humean philosophy that maintains that causes are ontologically real independent of our knowledge or conception of them. What this implies is a move away from attempting to grasp cause in terms of observable regularities between objects in the material world: "(t)o grasp the real underlying causes (why something

---

[77] Finnemore, Martha & Sikkink, Kathryn 2005, 'International Norm Dynamics and Political Change', International Organization, Vol. 52, Issue 04 (September 2005), pp. 887–917.

[78] Adler, Emanuel 1997, 'Seizing the Middle Ground: Constructivism in World Politics', European Journal of International Relations, Vol.3, No.3, p. 329.

[79] Kratochwil, Friedrich and Ruggie, John G. 1986, 'International organization: a state of the art on an art of the state', Vol. 40, No. 4, p. 767.

[80] See Onuf, Nicholas 2014, 'Rule and Rules in International Relations', Erik Castrén Institute of International Law and Human Rights University of Helsinki, 24 April 2014. Available at: (http://www.helsinki.fi/eci/Events/Nicholas%20Onuf_Rule%20and%20Rules%20%204-2-14.pdf).

[81] Kurki, Milja 2006, 'Causes of a divided discipline: rethinking the concept of cause in International Relations theory', Review of International Studies, Vol. 32, No. 2, pp. 199-200.

[82] Ibid.

happens), realists argue, we need knowledge based on various types of evidence and, importantly, a conceptual framework that allows us to conceptualise the real (ontological) unobservable causal powers that are behind observable events (or regularities of events)."[83] Hence, "causation is defined much more openly, or common-sensically, by the philosophical realists. Causes are defined rather loosely as all those things that bring about, produce, direct or contribute to states of affairs or changes in the world."[84]

Moreover, this view on causality seems to be in line with the sociological notion of culture often conceived of as a metaconcept that goes beyond representing a singular process of cause and effect, reflects a national identity ('who we are') and provides a normative basis for our actions ('what it is that we do') or ('should do').[85] Importantly, if taken seriously, this philosophical realist notion of cause also has far-reaching implications for the conduct of strategic culture research. In particular, it will enable us to break out of the epistemological impasse of determinism vs. holism that currently prevails in the mainstream accounts on strategic culture.

The stance taken on norms in this thesis is that they are the essential carriers of a country's strategic culture because they embody the societally accepted forms of strategic behaviour in terms of the use of military force. Following the discussion above, then, norms can be regarded as causes, because as 'reasons for action' they establish meaningful responses to the questions of peace and war and function as the regulative link between strategic ideas and strategic action. In this sense, I understand norms primarily in their regulative function which either constrains or enables certain kind of strategic behaviour. However, there is more to norms than treating them simply as 'road signs' or 'traffic rules'. They differ in one crucial respect: it is important to keep in mind that all norms are prescriptive or evaluative to the degree that they entail or express a moral stance of what acceptable behaviour is. Moreover, and importantly, the treatment of norms as reasons for action does not translate into a positivist argument 'if norm X, then behaviour Y' precisely because 1) the relationship between strategic thinking and strategic action cannot be grasped in form of a natural law and that therefore, and following Kurki's line of thinking, we can argue that 2) norms may possess various causal properties which need to be understood beyond the notion of 'independent variables' or 'effective causes'.

Indeed, there are different causal mechanisms which make norms as reasons for action either a) constrain behaviour or b) enable behaviour.[86] In this study, I identify the re-interpretations of the German past as one of the primary mechanisms, because they involve a re-assessment of the historical ex-

---

[83] Ibid., p. 202.

[84] Ibid.

[85] See Jepperson, Ronald L. and Swidler, Ann 1994, 'What Properties of Culture do we Measure?' Poetics, Vol. 22, No. 4 (1994), p. 360.

[86] These mechanisms are discussed in more detail in Chapter 2.

perience in terms of warfare – the foundation of the ideational and normative structure of any strategic culture. The notions of strategic cultural continuity and change, then, are inextricably tied to the question of how the causality of norms is conceived in constructivist theorizing, functioning either as the causal or the constitutive link between strategic discourse and strategic behaviour, depending on where one stands on the issue. As discussed earlier, the equivalent argument in which norms translate into policy in the context of German foreign and security policy is well known. Hanns Maull has defined Germany as a civilian power that acts according to its deeply rooted antimilitaristic norms that are then transformed into policies, whereby Germany abstains from the use of force and unilateral military action.[87] (Maull hence treats norms as causes of certain type of behaviour).

However, constructivists are inevitably puzzled here, because, although they are often able to show why states do not always act on behalf of their material interests based on strict rational decision-making, pursuit of power or economic calculations, they struggle with cases where a professed identity (such as that of a civilian power) seems to contradict with the policies pursued. As illustrated at the beginning of this chapter, German security policy behaviour after the end of the Cold War provides a case in point. Constructivists could argue that this occurred because of a potential conflict on the level of norms but in case of frequent deviation, the argument falls short because it seems to suggest a change or at least a significant shift on either the level of state identity or the level of norms. The problem here is that these assessments often lack a systematic analytical basis and empirical evidence for changes on the level of identity. This point brings us back to the debatable question about causality understood as a co-constitutive relationship between identity, interests and action where norms are supposed to function as carriers of identity and expressed in policy choices. I agree with constructivists who claim that a concept such as identity is difficult to pin down in analytical terms, let alone argue that it would cause a certain type of actions *per se*. This is also the case with the concept of (strategic) culture *if* we opt for a rigorous positivist understanding of cause (Humean cause) that endorses the study of social and political phenomena as strict law-like patterns or preconceived mechanisms for social and political behaviour – the thing which Kratochwil and Ruggie were lamenting.

Even though many scholars identifying themselves as constructivists would probably deny having argued about identity *causing* anything if applied under the strictest rules of positivism, the fact remains that identity is still often considered to be a first-order *explanans* of state action/behaviour in the constructivist analyses, which in turn becomes the main *explanandum*, although Wendt specifically argued against any such attempt in his *Social*

---

[87] Maull, W. Hanns 1990, 'Germany and Japan: The New Civilian Powers', Foreign Affairs, Vol. 69, Nr. 5, pp. 91-106.

Theory of International Politics.[88] However, and in contrast, the common constructivist understanding of the co-constitutive relationship between identity, interests and action also warrants an analytical framework in which the distinction of *explanantia* from *explananda* is rather arbitrary. IR constructivism is therefore perhaps better geared to answering 'how' instead of 'why' questions – as Wendt has famously argued "anarchy is what states make of it"[89].

Another option for the constructivist would be to adopt a post-structuralist position and argue that identity is an (inter)subjective matter since it is about the use of language which goes 'all the way down' and that it is inherently built around the eternal conflict about power.[90] Yet with this position it becomes even more problematic for the constructivist to attempt to explain (and understand) those policies which do not sit well with, or seem to be diametrically opposed to, what a given identity would suggest since shifts in elite power and interests would then explain what identity cannot explain, which is a contradiction in terms if, as constructivists claim, identity and interests co-constitute one another. [91] Although identities can be considered to be relatively stable and shared cognitive and social entities, they do not cause certain policies in the way bullet goes through the heart and causes death.

If there was no detectable pattern of German foreign and security policy behaviour, the post-structuralist critique that 'all events are unique' would apply to some extent.[92] In contrast, many constructivists would claim the opposite since in their assessment, state identity is a relatively stable social entity and numerous studies on German foreign and security policy are a testament of this argument.[93] Yet, at least since the end of the Cold War, the pattern is anything but consistent. However, this does not mean that we should not try to attempt to explain why there is none or why it is inconsistent. This thesis suggests that the solution to this will not be found in reinventing the concept of cultural continuity but in a more nuanced understanding of how cultural norms function and how they are conditioned by other

---

[88] Wendt 2001.

[89] Wendt, Alexander 1992, 'Anarchy is what States Make of it: The Social Construction of Power Politics', International Organization, Vol. 46, No. 2 (Spring 1992), pp. 391-425.

[90] For similarities and differences between constructivism and post-structuralism, see e.g. Palan, Ronen 2000, 'A world of their making: an evaluation of the constructivist critique in International Relations', Review of International Studies, Volume 26, Issue 4 (October 2000), pp. 575-598.

[91] See Katzenstein 1996.

[92] See e.g. Hansen, Lene 2006, *Security as Practice: Discourse Analysis and the Bosnian War*, Routledge, New York 2006.

[93] See Boekle, Henning, Rittberger, Rainer & Wagner, Wolfgang 2001; Rittberger, Volker (ed.) 2001, *German Foreign Policy Since Unification: Theories and Case Studies*, Manchester University Press, 2001; Harnisch, Sebastian 2001, 'Change and continuity in post-unification German foreign policy', German Politics, Vol.10, No.1, pp.35-60.

social factors. This will also allow us to make better arguments about the possibility and preconditions for strategic cultural change when the functioning, meaning and purpose of norms is not taken as 'given' and that there is indeed more to norms than conventional constructivist wisdom on national security would suggest.

There is also a growing literature of pragmatist studies on German foreign and security policy that actually suggests a move away from the 'logic of appropriateness' – in this sense meaning the functioning of the cultural norms in constructivist thinking towards a more situational understanding of foreign and security policy-making, something which also has implications for constructivist research.[94] These studies are also critical of the conventional constructivist position albeit for different reasons. Through the philosophical lens of pragmatism[95] , strategic culture could be coined as the sum total of social interactions and practices of the strategic actors. From this point of view, strategic culture can be considered both a context and an epiphenomenon since what actually counts is the situational awareness of the strategic actors. Overall, pragmatist approaches highlight the fact that political decision makers face problematic situations where the logic of appropriateness fails to account for the possible solutions that rest on a re-interpretation of existing cultural variables. IR scholars that utilize some of the insights of pragmatism regarding agency offer some interesting insights into the study of German foreign and security policy[96] yet the arguments are not directly applicable in terms of strategic culture research; i.e. the notion of change would rather be limited to a focus in changes in actors' beliefs. I will briefly come back to discuss this in the next chapter.

---

[94] See Wagner, Wolfgang, Baumann, Rainer & Hellmann, Gunther 2001, 'Agents, Structures, and German Foreign Policy after Unification. From Metatheory to Empirical Enquiry', Paper Prepared for Presentation at the 42nd Annual Convention of the International Studies Association in Chicago, 20-24 February 2001; Hellmann, Gunther 2009, 'Fatal attraction? German foreign policy and IR/foreign policy theory', Journal of International Relations and Development, Vol. 12, No. 3, pp. 257-292; Zehfuss, Maja 2002, *Constructivism in International Relations: The Politics of Reality*, Cambridge University Press, 2002.

[95] The philosophy of pragmatism (American Pragmatism) focuses on the notion of human agency and how we attain our beliefs and change them. Most accounts that discuss pragmatism in IR refer to Richard Rorty and John Dewey as their philosophical inspiration.

[96] See e.g. Hellmann, Gunther (ed.) 2006, *Germany's EU Policy on Asylum and Defense. De-Europeanization by Default?* Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

1.4. THE GRAY-JOHNSTON DEBATE AND ITS RAMIFICATIONS FOR THE STUDY OF STRATEGIC CULTURE

The theoretical debate on strategic culture evolved as the so-called Gray-Johnston debate that has been taking place since the mid-1990s in various publications, culminating in two issues of the Review of International Studies (RIS) in 1999.[97] The primary purpose of this sub-chapter is not to reiterate or reassess everything that has already been said in this debate but rather to highlight some of the important aspects of it, which are of value for the conduct of this study. In short, this debate can be seen as an intra-constructivist divide at the heart of which lies the dilemma of how to deal with causality and therefore the question: what does strategic culture explain, if anything, and how can we expect it to affect strategic behaviour?

In his early critique of the first generation of strategic culture scholarship, Johnston argues that "if strategic culture is said to be the product of nearly all relevant explanatory variables, then there is little conceptual space for non-strategic culture explanation of strategic choice."[98] He further asks "how does one evaluate a strategic culture where thought and action seem inconsistent with each other? Or, alternatively, is it always the case that one type of behaviour reveals one set of distinct patterns of strategic assumptions?"[99] This critique continues in his piece in RIS in which he laments the all-encompassing nature and determinism of Gray's approach.[100] Gray, in turn, rejects Johnston's positivism on the basis that there is no conceptual space for the separation of behaviour from culture if all actors are 'cultural actors'. Therefore, according to Gray, culture is best understood as providing the context for strategic behaviour which is a constitutive part of that very culture. As a result, Gray concludes that "strategic culture provides a context for understanding, rather than explanatory causality."[101]

Despite his hands-down positivist approach on strategic culture, Johnston's critique of the first generation has its merits. When this debate is assessed in scholarly works, the attention regularly tends to be focused almost entirely on the link between strategic culture and state behaviour. But there are other important aspects about Johnston's critique that are often ignored which need to be discussed since they reveal important aspects about how the option for strategic cultural change has been conceived. Even though

---

[97] See Review of International Studies, 25:1 (January 1999) and Review of International Studies, 25:3 (July 1999).

[98] Johnston 1995, p. 37.

[99] Ibid.

[100] Johnston, Alastair Iain 1999, '*Strategic cultures revisited: reply to Colin Gray*', Review of International Studies, Vol. 25, Issue 3 (July 1999), pp. 519-523.

[101] Colin, Gray S. 1999, 'Strategic culture as context: the first generation of theory strikes back', Review of International Studies, Volume 25, Issue 1, January 1999, p. 49.

Johnston makes clear that for a strategic culture to exist, certain strategic preferences need to be consistent across time; there are some points in his threefold critique of the first generation that problematize the question about the continuity of strategic culture. First, Johnston laments the first generation's view on the homogeneity of strategic culture. He argues that it is problematic to assume (as the first generation does) that "a single strategic culture emerges from its multiple inputs when each of these inputs could arguably produce an alternative, even contradictory strategic culture."[102] Second, he criticizes Gray and others for not allowing space for instrumentality of strategic culture and therefore the lack of conceptualizing agency within strategic culture. Third, as he rejects the first generation's view of strategic culture as "the monolithic, independent, and observable constraint on all actors behaviour", he is puzzled why the first generation has not attempted to ask and answer the following questions: what is the source or repository of strategic culture? Which time period is the most important in this regard? Why are certain historical sources considered formative sources of strategic culture and others not? How is strategic culture transmitted through time and does it change through its transmission?[103] In connection with the question about the homogeneity of strategic culture, Johnston asks the important question "how does one evaluate a strategic culture where thought and action seem inconsistent with each other? Or, alternatively, is it always the case that one type of behaviour reveals one set of distinct patterns of strategic assumptions?"[104]

This point is important because it not only reflects the issue regarding norms and their functions but it also raises the question of whether specific strategic ideas and thinking translate into certain strategic practices but not others. Part of this can be explained by how Johnston presents the issue. He presumes that strategic cultures are either homogenous or that there is considerable variation within and/or between different states. This becomes evident when he presents his analytical model. Johnston talks about 'the central paradigm of strategic culture' – the role of war in human affairs (frequency of conflict in human affairs); the nature of adversary and the threat it poses (zero-sum nature of conflict); and the efficacy of the use of force. He argues that this paradigm "reduces uncertainty about the strategic environment; but it is shared information that comes from deeply historical sources, not from current environment."[105] On a more operational level, Johnston argues, the question becomes "what strategic options are the most efficacious ones for dealing with the threat environment, as defined by the answers to the first three questions", and continues that "depending on where along these continua particular political decision makers are based, their strategic decision

---

[102] Johnston 1995, p. 38.

[103] Ibid., pp. 38-39.

[104] Ibid., p. 49.

[105] Ibid., p. 46.

preferences ought to vary accordingly."[106] Importantly, Johnston argues that "it is at this level of preferences over actions where strategic culture begins to affect behavioural choices directly. Thus the essential empirical referent of a strategic culture is a limited, ranked set of grand-strategic preferences that is consistent across the objects of analysis (e.g. textual sources for potential answers to the central paradigm) and persistent across time."[107]

Hence, the existence of enough internal variation between states along these continua becomes the necessary prerequisite for Johnston to argue that the strategic choice is different among a number of states because he assumes that different groups sharing different strategic preferences naturally align themselves differently along these dimensions. However, this model does not explain variation in strategic behaviour within one particular state very well, such as Germany, since participation in military crisis management operations would then be explained by decisions of a group in power that has a strategic preference for this sort of action. As strategic decisions of German governments have to be approved by the majority of member of the German Bundestag, this model becomes redundant because it cannot explain why German decision makers, who arguably do not have a consistent strategic preference in offensive strategy over time, have at times opted for one (however, this would not qualify as offensive in the sense of Johnston's layout of strategic preferences). Johnston's analytical model is too linear as it assumes that all the dimensions of this central paradigm – the role of war in human affairs, the nature of threat and the efficacy of the use of force are equally important in determining strategic choice across time. Moreover, the approach assumes that strategic culture is a collective endeavour – yet it does not tackle this with the question of the agents of change – such as powerful key politicians in the German cabinet.

On the second point, however, Johnston is right in criticizing the first generation for not conceptualizing agency within strategic culture. However, Johnston's own treatment of agency is not very convincing. In his account, strategic culture is "an integrated system of symbols (e.g., argumentation structures, languages, analogies, metaphors) which acts to establish pervasive and long-lasting strategic preferences by formulating concepts of the role and efficacy of military force in international affairs, and by clothing these conceptions with such an aura of factuality that the strategic preferences seem uniquely realistic and efficacious."[108]

First, as was already touched upon, Johnston presumes that possessing certain grand-strategic preferences will lead a group of political decision makers to opt automatically for a certain kind of strategic policies. Here, one could accuse Johnston of committing the same crime of mechanistic determinism as he attributes to the first generation. Second, Johnston hints to a

---

[106] Ibid., p. 42.

[107] Ibid., pp. 42-43.

[108] Ibid., 46.

manufactured 'aura of factuality' thereby referring to the possibility that strategic culture can be used in an instrumental fashion. But this argument does not provide any added value given Johnston's definition of strategic culture which presumes that grand strategic preferences have to be consistent across time and therefore Johnston overstates the importance of instrumental usage of strategic culture. If we understand instrumentality as a political effort to legitimize certain viewpoints, back up specific interests or as the aim to manipulate the strategic agenda, then it is more or less business as usual for political actors so it is hard to imagine why it would be any different in terms of strategic culture in the first place. However, as discussed at the beginning of this chapter, the views expressed in the second generation scholarship highlighting the role of instrumental agency, i.e. the usage of strategic culture as a political resource, is not as straightforward as Johnston would have it.

There is one further perplexing issue about Johnston's definition. Johnston seems to assume that strategic choices indeed 'flow logically' from this 'strategic culture paradigm' without giving further thought to the possibility that something else could cause them. What makes this view problematic is not that it takes something as 'given' but the fact that this 'logical flow' is the assumption behind Johnston's claim about the distinction between culture and strategy and what makes him argue for a definition of culture that can be falsifiable. This assumption more or less requires Johnston to treat strategic preferences as stable over time and not as ones that can be considered to change or even vary. For Johnston, every state has a certain range of strategic preferences to choose from, and the strategic decisions then flow logically from the pool of these preferences. More importantly, he makes the assumption that the use of force is in any case a viable option if the outcome can be controlled – but this raises a rather instrumental point about the use of military force and completely overlooks any issues that have to do with the political process of legitimating such a decision in the first place.

In contrast to Johnston, Colin Gray argues that "strategic culture should be approached both as a shaping context for behaviour and itself as a constituent of that behaviour".[109] For Gray, "(c)ulture or cultures comprises the persisting (though not eternal) socially transmitted ideas, attitudes, traditions, habits of mind, and preferred methods of operation that are more or less specific to a particular geographically based security community that has had a necessarily unique historical experience."[110] Hence, for Gray, strategic culture is a constitutive concept that is informed by sociological and anthropological writings about culture. Gray argues that Johnston's critique is misconceived and that he does not grasp the nature of strategic culture by trying to approach it as falsifiable. In his words, "anyone who seeks a falsifiable the-

---

[109] Gray 1999, p. 50.

[110] Ibid.

ory of strategic culture in the school of Johnston, commits the same error as a doctor who sees people as having entirely separable bodies and minds."[111]

For Gray, strategic culture is "a context, something that surrounds and something that weaves together".[112] Importantly, Gray's overall thinking is that strategic culture cannot explain the strategic behaviour of strategic actors but it can explain the meaning of the content of that action. Gray gives an example of British warfare during World War II. He argues that strategic culture cannot explain why Britain embarked upon a long continental military campaign but it can explain why the continental role was so different for Britain than for the other major European powers. Moreover, "the idea of strategic culture does not imply that there is a simple one-for-one relationship between culturally traceable preferences and actual operational choices. The claim rather, is that culture shapes the process of strategy-making and influences the execution of strategy, no matter how close actual choice may be to some abstract or idealized cultural preference."[113] According to Gray, we cannot make falsifiable arguments about strategic culture because "the unity of cultural influence and policy action denies the existence for the study of cause and effect."[114] Hence, instead, we should ask questions such as 'what does the observed behaviour mean'?

Gray makes a couple of important remarks about the study of strategic culture. First of all, we can talk about strategic culture because it is something that is distinctive in every security community. It seems that for Gray, strategic culture is a tendency to implement strategy in a certain way which then produces traceable patterns of behaviour – regardless how the cultural preferences equate with the outcomes. If we adopted Gray's thinking in this study *per se*, strategic culture could then explain why the question of participation in out-of-area military operations is more difficult for Germany than it is for France, for example. Following Gray, then, it cannot explain why Germany chooses to actually participate, or not. This makes sense when strategic culture is constructed along the lines of traceable patterns of behaviour, in other words, patterns of continuity. However, it becomes more complicated when we take the possibility of change in strategic culture more seriously when, for instance, we encounter situations or in Gray's words 'contexts' where there is no definite pattern that could be traced. Of course, this is a non-issue for Gray who believes that "(s)cholars who prefer to look only to recent history as the determining influence upon contemporary strategic culture, would be well advised to change concepts. If strategic culture is held to be significantly reshapeable on a year by year, or even on a decade by decade,

---

[111] Ibid., p. 53.

[112] Ibid., p. 68.

[113] Ibid., p. 55.

[114] Ibid., p. 56.

basis, then culture probably is unduly dignified, even pretentious, a term to characterize the phenomena at issue."[115]

The difficulty with Gray's account is that he constantly treats strategic culture more as a tendency to think or act in a certain fashion rather than as a response to emerging policy problems or security issues. For Gray, strategic culture cannot change other than as the result of reinterpreting new experiences. Yet he forgets that sometimes political decision makers have to make quick decisions based on scarce knowledge of what is actually going on or when they encounter situations that require novel policy *responses*. If these decisions deviate drastically from the given cultural preferences (say, certain culturally defined principles) then it is hard to argue that strategic culture constitutes strategic behaviour no matter what. Gray would argue that this does not matter since "human beings cannot help but be encultured into certain cultures".[116] Hence, it becomes impossible to discern the influence of strategic culture on strategic behaviour because it is somehow omnipresent. As a critique of Gray's position one could posit that it is difficult to conceive of strategic actors as actually being the 'context' of strategic behaviour because context does not implement anything, it just exists or does not and, strategic behaviour is strategic behaviour even if it does not produce any traceable patterns. This leads to inconsistencies in argument on Gray's part. Consider for example Gray's argument regarding British strategic culture that "(s)trategic culture explains why the continental role was, certainly psychologically was, so different for Britain, as contrasted with some other great powers, it does not explain why Britain chose to wage war as a continental power in those years. In other words, strategic culture provides context, even where the final choice is all but counter-cultural."[117] However, if what Gray claims is correct, then strategic culture cannot explain either why Britain chose not to participate in continental warfare for a hundred years.

Gray's argument makes perfect sense but only to a certain extent. If we are intent on pursuing a research design from which we can say something new about the functioning of strategic culture, then applying Gray's approach is not very helpful. I am making this argument not for the sake of the analysis but because of conceptual clarity. Gray's definition of strategic culture is just too all-encompassing. If, as Gray claims, we are the context of strategic culture, then there certainly is no way of separating the structure from the agents that operate within. Whereas Johnston's treatment of the term leaves much to be desired, it succeeds in framing one possible avenue of how to approach strategic culture in analytical terms even though many would disregard it for being too rigorous in its positivist stance. Indeed, while Johnston's approach has its proponents, it can be argued that the majority of strategic cultural accounts have either ascribed to Gray's interpretivism or some modi-

---

[115] Ibid., p. 52.

[116] Ibid.

[117] Ibid., p.59.

fied variant of it that attempts to avoid the pitfalls of its holism. For instance, Neumann and Heikka have argued for a concept of strategic culture understood as 'the dynamic interplay between discourse and practice'. According to them, "(t) he point is to follow [Ann] Swidler's shift of attention 'down' from conscious ideas and values — such as the idea of a grand strategy — to the physical and the habitual, and also 'up' from ideas located in individual consciousness to the impersonal arena of 'discourse'."[118] Neumann and Heikka also argue that "such a re-conceptualization is dynamic both in the sense that it introduces an understanding of change rather than stasis as the 'normal' state of affairs, and in the sense that it focuses on empirical change."[119] However, as I will discuss in more detail in the next sub-chapter in conjunction with critical realist metatheory, the discussion about strategic cultural change is not and cannot be limited to the realm of 'empirically verifiable outcomes', because these outcomes are the empirical manifestations of underlying causal processes. Indeed, it is unclear how a focus on practices is able to dig deep into the aspect of strategic cultural change, because the focus is solely on that which is empirically observable. Finally, Neumann and Heikka's deliberate exclusion of norms, ideas and values from their analytical framework is highly questionable, because this would exclude the whole realm of motivations behind the practices which their model claims to account for.

According to Bloomberg, the preference of interpretivism instead of positivism can also be understood as a move towards a concept of culture which has contradictory elements, various strains or traditions, or as the fourth generation scholarship generally claims, strategic sub-cultures.[120] The fourth generation scholarship – contra both Gray and Johnston – claims to be able to explain strategic cultural change via the notion of hegemonic epistemic communities. Consider Bloomberg's assertion that "(a)ccepting that there are two or more subcultures within a strategic culture can not only retrospectively explain why strategic policy changed but, arguably, if we become familiar with a particular state's strategic debates we may be able to predict that a 'change is coming' – and possibly even determine which of the currently subordinate subcultures may become dominant for a time. Such a model begins solving the too-much-continuity problem by allowing scholars to explain medium- to long-term strategic policy changes."[121] In a similar vein, Libel posits that "[...] competing strategic subcultures can be associated with the groups that promote them within a political system. By identifying the exact contents of competing ideas as well as their creators and those that advocate

---

[118] Neumann, Iver B. & Heikka, Henrikki 2005, 'Grand Strategy, Strategic Culture, Practice. The Social Roots of Nordic Defence', Cooperation and Conflict, Vol. 40, No. 1, p. 12.

[119] Ibid., p.11.

[120] Bloomberg, Alan 2012, 'Time to Move On: Reconceptualizing Strategic Culture Debate', Contemporary Security Policy, Vol. 33, No.2, p. 451.

[121] Ibid., p. 454.

for them, one can accurately describe how strategic culture influences policy change."[122]

The fourth generation, then, takes a seemingly different approach to strategic culture than either Johnston or Gray by highlighting the role of strategic sub-cultures in explaining change. However, these views seem problematic in terms of explaining change for a number of reasons. First, it is evident that the aim of the 4th generation is to promote the notion and importance of strategic cultural agency in order to move beyond determinism and holism of the mainstream accounts. Yet it is unclear what the 'identification of the creators of competing ideas' – i.e. the identification of different epistemic communities tells us about how strategic cultures change. Libel, for instance, applies the framework of policy change by Adler and Haas, which basically evolves in four steps: first, there is a policy crisis as a triggering event which leads to a collapse of a hegemonic sub-culture. This leads then to policy innovation and re-positioning of the epistemic communities. Next follows policy diffusion through which epistemic communities compete over influence in the policy debate which is followed by choice on behalf of the policymakers among the available options presented to them by epistemic communities. Further, the chosen policy becomes 'persistent' as policy-makers adopt the strategic sub-culture of one epistemic community. Finally, a new equilibrium is attained, which results in the emergence of a new hegemonic sub-culture.[123] Importantly, however, and as Yee has pointed out, the epistemic community approach, which highlights the bureaucratic role and power of policy experts, neglects the ideational qualities that differentiate between persuasive and less persuasive ideas and enable the more persuasive ones to affect policies themselves. Instead, as Yee criticizes, "the causal effects of ideas on policies are displaced onto the political effects of experts".[124] The elevated role of sub-cultures also suggests – wrongly, in my view – that the primary cause for policy change within strategic culture is basically reducible to the differences in worldviews between these epistemic communities; i.e. change is dependent on the interests of the domestic political hegemon that is presumed to be ideationally firmly attached to certain epistemic community. This amounts to an epistemic fallacy at best, because it assumes by definition that policy experts are causally significant actors within strategic cultures. Indeed, the link between policy experts and policy makers is treated as unproblematic, almost as a self-evident feature of strategic culture. However, there are crucial differences between strategic cultures in how this link is es-

---

[122] Libel 2016, p. 153.

[123] Ibid., p. 141-2. See also Adler, Emanuel & Haas, Peter 1992, 'Conclusion: epistemic communities, world order, and the creation of a reflective research program', International organization, Vol. 46, No.1, p. 373.

[124] Yee, Albert S. 1996, 'The Causal Effects of Ideas on Policies', International Organization, Vol. 50, No. 1 (Winter, 1996), pp. 69-108.

tablished and maintained, and more importantly, how it is evaluated as being causally relevant in terms of policy making.

Haas has claimed that epistemic communities exhibit a considerable degree of commonality among their members, amounting to a 'shared set of normative and principled beliefs', 'shared causal beliefs', 'shared notions of validity' and a 'set of common practices associated with a set of problems'[125] which would also indicate that these experts share a consensual understanding of the objective merits of ideas, i.e. of their persuasiveness. Yet critics have argued that such a consensus among these experts might not occur and is rather the exception than the rule in security policy.[126] This would seem to indicate that the existence of political conflict *between* epistemic communities is an *a priori* condition for the fourth generation scholarship's explanatory framework actually to have any explanatory merit. Moreover, it is questionable whether there really exists a *multitude* of 'shared sets of normative and principled beliefs' regarding *the issue of the use of military force* within a single strategic cultural entity – an important delineation which is not discussed in the fourth generation scholarship. For instance, as will be argued later in detail in this study, in German strategic culture the principled beliefs regarding the use of military force are traditionally aligned according to the lessons learned from the German past, known as the so-called 'never again' (*nie wieder*) principles. While it is one thing, for the argument's sake, to posit that different sub-cultures have emerged as a result of the different interpretations of the German past (i.e. ethical pacifists, antimilitarists, Eurocentrists or Atlanticists)[127], it is quite another to argue that the interpretations within these subcultures would differ to the degree proposed by Haas. Because the crux of the explanatory power of this model lies in its ability to account for the differences between these subcultures and the conflict among them, scholars operating with subcultures rarely discuss commonalities between subcultures within the same strategic cultural frame, which cannot be argued to be any less significant from the outset. It seems that the fourth generation scholarship may have over interpreted the significance of conflict within strategic cultures, at least if this is mirrored against the example of German strategic culture.

---

[125] Haas, Peter 1992, 'Introduction: Epistemic communities and international policy coordination', *International Organization*, Vol. 46, p. 3.

[126] See e.g. Levy, Jack 1994, 'Learning and foreign policy: Sweeping a conceptual minefield', *International Organization*, Vol, 48, pp. 279-312; Jacobsen, Kurt 1995, 'Much ado about ideas: The cognitive factor in economic policy', *World Politics*, Vol. 47, pp. 317-349.

[127] This category of subcultures is my own take of how one could conceptualize the notion of subcultures within German strategic culture based on the traditional lines of thought on security and defense that rest on different interpretations of the German past. Henning Tewes has labelled German security sub-cultures in terms of foreign policy orientation as Atlanticists, Gaullists and Muscovites. See Tewes, Henning 2002, *Germany, Civilian Power and the New Europe. Enlarging NATO and European Union*, Palgrave Macmillan 2002.

In addition, what makes it hard to argue for the prominence of strategic subcultures in German strategic culture is the fact that besides the leftist Die Linke, which most strongly represents the tradition of ethical pacifism and antimilitarism in contemporary German politics, neither of the major peoples' parties in Germany, the SPD (The Social Democratic Party) and the CDU/CSU (The Christian Democratic Union in Germany / The Christian Social Union in Bavaria) conform to any one particular lesson from the German past, even though conservatives are traditionally more Atlanticist and Social Democrats more Euro-centrist in their views on security and defence. Rather, these different traditions, or traits as Bloomberg would have it, are spread across the German party-political spectrum (with the exception of Die Linke). Indeed, to make predictions regarding strategic cultural change based on these traits in the German case the way Bloomberg would, is nonsensical; it would indicate that some interpretation of the German past would have to be in a hegemonic position vis-à-vis the rest at all times (before it becomes severely contested). The further one follows this logic, the more it seems to resemble Johnston's positivist account which sought to distinguish between the causal power of individual ideas by way of falsifiable hypotheses except that in this logic it is the policy experts, not ideas, that possess that causal power. If one insists on an account of change that relies solely on agency, a shift of focus to the role of specific actors, such as the Chancellor, the foreign minister or the defence minister functioning as 'norm entrepreneurs' seems more promising in this regard, because it does not neglect the persuasiveness (i.e. the causal properties) of ideas themselves.

1.5. SUMMARY

In this opening chapter, I have laid out the conceptual and theoretical premises for the study of strategic culture. I have also argued why it is imperative that we move from a stale conception of strategic culture as a static entity underscoring the aspect of continuity to an understanding of strategic culture which underlines its dynamic nature and the possibility of strategic cultural change. What is more, I have shown how the mantra of continuity leads to inconsistent argumentation regarding the evolution of German strategic culture after the end of the Cold War.

As argued, the mainstream approaches to strategic culture are too invested in the epistemological debate on strategic culture to actually be in a position to make an analytical shift towards the study of strategic cultural change. As already hinted in this chapter and as will be argued in detail in the next chapter in conjunction with a discussion on methodology and strategic culture, critical realist metatheory presents one avenue which enables us to move beyond the Gray-Johnston debate and commence with a serious discussion on the aspect of strategic cultural change.

2 UNDERSTANDING STRATEGIC CULTURAL CHANGE

This chapter contemplates the question of strategic cultural change in general, in the context of German strategic culture in particular. The aim is to provide a solid methodological basis for the rest of this study. First, the chapter discusses the state of methodology in strategic culture research and argues that critical realist metatheory, particularly its focus on ontology and its discussion of causality may be helpful in reclaiming strategic culture research back from the epistemological impasse it has been driven into. Second, the chapter discusses the few existing accounts on strategic cultural change as well as their added value to the study of strategic culture. Third, a refined analytical framework is introduced, that, as will be argued, is better suited for the analysis of strategic cultural change because it deviates from an essentialist understanding of the evolution of strategic culture that has been the hitherto philosophical fundament of the existing theory on strategic culture. Finally, the chapter seeks to paint a comprehensive picture of the issue of strategic cultural change understood both in terms of social and political processes and policy outcomes, which are shaped but not determined by the specifics of the strategic culture in question.

The discussion of strategic cultural change is ultimately tied to the question of what strategic culture is expected to do, and this brings us briefly back to Gray and Johnston. Even though neither scholar focused particularly on the question of change, it is useful to elaborate briefly on what change would look like given their theoretical and analytical premises that were discussed in Chapter 1. On one hand, if we argue in the vein of Johnston that strategic culture is the frame of reference we apply when we seek to explain the impact of cultural factors on some specific policy choices, then strategic cultural change refers to those factors and conditions that make decision makers choose differently or deviate from a certain existing policy pattern. Hence, to explain strategic cultural change would equate to an explanation of variance in strategic choice. Gray, in turn, has argued that this is nonsensical because ideas do not necessarily result in action as in if idea (X) then action (Y).[128] On the other hand, if we embrace Gray's framework and argue that culture is the context, the 'thing that weaves together', then strategic cultural change refers to the changes within and of that same context and, hence, make an inquiry into strategic cultural change an immensely complex analytical task. This is so because 'context' is not something which can be pinned down very accurately in empirical or analytical terms, especially if that context is supposed to contain strategic actors as well. Gray's account ultimately implies for the study of strategic culture that regardless of how rigorous its theoreti-

---

[128] See Chapter 1.4. for more detail.

cal, methodological and empirical design has been, every attempt at discovering strategic culture is bound to be an interpretation of the cultural context at best. As Gray often mentions, explaining strategic culture is inevitably a vain attempt due to the nature of the beast itself.[129] Hence, both Johnston and Gray fall short in grasping the crux of the matter with strategic cultural change because of their rather entrenched theoretical and analytical positions.

As was discussed in the previous chapter, change is not something which would have attracted the attention of many scholars, due to reasons that have both theoretical and empirical origins. The possibility of change has been recognized, but rarely considered a worthwhile object of study in its own right. As we shall see, however, 'continuity' and 'change' are not necessarily some definite states of being, becoming or existing that we could always clearly empirically refer to. For instance, German policies did not fundamentally change at first as a result of the changes within the normative framework underlying German strategic culture in the mid-1990s. Yet the long-term impact of this normative change was crucial in facilitating the possibility for future changes in security and defence policy practices.[130] Hence, the empirical study of strategic cultural change needs to go beyond the notion of 'observable policy outcomes', because outcomes always lock down change in spatial and temporal terms. Importantly, however, observable outcomes are by necessity the products of the underlying social and political processes. Indeed, as is discussed in detail in this thesis, the question of change in German strategic culture is inextricably tied to the social and political process related to the re-interpretation of the German past (*Aufarbeitung der Vergangenheit*). This is a crucial notion in the attempt to move beyond the empirical, 'observable' realm of strategic culture.

2.1. TAKING STOCK: METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS, CRITICAL REALISM AND THE STUDY OF STRATEGIC CULTURE

The Gray-Johnston debate, apart from setting the stage in terms of epistemology, has not contributed much to the methodological discussion in strategic culture studies. Part of the reason for the lack of methodological debate lies in the relative scarcity of comparative accounts on strategic culture: most studies concentrate on single country studies or studies of single strategic cultural entities, such as the culture of the military. This relates to the consensus in the field of strategic culture studies that the (national) political elites are the most important strategic cultural actors and that the primary objective of study is the strategic culture of the (nation) state. Exceptions to

---

[129] See Gray 1999; 2007.

[130] For a detailed discussion, see Chapter 3.5.

this include recent studies that have focused on the premises of EU strategic culture, which have inquired into the possibility of strategic cultural convergence among the EU member states as well as on the level of EU institutions.[131] While these comparative studies offer valuable theoretical and empirical insights in terms of strategic cultural convergence and divergence on a transnational level, the point of departure for any study on strategic culture usually begins from within the (single) state (which should not be an excuse for a stale epistemology or methodology).

As was portrayed in the previous chapter, there are widely differing views in IR scholarship about the utility of cultural approaches in the study of foreign and security policy of states. These approaches differ in their understanding of strategic culture and in their accounts of international politics and, as a consequence, several colliding ontological and epistemological assumptions within strategic cultural studies exist. Despite the fact that there are many ways to approach the subject, cultural approaches are more often than not associated with ideational views towards security (ideational vs. material), which often situates these approaches within the constructivist/post-positivist camp vis-à-vis rationalist/positivist views.

That being said, the view presented in this thesis maintains that the current problems existing in strategic culture research can only partly be traced back to the material/ideational, positivist/post-positivist i.e. the different ontological and epistemological divisions. Consequently, they cannot simply be explained away by claiming that the analytical value of strategic culture is diminished by the fact that it cannot explain anything about social reality. This becomes all the more evident if we do not take at face value the famous division of explaining and understanding international phenomena by Hollis & Smith.[132] The question then, becomes: what implications do these different ontological and epistemological positions entail for the study of strategic cultures in general, and strategic cultural continuity and change, in particular. Analytical and empirical questions are indispensable for any account of strategic culture precisely because the ontological and epistemological grounds are muddled enough to make the choice between analytical framework *a* and *b* more than just a question of method. Rather, it is a question of methodology. Hence, all these questions partly depend on the ontological and epistemological choices we make in our research on strategic culture, but it is important to keep in mind why it matters to study a particular strategic culture or a set of cultures from one and not the other point of view, even though all strategic cultural approaches share a common interest in the ideational and normative structure underlying any strategic culture.

---

[131] See e.g. Giegerich et al. 2013; Schmidt-Zula (ed.) 2013, *European Security Policy and Strategic Culture*, Routledge 2013; Matlary, Janne Haaland 2006, 'When Soft Power Turns Hard: Is an EU Strategic Culture Possible?' Security Dialogue, March 2006, vol. 37, No.1, pp 105-121.

[132] Hollis, Martin & Smith, Steve 1990, *Explaining and Understanding International Relations*, Oxford University Press, 1990.

For the methodological purposes of this study, it seems imperative to make the attempt to avoid the pitfalls of determinism (Johnston), which builds on a positivist understanding of strategic culture as well as of holism (Gray), which makes it difficult to pursue an explanatory account of strategic culture. What we need instead is an account which makes it possible to grasp strategic culture as an explanatory concept without reducing our understanding of 'explanation' to the rather narrowly defined interplay between independent (strategic culture) and dependent (behaviour) variables. Here, as was hinted earlier, we can utilize the critical realist notion of cause and argue that as an explanatory concept, there are causal powers at work in the context of strategic culture that are real but not necessarily always empirically observable the way we expect them to be.[133] Positivists would argue that these entities do not matter unless we can directly sense or experience them, and many post-positivists would claim that these do not matter because there is no external reality beyond of what we can comprehend about the world. These two epistemological positions basically determine how Johnston and Gray, (i.e. the mainstream strategic culture literature) actually define 'what there is to know' about strategic culture. Hence, what there is to know about strategic culture is reduced to the epistemological question 'how can we know about the interplay between strategic thinking and strategic behaviour?' These views are flawed in the sense that they subject ontology to epistemological claims even though one could think that 'what there is to know about strategic culture' would have methodological primacy before any questions of epistemology. The general claim that social scientific concepts are 'problematic' because their definitions are contested does not provide any grounds for epistemological primacy, quite the contrary. Indeed, this does not mean that we should not make realistic claims about strategic culture that exists as a real social and political entity even as scholars differ in how they refer to it empirically. Importantly, and because of their epistemological entrenchment, these mainstream views are unable to look beyond the surface of strategic culture – what critical realists would call 'depth reality' or 'deep reality' of strategic culture.[134] To put it simply, what this depth reality view means in the conduct of this study is that we need to take those causal implications of strategic culture seriously, which goes beyond our immediate senses or perceptions as well as our social constructions of strategic culture.

Indeed, the existence of a deeper layer of reality and the claim that we only have access to part of reality (stratification of reality) is one of the core ontological claims that critical realism makes. As Patomäki and Wight have put it, "the world is composed not only of events, states of affairs, experiences,

---

[133] For a discussion on 'observable' and 'non-observable' entities, see e.g. Jackson, Patrick Thaddeus 2011, *The Conduct of Inquiry in International Relations. Philosophy of Science and its Implications for the Study of World Politics*. Routledge, 2011, pp. 84-91.

[134] See e.g. Patomäki, Heikki & Wight, Colin 2000, 'After Postpositivism? The Promises of Critical Realism', International Studies Quarterly (2000), vol, 44, p. 218.

impressions, and discourses, but also of underlying structures, powers, tendencies, that exist, whether or not detected or known through experience and/or discourse."[135] However, "although the underlying level may possess certain powers and tendencies, these are not always manifest in experience, or even for that matter realized. A nuclear arsenal has the power to bring about vast destruction and this power exists irrespective of being actualized."[136] As I will argue in a similar vein in this chapter, experience of warfare – the existence of which cannot be reduced to the idea of 'discourse of warfare' nor to a neo-positivist notion of 'experience' – is causally emergent in the sense that it has the capacity to bring about change in strategic culture. Hence, critical realism is both 'intransitive' and 'transfactual'[137] in that it presupposes emergent causal powers that may or may not become empirically manifest regardless of their discursive inferences in a social world which is open and more complex than what the mainstream approaches of strategic culture would have us believe. This is the way critical realism is able to bypass the epistemological impasse of the mainstream accounts methodologically – i.e. by redefining 'what there is to know' about strategic culture and shifting the focus from epistemology to ontology.

A serious empiricist skeptic would pose the epistemologically legitimate and necessary question of 'how do I know that these unobservable entities or causal powers actually exist if I cannot sense them or if no discursive reference is readily available'? As Jackson has presented it, these entities might serve either instrumentally "as not truly referring to anything but instead as playing important roles in enabling theories to cohere and to generate sensible explanations and predictions" or as "provisional place holders, destined to be replaced as science advances."[138] However, those embracing critical realism (as opposed to Jackson) would say that that these unobservable entities are real precisely because they represent the best explanation we have for something we cannot otherwise (sufficiently) explain.[139] Furthermore, as Patomäki and Wight have argued,

"(...) if objects are constructed in discourses then there is simply nothing more to discover. Everything that is an object of discourse would be said to exist, that which is not an object of discourse would not exist. Science, at least as currently practiced, would come to an end."[140] Similarly, as they argue, an explanation of things 'as if' they existed without an inquiry into whether they actually exist, is a guaranteed way to end scientific practice.[141]

---

[135] Ibid., p. 223.

[136] Ibid.

[137] For more on 'intransitivity' and 'transfactualism', see e.g. Archer, Margaret et al. (ed.) 1998, *Critical Realism: Essential Readings*, Routledge, London and New York 1998, pp. ix (general introduction).

[138] Jackson 2011, pp. 79-80.

[139] See e.g. Jackson's discussion on the 'invisible dragon', ibid., pp. 78-81.

[140] Patomäki & Wight 2000, p. 218.

[141] Ibid.

Hence, for a critical realist, the existence of a real world independent of our minds is a crucial precondition for scientific argumentation. From a critical realist point of view, then, the skeptical critic is asking the wrong question, because the question is based on an epistemological, not ontological foundation.

The significance of these unobservable entities is related to the perhaps most fundamental methodological claim this study makes. As mentioned earlier, strategic cultural change needs to be grasped in terms of both *processes* and *outcomes*, for reasons that have actually more to do with trying to do justice to the complexity of social and political reality than theory. This is crucial for an understanding of strategic culture developed in this study. Hence, we can directly detect change in terms of *outcomes* in the form of recurring strategic practices or institutionalized forms of behaviour. However, changes that take place in strategic cultures do not simply materialize out of thin air, but are the products of social and political *processes* that evolve over time, which are not necessarily directly observable the way the outcomes of these processes may be. Indeed, as will be argued in the upcoming chapters, the *process* of coming to terms with the German past has played a pivotal role in terms of strategic cultural evolution in Germany ever since the end of World War II. The argument advocated in this study is that we cannot truly claim to grasp what strategic cultural change is all about if we only focus on observable outcomes and neglect study of the processes that underlie these outcomes.

Ontologically, socio-cognitive components of strategic culture are what critical realists would call 'detectable unobservables'.[142] What this means is that they are not directly observable but that there are detectable signs of these components along the historical trajectory of the process of coming to terms with the German past, expressed for instance in the substance and meaning of past events and occurrences. Again, the point here is that even if changes in strategic cultures are observable in terms of outcomes, we need to dig deep into the underlying social and political processes without which some of these changes would not have come to pass. Hence, in order for our explanatory framework to function we need to embrace the critical realist notion of stratified reality and pay attention to the 'depth reality' of strategic culture (processes) as well as the surface of it (outcomes).

One of the ways in which we can evaluate the causal significance of these underlying processes and hence argue scientifically what is 'real' about strategic culture is by conducting a series of counterfactual thought experiments. As Richard Ned Lebow has argued, the use of counterfactuals in the study of history or international relations is a useful research tool in contemplating about the possibility of "alternate worlds" and non-linear causation.[143]   In

---

[142] See e.g. Jackson 2011, p.86.

[143] See Lebow, Richard Ned 2010, *Forbidden Fruit. Counterfactuals and International Relations*. Princeton University Press, 2010.

general, counterfactual arguments can be grasped in form of 'what if' statements. As Lebow illustrates, they are widely used in everyday life situations, when we contemplate the choices we have made or what we are about to make. Most importantly, though, counterfactual thought experiments problematize what Lebow calls 'the hindsight bias' of science, i.e. the faith in the over-determination of historical outcomes once they have occurred.[144] What this means is that we should think twice about the inevitability of historical outcomes, but not only that; there is no *a priori* reason why counterfactual reasoning could not be used in the analysis of events that may not be regarded as major historical shifts.

Moreover, as counterfactual claims embrace the idea of social and political reality as fundamentally contingent, they seem to fit rather well with critical realist metatheory. The notion of contingency connects to the critical realist conceptions of emergent 'causal powers' or 'causal properties' of social and physical objects in that the emergence of these properties is not somehow cosmically preordained or brought about by any form of logical determinism. Rather, the emergence of these properties is contingent upon how the 'deep' reality connects with the 'surface' in different social and political contexts. In this study, I will conduct a counterfactual thought experiment on the case of the massacre of Srebrenica in Chapter 5 to illustrate the causal significance of the event for the evolution of German strategic culture.

Before we conclude with the theoretical and methodological premises, let me briefly return to the discussion of 'causal powers' or 'causal properties' as understood by critical realists, because it is imperative to elucidate what that means in order to pave the way for the introduction of the analytical framework for strategic cultural change. First of all, one of the most crucial claims critical realism makes in terms of causes, which are ontologically social, is that they are very different from those causal powers studied by natural sciences. Indeed, as Kurki has argued, "(i)n the social sciences, causal factors include a variety of ontological forces: material resources, social structures, social rules and norms, discourses and, controversially for the interpretivists, also 'reasons' that agents have for their actions. Engaging with these sorts of causal factors – and the causal complexes that they form – entails non-empiricist epistemological tools: it entails interpretation and recognition of the 'double hermeneutic' relations between the inquirer and their objects of study."[145] Importantly, instead of the 'if X, then Y' way of conceptualizing cause, for critical realists, causes are "those things that produce, generate,

---

[144] Ibid., p. 8.

[145] Kurki, Milja 2007, 'Critical Realism and Causal Analysis in International Relations', Millennium, Journal of International Studies, Vol. 35, No.2, p. 366. 'Double hermeneutic' is, according to Anthony Giddens, a principal feature of social sciences in contrast to natural sciences, i.e. social sciences are reflective; they study not only social actors but the perceptions of these actors, for more see Giddens, Anthony 1987, *Social Theory and Modern Sociology,* Cambridge, Polity Press 1987.

create, constrain, enable, influence or condition".[146] Hence, the way causes are conceptualized in critical realism is based on an ontological appreciation of the complexity of relations between social and physical objects. In effect, this view of causality captures nicely what is at stake when we take the philosophical leap out of the laboratory into "the world out there", because it opposes the explanatory logic of the DN-model.[147] Indeed, the methodological implication of critical realism is that the search for constant conjunctions of natural laws (as in neopositivist approaches) is an insufficient basis for explanatory science. Instead of making *deductive* or *inductive* arguments, i.e. logically constructing conclusions by moving from general observations to particular conclusions (deduction) or from particular observations to general conclusions (induction), critical realism's logic of scientific discovery is *retroductive*, meaning that the researcher's task is to ask questions such as 'what the real world must be like for a specific *explanandum* to be actualized', i.e. for it to become empirically manifest. Or, to put it more specifically, critical realists ask 'what the *sufficient* or *necessary* conditions for the actualization of the explanandum are'.[148] As Mahoney has argued, the logic of necessary cause postulates that "a cause is something that – when counterfactually taken away under ceteris paribus conditions – postulates a different outcome" while in contrast, the logic of sufficient cause maintains that "the counterfactual absence of the cause may not change the outcome in an individual case and thus could be interpreted as not exerting an effect under the necessary cause definition".[149] Mahoney argues further that the problem with these logics is that individual causes do not take the form of only necessary and/or sufficient causes.[150] Consider e.g. Daniel Jonah Goldhagen's famous argument regarding 'a culture of German anti-Semitism' which he considered to be a *sufficient* cause to provide for the motivational basis for the Holocaust.[151] Indeed, it is not difficult to think of examples of causes related to

---

[146] Kurki 2007, pp. 366-7.

[147] DN-model (deductive-nomological model) is the explanatory model favored by positivist and empiricist science. It is usually affiliated with Carl Hempel, Paul Oppenheim and Karl Popper. The model is based on deductive inference, according to which the explanandum is a deductive consequence of the explanans. According to the DN-model, the truth of the premises of the phenomenon under study entails the truth of its conclusion, which, in turn, hinges on accurate prediction of the phenomenon itself with the help of direct observation and the uncovering of general laws. For more on DN-model, see e.g. Hempel, Carl-Gustav 1966, *Philosophy of Natural Science*, Prentice Hall; 1st edition 1966; Popper, Karl 2002, *Logic of Scientific Discovery*, Routledge 2002 (first published in 1959).

[148] For a discussion of sufficient and necessary conditions, see e.g. Mahoney, James 2008, 'Toward a Unified Theory of Causality', Comparative Political Studies, Vol. 41, No. 4/5, April/May 2008, p. pp. 412-436.

[149] Ibid., pp. 417-418.

[150] Ibid.

[151] Goldhagen, Daniel Jonah 1997, *Hitler's Willing Executioners: Ordinary Germans and the Holocaust*, Vintage Books, 1997.

Goldhagen's claim that are neither necessary nor sufficient but when combined together are more likely to produce the observed outcome. For instance, think of Hitler's rise to power, the rise of the Nazi party (NSDAP) as a political force and its racial doctrines, the preceding economic decline in the 1930s in Europe or German 'humiliation' in the Treaty of Versailles 1918 or, for that matter, the relatively high unemployment rate of young male Germans in the 1920s and 1930s. None of these factors alone (and there are several others) can explain the Holocaust but when combined together in an explanatory framework we are at least in a position to provide a better explanation than 'a culture of German anti-Semitism'.

Hence, in order to posit an explanation of strategic cultural change, we need to be able to determine not only what the sufficient or necessary causes for its actualization are but we also need to focus on the underlying conditions unravelling the causal mechanisms that may possess the emergent causal powers to bring about, i.e. to actualize the observed explanandum. This shifts the focus away from 'individual causes' to their combinations. However, as will be discussed further in in this chapter, the problem with studying how and why changes in strategic cultures occur is not only a question of how one conceptualizes causality and therefore explanation, but also what exactly is regarded as 'change' in terms of strategic culture. Again, appearances may be deceptive if we only focus on the 'surface' of strategic culture. To reiterate, the point this thesis is attempting to get across is that if we only focus on directly observable empirical aspects of strategic culture, such as specific discourses, certain strategic practices or institutionalized forms of behaviour we may actually never fully comprehend the changes that we may observe in these directly observable entities. I argue that this is because the notion of 'change' in social sciences (as opposed to natural sciences) by necessity presupposes a social ontology of 'change' which cannot be reduced to 'observable effects of natural laws' but is dependent on the 'double hermeneutics' of social sciences. Methodologically, critical realism promotes the idea of epistemological relativism, but that does not mean that 'anything goes'. Instead, what it means is that some but not all ways of telling stories result in better stories being told. This relates to the general belief of scientific realism that the purpose of science is to deepen our understanding of the social and political reality which we inhabit, which, in turn, means that we ought to argue scientifically about what is 'real' about the world and hence go beyond mere appearances.[152]

This study commences with the assumption that strategic culture is a multifaceted social and political phenomenon the study of which cannot be limited to a discussion on the virtues and vices of specific methods, because methods, if anything, depend upon the methodology, i.e. how the research is designed and supposed to be conducted as a whole. Indeed, it needs to be noted that none of the existing accounts of strategic cultural change dis-

---

[152] See e.g. Bhaskar, Roy 2008, *A Realist Theory of Science*, Verso 2008.

cussed in this chapter apply a single, extractable method to the study of strategic cultural change. They each devise a more or less complex analytical framework the explanatory power of which can be evaluated against both the claims that they make based on the given research material, and against the chosen methodological avenue understood holistically as in 'the manner in which research is conducted'. As the above discussion on critical realist meta-theory suggests, however, methodological claims need to be founded on a solid ontological basis, meaning that the knowledge-claims made need to be based on an understanding of 'what there is to know' of any given research object, even though it is fundamentally an open question. And yet, so is the world we inhabit and which we study. The existence of a definition of strategic culture as '*abc*' does not hence mean that strategic culture could not be defined as '*xyz*', but it does mean that both definitions have to be based on an explicit understanding of 'what there is to know' about strategic culture. This rather common-sense notion of ontological primacy seems to elude at least the mainstream accounts of strategic culture, which focus almost all of their research energy on dwelling on exhaustive epistemological debates.

As was argued at the beginning of this thesis, strategic culture can be understood as *consisting of specific strategic thinking and other strategic practices, the purpose of which is to establish clarity regarding the potential outcomes of questions and choices related to peace and war and the use of military force*. It needs to be pointed out here that this definition basically aligns itself to that presented by Gray but with a crucial difference: it recognizes that culture functions on a deeper level of reality than actors do. Actors act observably within and upon the strategic culture that they inhabit, but strategic culture as a whole, as argued, operates on a level that involves social and political processes which may or may not involve actors directly. As discussed, this level of reality is quite neatly captured by the notion of 'detectable unobservables'. Hence, there is room for political agency in the above definition. In fact, strategic culture understood as a social and political process by definition involves strategic actors, which are mainly the executive and the legislative bodies i.e. the Federal government, the Bundestag and the relevant ministries and governmental bodies, and the German army, the Bundeswehr. Of course, as Gray has pointed out, people are 'encultured' beings but that does not mean that there is no room for an analytical separation of strategic culture and the strategic actors that act upon it, often in the midst of the cross-pressures of the lessons learned from the past and emerging challenges to security. Yet, while the above definition recognizes the need for an analytical separation of culture and agency, it differs from Johnston's concept in that it treats causality in critical realist fashion, allowing the concept to unfold.

Moreover, contra Gray, the view of strategic culture presented in this study does not treat it primarily as a 'tendency to think and act in a certain fashion' but rather as a 'response to a complex and unclear security environment'. The former is misleading in the sense that it suggests a concept of

strategic culture that rests on the idea of the cultural status quo, whereas the latter does not. In my view, in order to be meaningfully applied as a concept, this distinction needs to be made. The core purpose of any strategic culture is to establish *clarity* regarding the most fundamental issues of human condition: peace and war (and the use of military force) and what this means in terms of concrete policies. Finally, strategic culture is strongly embedded in the (national) past(s), because as a process, it evolves over time. However, the evolution of strategic culture is neither solely linear nor circular. Pure linearity would be confined to a path-dependency, and nothing could be learned from it because the past would not guide future. Pure circularity would be mere repetition of the existing patterns of thought and practices. With no possibility of breaking out, we would be bound by fate and nothing could be learned from it. Indeed, we may perceive a pattern, large or small, but the outcome of that pattern is not fated by the forces of history: there can be more than one outcome to a certain pattern, as is argued in Chapter 5 in conjunction with counterfactual argumentation and strategic cultural change. What makes the difference is how strategic culture establishes clarity in terms of potential outcomes of our questions and choices related to peace and war and the use of military force – a process which is guided but not determined by the lessons we draw from the past and the experiences we make. This is, I believe, how strategic culture ultimately functions.

With these rather significant methodological caveats in mind, this study is, first and foremost, exploratory in nature as it enters the terrain of critical realist metatheory in order to tell a better story about changes in German strategic culture after the end of the Cold War. The most valuable contribution this study makes is the attempt to devise an analytical framework for the study of strategic cultural change. It is my belief that this framework, capturing strategic cultural change as a process which incorporates sources, mechanisms as well as outcomes of strategic cultural change is flexible enough to be applied to both single entity studies as well as comparative research designs on strategic cultures with certain epistemological caveats.

2.2. EXISTING ACCOUNTS OF STRATEGIC CULTURAL CHANGE

I will focus on four specific accounts of strategic culture that have been used to attempt to construct a concise view of strategic cultural change. For the general purpose of analytical clarity, these accounts need to be discussed separately, because they all focus on different aspects of strategic cultural change and have a distinct way of capturing (what in their terms) is the essence of change. While I will mainly discuss the key arguments that these accounts make in terms of strategic cultural change I will also attempt to address their strengths and weaknesses in comparative fashion whenever it is feasible. I will also summarize the key findings of these accounts before pre-

senting my own analytical model for the study of strategic cultural change. First, I will discuss Christoph O. Meyer's and Tobias Wilke's accounts of the mechanisms of strategic cultural change. Second, I will draw on Kerry Longhurst's view on strategic cultural change understood in terms of 'fine-tuned' and 'fundamental' change. Finally, I will elaborate on Carolin Hilpert's account of strategic cultural change understood as change on the level of 'recurring policy practices'. While each of these accounts can be argued to either conform to Johnston's or Gray's theoretical premises (Wilke, Meyer) or deviate from them (Longhurst, Hilpert), they all provide their own twist to the study of strategic cultural change.

2.2.1. MECHANISMS OF STRATEGIC CULTURAL CHANGE

Meyer's study was among the first serious studies to set out to explore the question of a common, European strategic culture. Meyer compared the political elites of several EU member states as well as similarities and differences in their strategic discourse in an attempt to discover the persistence and transformation of strategic norms on the European level. Indeed, for Meyer, strategic norms are a key component in understanding continuity and change in strategic cultures, because he strongly agrees with Martha Finnemore's argument that norms can be understood as 'reasons for action'. Meyer argues that Johnston's account is "better in line with the arguments of modernist constructivists concerning the use of non-material factors within a research design that aspires to identify causality and advance explanations."[153] As Meyer writes regarding the study of strategic culture, "(w)e are therefore dealing with theories, which can tell us whether the strategic behaviour of collective actor, 'X', is possible on the grounds of defending a constituent norm, 'Y', against violation. Behaviour 'X' could still occur, but would have to be caused by other considerations."[154] The merits and demerits of positivism and post-positivism were discussed earlier in the context of the Gray-Johnston debate and there is no need to repeat them here. Suffice it to say that when Meyer talks about 'mechanisms of strategic cultural change' it means that these are causal mechanisms which can bring about real change in strategic culture.

As I argued in the first chapter, the approach that understands norms as 'reasons for action' is plausible, but, in contrast to Johnston, I also argued that this is not all there is to how norms affect strategic thinking and strategic behaviour. First off, norms cannot be reduced solely to the role of 'explanatory variables' in the framework of strategic culture because real life simply does not work that way. For instance, take a classic example of a fire alarm situation in a classroom. If the alarm goes off, we will get out of the class even

---

[153] Meyer, Christoph O. 2006, *The Quest for a European Strategic Culture. Changing Norms on Security and Defense in the European Union*, Palgrave Macmillan, 2006, p. 17.

[154] Ibid., p.18.

if we did not smell any smoke, because it is considered the appropriate way to act in such a situation. However, whether the school is actually on fire or not, we do not get out primarily because it is an appropriate way to behave in a situation like that. Rather, we get out above all because otherwise there is a possibility that we could be burnt. Similarly, if the act of leaving the classroom would for some reason be regarded as going against the prevailing norms, we would still get out or at least attempt to do so if the classroom caught fire. Now, one could argue that even when behaviour deviates from what is considered to be the norm in a given situation, actors are still aware that they are not abiding by that norm. Hence, norms certainly constitute and regulate behaviour one way or the other, but they do not necessarily determine its outcome, which may depend on a multitude of factors. This is why norms alone cannot explain change in terms of outcomes. But norms do play an important role in the process of strategic cultural change (or continuity) because they embody the collectively accepted and approved ways of thinking and doing, even if we don't always abide by them. In short, as 'reasons for action', norms are part of the explanation, not the explanation itself. Meyer would most likely agree with this distinction because he argues that "norms and ideas do not only come into play at the decision-making stage, but perhaps more importantly, at every stage of the cognitive process ranging from issue-selection, interpretation and evaluation, which precedes and feeds into the identification of interests and options for action."[155] Crucially, by referring to previous studies Meyer further states that so far, "(t)he evidence is that norms tend to be followed under conditions when policy-makers have sufficient time to consider their choices, when a large group of actors is involved, and when uncertainties are high."[156] Hence, situational factors matter when norms are put to test.

Meyer's solution to the Gray-Johnston problem is so to speak to embrace the best of both worlds, i.e. to pursue a causal explanation of strategic cultural change by focusing on specific ideational, cognitive or normative components without resorting to an over-determination of outcomes along the lines of national essentialism (e.g. Germans cannot help but act as Germans).[157] This is a stance that makes sense in cases in which we are able to determine what the relevant norms, ideas or cognitive positions are in a given strategic culture. Therefore, in order for Meyer's solution to work, strategic culture needs to be unpacked into its ideational, normative and cognitive components. Meyer's key argument is that "changes in national strategic cultures as well as the norms and narratives underpinning them can and do occur, if existing cognitive schemata are challenged either through a constant stream of similar, or a repetition of the same kind of discrepant information, or it can occur through the accumulated, high intensity exposure to such information.

---

[155] Ibid.

[156] Ibid., p. 19.

[157] Ibid., p. 20.

The latter case has been described [...] in terms of 'external shocks', 'crises' or 'formative moments' which can, but do not have to, lead to the revision and reinterpretation of collective memory and beliefs."[158]

Clearly, the most obvious source of such mechanisms is the participation in and experience of warfare or conflict management that involves more or less directly the question of the use of military force. Hence, external shocks may cause change by putting the normative framework of strategic culture under pressure and by questioning the prevailing understandings of not only what kind of behaviour is morally acceptable or appropriate, but also by forcing the political decision makers to contemplate their response in the face of a new security threat. Even so, it is important to highlight the fact that new interpretations of existing norms do not necessarily overturn the ideational core of strategic culture, unless we can argue that there is a changed pattern of behaviour that relates to a transformation in the normative framework. Meyer argues that there are two further mechanisms of normative change that can gradually change strategic culture. As he posits, "(b)eyond the dramatic case of normative change through military defeat or occupation, more gradual changes can arise also from international or transnational processes related to international law-making, peer pressure, naming and shaming, as well as arguing and persuasion. Agents of such changes can be epistemic communities of lawyers or the military profession, non-governmental organizations, the audio-visual mass media, international organizations or governments. At the same time, normative change may also occur gradually within societies because of the changing impact of historical experiences, opening opportunities for normative contestation as new groups occupy positions of influence within a given society."[159]

In contrast to Meyer, I posit that the mechanisms of change other than external shocks can have significant impact on the evolution of strategic culture in areas that are not necessarily primarily concerned with norms or normative influence per se. One such domain is practical and material defence and security policy co-operation that is aimed to be based not only on shared ideas and values, but also on best practices, benchmarking, economic efficiency and viability. For instance, the Bundeswehr reform (discussed in detail in Chapter 5) can be seen not only as a solidification of the shift from territorial defence to out-of-area operations but also in the context of the broader de-

---

[158] Ibid., p. 25.

[159] Meyer 2006, pp. 26-27.

velopments at the European and EU level toward a professionalization and specialization of the armed forces.[160]

In summary, the argument is that of all three of the mechanisms presented by Meier, the experience of warfare is the most significant, 'first order' mechanism of strategic cultural change, because as discussed at length in this thesis, it has the power to question directly the fundamental beliefs related to the questions of peace and war and the use of military force. In the German case this has been a particularly pertinent feature because it relates directly to the process of coming to terms with the German past. In this sense the changing impact of historical experiences is among the experiences that relate to warfare, and should therefore be viewed as part of that mechanism, which is imperative in understanding and explaining continuity and change in German strategic culture. Moreover, the other mechanisms mentioned by Meier can be important in terms of change, but they serve rather as 'second order' mechanisms in that they are usually complementary to the experience of warfare. To be sure, there's no doubt that the second order mechanisms can be powerful in their own right, and that the impact of generational change or public opinion on the evolution of strategic culture should not be underestimated.

Indeed, as a critical remark regarding the above delineation of the causal mechanisms into 'first order' and 'second order' mechanisms, one could of course posit that the generation that did the fighting in World War II in Germany has nearly vanished. Moreover, the generation of *Kriegskinder*, the last generation to directly experience World War II is getting older, and the political power in Germany is shifting to younger generations. But then, it seems that every generation *experiences* a war, either directly or indirectly, which has a considerable impact on the evolution of the respective strategic culture. In Germany, this has been the legacy of World War II and the Nazi past which will eventually continue, as an *indirect* experience, to be reflected upon and mixed with the *direct* experiences made with modern warfare and Bundeswehr's current and future out-of-area operations. Hence, the argument put forward is that in terms of causal mechanisms, it is primarily the evolving experiences related to warfare (of which reinterpretations of the past are an integral part) which have the power to challenge the status quo in strategic cultures and the existing beliefs and ways of doing things, regardless whether we talk about the people in power currently or the millennials.

---

[160] This shift is also reflected in the new White Paper on German Security Policy and the Future of Bundeswehr. It aims to balance the Bundeswehr role between global deployments and territorial defense, given the recent crisis in Ukraine and the unpredictability of Russia, reflecting the hybrid nature of emerging security threats. The new White Paper also underlines concepts such as 'Pooling and Sharing' as well as the recommendations of the 'Rühe-Commission' in 2015 in highlighting the 'interoperability' aspect of the armed forces of NATO-member states. See White Paper on German Security Policy and the Future of Bundeswehr (2016). Available at: (https://www.bmvg.de).

Wilke's account, which is discussed below, is similar to Meyer's in that it aims to account for the causal mechanisms at work in strategic culture via the assessment of the normative and ideational structure of strategic culture. Yet his methodological approach differs from Meyer's in one crucial respect, namely, that his view on causality is more nuanced than that of Meyer's. Wilke has argued that "the incremental adaptation of the country's strategic culture – defined by perception of threat and self, and its understanding of spatial and functional limits of the use of force – seems to have come to a preliminary conclusion. As adaptation has allegedly culminated in a final 'Enttabuisierung des Militärischen', entailing a readiness to defend German security 'auch am Hindukusch', we find sound and ample justification to look for the roots of Germany's basic strategic cultural tenets and reasons for their change, paving the way for this new outlook in international affairs and increased sense of global responsibility, turning the former civil into an increasingly normal power."[161]

On factual terms, there is not much to be disputed about the above statement, except for the alleged transformation of Germany into a 'normal' power, which, according to the view presented in this thesis in Chapter 5, never was a very accurate description of what took place in German strategic culture to begin with. Yet the more interesting part involves the form rather than the substance of Wilke's argument, because, if change is coined in terms of incremental normative or ideational adaptation, it must be based on the assessment of the underlying social and political processes that are causing this adaptation.

Wilke's assessment of this incremental adaptation rests on his observation that while "Cold War strategic cultural adaptation was largely informed by societal and elite learning processes about the devastating effects of authoritarian militarism and hegemonic strivings for power, since the 1990s German governments and subsequently society has begun to embrace a new understanding of international responsibility in security and defence, which still recognizes the specific reasons for the nation's Cold War civil identity but is far more willing to actively respond to international demands and contingencies."[162] According to Wilke, this willingness is epitomized by the German government's decision in 2003 to agree to the draft of a European Security Strategy (ESS) which provides the declamatory proof for this new understanding of responsibility to become a "normal" partner. His argument is that "if we find a consistency between norms and ideas put forward by national society and political elites [...] and those addressed in the ESS, unanimous convergence towards a European strategic culture as well as substantial and lasting German Normalisierung can be argued to take place."[163]

---

[161] Wilke, Tobias 2007, *German Strategic Culture Revisited. Linking the past to contemporary German strategic choice*, Lit Verlag, Berlin 2007, p. 12.

[162] Ibid., p. 13.

[163] Ibid.

However, I posit that Wilke's argument falls short not only with regard to Germany's 'normalization', but also as far as the link between German responsibility and the agreement over ESS is concerned. First, the issue of a new sense of responsibility does not fit well with an understanding of Germany willing to become a 'normal' partner, because 'normality' as such does not provide any definitive standards as far as responsibility is concerned. Furthermore, no empirical evidence exists that would suggest that Germany agreed to the ESS in particular because of a new sense of international responsibility. We could just as well argue that Germany agreed to the ESS because it was in line with the tenets of its strategic culture. Indeed, the principal restraint in all things military, which is still a prevalent feature of German strategic culture, fits well with the 'soft' power character of EU foreign and security policy. Hence, German agreement on ESS could be explained by the general 'good fit' between German strategic culture and the ESS rather than a new sense of international responsibility in terms of 'normality'. Therefore, even if we could find empirical evidence to back up Wilke's claim, the factors which underline continuity in German strategic culture seem to explain German attitudes toward the ESS better. Second, as will be argued in Chapter 5, the argument about norm convergence at the EU level is problematic, if it is taken to explain the formation of a common, European strategic culture. Most importantly, key differences remain between EU member states on the issue of the use of military force. Moreover, as long as the decision on whether to use military force or not remains strongly in the traditional domain of nation states and in the hands of their executives and legislatives, the differences between EU member states on this particular issue will directly impact the formulation of any kind of European strategic culture. Third, and importantly, if Germany would be adapting as Wilke describes the adaption process, it would seem reasonable to assume that Germany would not hesitate to use military force in a more consistent manner. Yet there has been no detectable empirical pattern of the sort since the end of the Cold War. This alone makes the argument regarding the link between increased international responsibility and a desire to become a 'normal' power difficult to digest, because 'normality' would then refer to a status of normality regarding the use of military force, which in the German context, given its experiences on warfare and the German past, is a contradiction in terms.

However, despite the problematic nature of the substance of his argument regarding the adaptation of German strategic culture, Wilke's methodological approach is quite detailed and sophisticated. Wilke understands change as normative and ideational adaptation. He aims to account for the underlying causal mechanisms of normative and ideational adaptation of strategic culture by pitting constructivist logic against a rationalist one. His basic argument is that constructivist logic would state that formative moments or critical junctures initiate either learning processes or adaptation pressure that lead to adaptation of a strategic culture which enables new strategic choices or alternatively, and according to the rationalist logic, either structural

changes or material demands that initiate learning or adaptation enable new strategic choices.[164] Hence for Wilke, change is ultimately to be understood in terms of the causal mechanisms which underline the processual nature of change. Hence, he actually deviates from the Johnstonian angle and Meyer's account in the sense that the underlying causal mechanisms are grasped in terms of 'x leads to y through *abc*' instead of 'if x then y', which, as discussed, refers to an understanding of causality as a static correlation the aim of which is to reveal the underlying causal mechanism as a natural law.[165] Importantly, what this methodological choice implies is that change is ultimately to be understood in terms of dynamic processes, not only as static outcomes.

There are a couple of further points to Wilke's methodological approach that need to be addressed before we turn to discuss Hilpert's account. Firstly, even if the move from 'if x then y' to 'x leads to y through *abc*' enables us to contemplate strategic cultural change in the form of social and/or political processes, it does not fundamentally alter the way strategic culture is thought to function, because if the latter formula is true, then by definition so is the former. However, the advantage of the latter formula compared to the former is in that it does not 'black-box' all the intervening variables and hence the latter provides a better way of looking at the underlying causal mechanisms, which can and do vary and thus deny the existence of strategic cultural change as a result of static causal mechanisms. Therefore, Wilke's approach is definitely more nuanced than Johnston's in that it pays attention to the intervening variables which affect the process of change.

Secondly, and more importantly, Wilke's account is still unsatisfactory especially because it delineates the impact of the causal mechanisms underlying strategic culture to producing new strategic choices in a more or less deterministic fashion. As I argued in Chapter 1, while I agree with the principle that norms provide 'reasons for action', they do not have a monopoly over strategic choice, let alone over the policies that ensue based upon these choices. To translate this argument into Wilke's terminology would be to argue that norms or ideas (x) do not necessarily lead to new strategic choices (y) through a, b and/or c, but they can be one of the reasons why new policies are introduced and hence be part of the explanation of strategic cultural change. To be sure, this modified position is more in line with Gray than Johnston because while it ultimately argues that neither the basic conditions 'if (idea) x then (behaviour) y', '(idea) x precedes (behaviour) y in time' nor the modified position '(idea) x leads to (behaviour) y through *abc*' is a satisfactory formula for an understanding of how strategic culture functions, it

---

[164] Ibid., p. 32, see Table VI.

[165] On the differences between these two accounts, see Bennett, Andrew & George, Alexander L. 2005, *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences,* MIT Press 2005 and King, Gary, Keohane, Robert & Verba, Sidney 1994, *Designing social inquiry: Scientific inference in qualitative research*, Princeton University Press, 1994.

rests upon a counterfactual condition that 'but for (strategic thinking) x, (behaviour) y would not have occurred'.

This formulation also alleviates the problem mentioned by Neumann and Heikka of trying to attempt to account for the explanatory power of individual ideas.[166] It shifts the focus from individual ideas to the ideational structure of strategic culture understood as a combination of different beliefs, ideas and norms, hence avoiding the determinism of Wilke's account. Hence, for Gray's constitutive argument about strategic culture to make sense, the relationship between strategic thinking and strategic behaviour has to be one that has a meaningful correspondence with the world within which strategic culture operates. Strategic thinking does not have to be the *effective* cause of strategic behaviour in order for either to be meaningful but it has to fulfil the counterfactual condition if we are to assess the explanatory power of the concept. In other words, strategic thinking is part of the explanation for strategic behaviour. In this sense, the relationship between strategic thinking and strategic behaviour is one where ideas, norms and beliefs precondition, not necessarily determine, the course of strategic action.

2.2.2. FINE-TUNED CHANGE VS. FUNDAMENTAL CHANGE

Kerry Longhurst's view on strategic culture and change differs from the above two in that it does not actually pay much attention to how strategic culture functions, or what the underlying mechanisms are, but rather focuses on pointing out the structured nature of strategic culture. She argues that strategic culture consists of multiple 'layers' of culture which incorporate the possibility of change and is worth quoting at length: "there are the deeper, basal, qualities that have their origins in the primordial or formative phases of a given strategic culture; these are here called foundational elements. Foundational elements comprise basic beliefs regarding the use of force that give a strategic culture its core characteristics. Importantly, foundational elements are highly resistant to change. Extending out of these foundational elements are the observable manifestations of the strategic culture: the longstanding policies and practices that actively relate and apply the substance of the strategic culture's core to the external environment, essentially by providing channels of meaning and application. These aspects of strategic culture – here called regulatory practices – are less resilient to change. Midway between the foundational elements and regulatory practices are the security policy standpoints, the contemporary, widely accepted, interpretations as to how best core values are to be promoted through policy channels, in the sense that they set the preferences for policy choices."[167]

Hence, the core of Longhurst's argument is that the fundamental beliefs understood as the 'deeper qualities' or 'foundational elements' are much

---

[166] See Neumann & Heikka 2005.

[167] Longhurst 2004, p. 17.

more resistant to change than longstanding regulatory policy practices. What this definition also implies is that if there is a stable, non-conflictual and consensual link between foundational elements and regulatory practices, there is no reason to expect any radical or fundamental change in strategic culture. This, in turn, translated to Meyer's line of argumentation would mean that as long as particular norms, which can be understood as embodying the core of the foundational elements in a given strategic culture, i.e. the beliefs regarding the use of military force, offer not only morally but also practical and viable solutions in terms of security and defence policy, there is no reason to expect any radical or fundamental change in strategic culture. Yet as Longhurst argues, '(t)he normal functioning relationship between foundational elements and regulatory practices may be disturbed if a certain policy practice has become so ingrained that it can be a force for inertia, appearing as a lag or even an ill-suited policy to pursue."[168] This, in turn, implies that the institutionalization and the taking for granted certain strategic practices can both serve as a force for inertia and as an impediment to change.

Longhurst's view on strategic cultural change rests on the notion of 'fine-tuned' and 'fundamental' changes. She argues that "(f)undamental change of a strategic culture is a far less common phenomenon. It is more abrupt serve to reinforce memory. This means that subsequent generations, in nature, occurring when trauma is sufficiently severe as to nullify the existing strategic culture, giving rise to the establishment of new core beliefs, leading subsequently to new policies and practices. This fundamental change to or collapse of a strategic culture is best described as a situation of 'collective infancy'. Related to this theme of change is the issue of policy inertia: even in the event of a foundational element being challenged, certain practices or policies may resist change or adjustment."[169] Hence, what we could draw from this line of argumentation is the notion that fine-tuned change or adaptation of policy practices occurs more frequently simply because policy practices deal with everyday politics that may require adaptation or streamlining of policy standpoints without a comprehensive overhaul of the underlying ideational fundaments of a strategic culture. Moreover, this also implies that the moment of 'collective infancy' can only take place if the existing ideational, normative and cognitive structure of a strategic culture is put under so much strain that it no longer provides a viable way of thinking about and pursuing security and defence policy. Therefore, a way out of this phase of infancy towards a strategic maturity takes place via novel strategic ideas, thoughts and norms as well as fresh regulatory practices.

However, it is imperative that a couple clarifications from the viewpoint of this study are made in terms of how we could utilize Longhurst's stance analytically. First, it is important to specify the distinctions between 'a complete collapse' of a strategic culture on one hand, and 'collective infancy' and 'fun-

---

[168] Ibid., p.18.

[169] Ibid.

damental change' on the other. Collapse of a strategic culture can be understood as a comprehensive strategic reset of the hitherto existing system of strategic beliefs and actions whereas fundamental change may refer to a change *within* these belief systems and result in new policies. However, whereas fundamental change need not imply a complete strategic reset, by definition strategic reset always necessitates fundamental change. Hence, if we are intent on using both 'collapse' and 'fundamental change' analytically as signifying qualitative differences within and between strategic cultures, then this distinction is necessary. Second, and regrettably, Longhurst spends little time on the question of change beyond the notion of fine-tuned change and fundamental change. Ultimately, her conception of change relies on an understanding of how the different layers, i.e. fundaments, policy standpoints and practices of strategic culture relate to one another. It also seems that beyond these layers there is not a lot of room to contemplate the underlying social and political processes which bring about change (Meyer and Wilke would call these 'mechanisms'). This can be derived from Longhurst's clear distinction between fine-tuned change understood in terms of policy corrections, alterations or adaptations on one hand, and fundamental change in terms of either 'collective infancy' or new policies and practices on the other hand. The problem here is that all of these notions refer to a concept of change that is knowledgeable only as an observable outcome. Third, and consequently, what remains unclear is the relationship between fine-tuned and fundamental change in terms of not how they differ but how they affect one another. For instance, the question of whether enough fine-tuning of regulatory strategic practices is enough to trigger a change on the more fundamental level, is left open.

Overall, it would seem that Longhurst's categorization of change understood qualitatively as either fine-tuned or fundamental change is analytically useful in a rather broad sense, because it gives a generic idea of the magnitude of change(s) in question and where we might be able to observe them, but as I will argue later, it needs to be supplemented with Meyer's arguments regarding the mechanisms of change. This enables us to contemplate on the question of change both in terms of outcomes as well as processes.

2.2.3. CHANGE ON THE LEVEL OF RECURRING POLICY PRACTICES

Hilpert's account differs from the above three in one crucial respect, namely, that it shifts the focus from ideational structure to agency. She shows how German participation in the ISAF operation in Afghanistan (2002-2014) – understood as an external challenge – changed some of the strategic practices of the Federal Republic on the level of civil-military relations, military doctrine as well as procurement.[170] In terms of strategic cultural change, she ar-

---

[170] Hilpert, Carolin 2014, *Strategic Cultural Change and the Challenge for Security Policy. Germany and the Bundeswehr's Deployment to Afghanistan*, Palgrave Macmillan 2014.

gues in particular that "the most prevalent patterns of change are the exter-
nal challenges which are seized by political entrepreneurs to forge new prac-
tices. Though there have also been other reasons for change, it has been ded-
icated agents seizing windows of opportunity and using external threat-
related challenges that have been the most successful at gradually adapting
the German way of warfare."[171] Importantly, for Hilpert, "(o)nly in combina-
tion with practices, the final institutionalization of repeated patterns of be-
haviour, will I be able to truly assess change".[172] This is because while "fac-
tors, which have the potential to change German strategic culture may mere-
ly evoke a new, altered rhetoric, without leading to any changes in how things
are actually done."[173]

The analytical shift in focus from ideational structure to agency and prac-
tice reflects the most recent criticism voiced toward the Gray-Johnston di-
chotomy. For instance, Neumann & Heikka argue that that the definition of
most the current strategic culture literature is based on an outdated defini-
tion of culture. Instead, they suggest a definition of strategic culture as the
'dynamic interplay between discourses and practices'.[174] What this implies is
a co-constitutive understanding between strategic discourse and practice. It
seems that bringing the discussion about practices into the realm of strategy
is a way for them to break out of the methodological impasse of trying to ex-
plain the relationship between cultural ideas and cultural behaviour, which
according to Neumann & Heikka is an outdated way of looking at strategic
culture.[175] This argument reflects the 'practice turn' in IR, the general argu-
ment of which is that when we find ourselves in problematic situations, we
try to apply a practical form of inquiry to find appropriate ways to deal with
the problem. As Hellmann has argued in terms of how pragmatism relates to
beliefs, "(e)xperience (that is, past thoughts and actions of ourselves as well
as others), expectation (that is, intentions as to desired future states of the
world we act in as well as predictions as to likely future states), and creative
intelligence merge in producing a new belief."[176] He further specifies that
while "beliefs are rules for action, language is a tool for coping with the world
rather than for representing reality or for finding truth."[177] Hence, what this
implies is that pragmatists categorically reject the view that our beliefs would
somehow correspond with the reality 'out there'.

While I find that the study of practices is useful in an attempt to capture
the different aspects of strategic cultural change, the approach falls short in

---

[171] Ibid., p. 3.

[172] Ibid., pp. 8-9.

[173] Ibid, p. 8.

[174] Neumann & Heikka 2005, p. 9.

[175] Ibid.

[176] Hellmann, Gunther 2009, 'Pragmatism in International Relations', International Studies Review,
Vol. 11, No.3, (Sep., 2009), p. 639.

[177] Ibid.

some crucial respects, the details of which will be discussed below. However, a couple theoretical and conceptual clarifications need to be made before that. First, it needs to be noted that while I have argued that strategic culture needs to be understood as a set of 'responses' to the internal and external security and defence policy challenges rather than a 'tendency' to think or act in a certain fashion, these responses do not always follow the most 'practical form of inquiry', as will become clear in the course of the empirical chapters. Second, for the concept of strategic culture to make any sense the relationship between strategic thought and action needs to be one which has a meaningful correspondence with the world within which strategic culture operates. Hence, if we agree that the ideational structure of strategic culture consists of ideas, beliefs and norms then these have to have a meaningful correspondence with strategic action and strategic practices because without it there can be no meaningful correspondence between strategic culture and the reality 'out there'. Moreover, even if we followed the line of argument that the reality 'out there' becomes meaningful only through our efforts to make sense of it, it needs to be noted that culture is the very domain of human thought and action which either enables or constrains us in finding practical solutions or otherwise to the problems we face and hence in our very ability to make sense of whatever may be 'out there'. In other words, and following Gray, the fact that we are 'encultured beings' sets limits to how we are able to experience the past and what we can expect of the future. This, however, also means that there necessarily exists a reality 'out there' which is not exhausted by our experiences of it.

Hence, the point is not whether what we believe is 'true' in terms of the reality 'out there' but rather that what we believe makes sense in terms of what is 'out there'. This is why I find the pragmatist position rather problematic; it squeezes the diverse impact of the German past on the evolution of German strategic culture into a 'vacuum-packed box of readily available experiences' which are arguably harnessed by the political actors in the most practical way possible. Anybody who has studied the discourse on German defence and security in depth should arrive at an opposite conclusion: the German discourse on strategy, defence and security is anything *but* practical – it is complex, diverse, conflictual and even contradictory. It also begs the question of how one can actually be "creatively intelligent" about beliefs that relate to the lessons learned from the past. However, it needs to be noted in defence of Hilpert, that while maintaining her stance on practices Hilpert seems to recognize the problem of combining the theory of pragmatism with the concept of strategic culture as she criticizes Neumann and Heikka for completely abandoning the motivations of the actors: norms, ideas and beliefs.[178] Indeed, if strategic discourse is not based on norms, ideas and beliefs, then what?

---

[178] Ibid., 9-10.

I agree with Hilpert that, in terms of change, identifying a practice as an institutionalized pattern of behaviour is a strong analytical move because in this way we *might* be able to observe the result of the process of change as an 'institutionalized political outcome'. Yet it is absolutely imperative to underline a fact which Hilpert does not discuss, namely, that *not all processes of strategic cultural change lead to practices which can be coined as institutionalized patterns of behaviour or which can be detected as 'observable outcomes'*. However, and contra Hilpert, this does not mean that these processes would be unable to bring about change just because it seems that they are lacking a clearly definable empirical referent (for instance the evolving relationship between German guilt and German behaviour in German strategic culture) or that they would be inconsequential in terms of policy outcomes. What this means, however, is that we need to attempt to make these processes manifest in some empirical fashion. For example, a detailed description of the substance of the process itself (e.g. the evolving relationship between guilt and responsibility) with the help of an existing analytical category (e.g. categories of guilt) is a viable method at arriving at a point where these processes become more intelligible, and hence more 'observable'. However, it is crucial to note that the explanatory power of these processes does not reduce itself to the results of our observation efforts, because while these observations may be valuable, they do not exhaust the realm of where and when these processes might become empirically manifest.

The other issue I have with Hilpert's account is the fact that she criticizes the existing accounts of German strategic culture[179] for being too obsessive about 'high politics' and for stopping the discussion on the decision to send troops to other countries and argues for an approach that shifts the analytical focus to operative-strategic level because "(s)trategic culture influences not only whether forces will be sent, but also how these forces have to behave once they are in a foreign country."[180] While this criticism has its merits to a degree, it remains unclear how a conception of a political practice as an institutionalized pattern of behaviour remains somehow external to the realm of 'high politics'. Even if a particular process of change was triggered as bottom-up, i.e. as a 'grass-roots' process, it becomes an institutionalized practice in terms of strategic culture only when it becomes in contact with 'high politics', because in order to be institutionalized, it requires political legitimacy. Hence, norms matter more in terms of strategic culture than what Hilpert is willing to admit. Related to this is the fundamental question whether change understood in terms of strategic practices unfolding as institutionalized patterns of behaviour is sufficient for an explanatory account of strategic cultural change. As I have attempted to argue, an explanatory account of strategic cultural change needs to go beyond the notion of observable strategic prac-

---

[179] Hilpert specifically refers to the writings of Dalgaard-Nielsen, Duffield, Longhurst, Lantis and Berger, see ibid., p.9.

[180] Ibid., p. 10.

tice to grasp the essence of change. And even so, even with its flaws, Hilpert's account is a valuable analytical addition to the empirical study of strategic culture and strategic cultural change, in particular.

2.3. CONSTRUCTING AN ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK FOR THE STUDY OF STRATEGIC CULTURAL CHANGE

So far in this chapter, I have portrayed the few existing accounts which have addressed the issue of strategic cultural change in more detail. Taken as a whole, these accounts bring added value to the study of strategic cultural change because they all approach the aspect of change from different epistemological angles. Based on the above analysis of these accounts, a couple of key points stand out: 1) change often takes place as an incremental process, to be understood primarily as ideational and normative adaptation or fine-tuning of existing strategic practices, observable mainly but not only when it becomes institutionalized pattern of behaviour; 2) change can also be fundamental in case the existing ideational/normative structure is challenged by external shocks to the degree that it no longer provides clarity in terms of the issues of peace and war and the use of military force which also implies dysfunctionality in the link between strategic thinking and strategic behaviour; 3) external shocks related to the experience of warfare are the most important, 'first order' mechanisms of strategic cultural change because they are capable of triggering fundamental change that goes beyond the notion of change understood in terms of observable shifts in policy practices. These primary mechanisms are supplemented by other, 'second order' mechanisms such as generational change, peer persuasion or mediatized crisis-learning which are, from an explanatory perspective, secondary to the experience of warfare.

Empirically, if we talk about Bundeswehr out-of-area operations as 'single' case studies, the case of Afghanistan and German participation as part of the ISAF operation (2002-2014) is arguably the best-case scenario since here we have a longer time frame and hence more data to make arguments about how these operations are capable of changing strategic culture at the level of strategic practices. However, the question that is often left unanswered is that if fundamental or major change is such a rare occurrence, how do the changes and shifts at the level of strategic and policy practices, which arguably take place more frequently, affect the overall evolution of strategic culture? If the case of Afghanistan is used as an example, it might be too early to draw any far-reaching conclusions on the matter. However, as Zapfe has noted in an important recent article, German strategic culture plays a pivotal role in the current Bundeswehr reform that is supposed to be in full effect in 2017. This reform largely relies on the experiences gathered during the OEF/ISAF mission in Afghanistan. The key document in the reform is the so-

called 'Conception of the Bundeswehr' (*Konzeption der Bundeswehr or KdB*), published in 2013. As a central element, the KdB introduces the concept of *Bundeswehrgemeinsamkeit*, meaning a dimension of 'jointness' beyond the military sphere: the KdB, and its subordinate documents, shall bind uniformed and civilian pillars of the Ministry of Defence. As Zapfe states, "(o)n the operational side, the year 2016 may well see a historical first. The Ministry of Defence is well into a process of publishing a document that is internally titled 'Operational Guideline' (*Einsatzleitlinie*) and supposed to serve as the central document guiding German operational doctrine. It is supposed to serve as a capstone document on joint operations – on how to use the structure and equipment lined out in the KdB."[181]

Hilpert, who has studied the case of Afghanistan in depth, does not attempt an answer to this question. However, she makes an interesting observation that "discourse is not an absolute necessity for a change in practices. If the nature of the external challenge, coupled with internal factors – primarily agency – is large enough, there can be change regardless of the political-strategic rhetoric. In such cases, most agents of change do not come from the highest political levels; they need not even be politicians."[182] She particularly mentions German reluctance to adjust to the NATO COIN (Counterinsurgency) doctrine as well as the changes in German Rules of Engagement (RoE), which were forced upon Germany by external events and challenges and championed by agents other than the Federal government (rank and file of Bundeswehr in the case of the former and Bundestag MPs in the case of the latter).[183] However, while it is impossible to prove the opposite of Hilpert's above claim, it would seem plausible to assume counterfactually that had the German government decided to take a firm stance on the issue of COIN for instance, the discourse surrounding that stance would have made a difference in how Germany would have acted upon it. In other words, as the German government did not take a firm stance on the issue, it provided windows of opportunity for other actors to function as policy entrepreneurs in this regard. Moreover, both the adoption of the NATO COIN doctrine as well as the changes in the German RoE were initially made possible by specific forms of strategic thinking, even though these changes were not initiated by the German government.

Indeed, the answer to the question posed above regarding the way changes in policy practices affect the overall evolution of strategic culture rests mainly with how one defines strategic culture. If, on one hand, we take Hilpert's claims regarding the primacy of strategic practice as granted, then we need not think any further. This is because change in strategic practices – if it establishes an institutionalized pattern of behaviour – affects the way

---

[181] See Zapfe, Martin 2016, 'Strategic Culture Shaping Allied Integration: The Bundeswehr and the Joint Operational Doctrine', The Journal of Strategic Studies, Vol. 39, Issue 2, 2016, pp. 246-260.

[182] Hilpert 2014, p. 195.

[183] Ibid., pp. 193-194.

strategic culture is shaped. However, on the other hand, if we apply the definition of strategic culture I offered above, it could be argued that if changes in strategic practices fundamentally alter the fashion in which the ideational/normative structure is able to establish clarity in terms of potential outcomes to the questions and choices regarding the use of military force, these practices might significantly shape the way strategic culture unfolds. To give an example, it can be argued that the strategic practice of Bundeswehr out-of-area operations since the mid-1990s has had a considerable impact on how German strategic culture has evolved, not only because it represents an institutionalized pattern of behaviour but perhaps more importantly since it has provided new ways of addressing the issue of the use of military force – the core of any strategic culture.

Aside from the assessment of change in strategic culture studies, there exists a broad literature on *foreign policy* change in terms of so-called 'critical junctures'. These studies are informed by historical institutionalist perspective which posits that historical development is characterized by long periods of stability which are punctuated by 'critical junctures' during which more dramatic change becomes possible. For instance, Capoccia & Kelemen define critical junctures as "relatively short periods of time during which there is a substantially heightened probability that agents' choices will affect the outcome of interest."[184] This definition also suggests that actors' choices have more impact on the outcomes of policy during the critical juncture than after this period has come to an end. This is because their choices during the critical juncture are assumed to trigger a path-dependent process that constrains future choices.[185]

However, there is no a priori reason to assume that actors' choices would be necessarily freer during phases of change and more constrained during times of institutional equilibrium. What may appear as windows of opportunity for some actors may mean something entirely different for other actors. Hence the very opposite may very well be the case. Realists could argue for instance that militarily more powerful states possess more options than weaker ones regardless whether the institutional situation is characterized as equilibrium or as a 'critical juncture'. Indeed, what would count as a 'critical juncture' in terms of strategic culture is unclear; the notion of 'critical juncture' seems to rather point to a set of structural, contextual circumstances than to highlight specific factors for change.

Sociologist Ann Swidler, who already in the 1980s developed a theory of cultural influence on action in terms of practices, argued that culture has independent causal power because it shapes the capacities from which strategies of action are constructed. During 'settled periods' culture "independently influences action but only by providing resources from which people can con-

---

[184] Capoccia, Giovanni & Kelemen, Daniel R. 2007, 'The Study of Critical Junctures: Theory, Narrative, and Counterfactuals in Historical Institutionalism', World Politics, Vol. 59, No. 3 (Apr., 2007), p. 348
[185] Ibid.

struct diverse lines of action", while during 'unsettled periods', "explicit ideologies directly govern action, but structural opportunities for action determine which among competing ideologies survives in the long run."[186] The problem with these notions is not so much that they seem to equate structural uncertainty with increased possibility for change, but that the logic of historical evolution rests on circular trajectory, i.e. 'stability-critical juncture-stability' or 'settled-unsettled-settled'. Hence, the notions of 'stability-critical juncture' and 'settled-unsettled period' refer to a state in which a culture finds itself at any given point in time. This is defined either as a *de facto* period of continuity or a period of change, because structural uncertainty is taken to explain either a) the increased probability that actors' choices influence action by affecting the outcome of interest or b) the prominence of a certain ideology over another in terms of affecting the way how strategies of action are constructed on a general level (irrespective of given value assessments).

First, this is misleading in the sense that it not only overdetermines the structural vis-à-vis contingent factors in bringing about change[187] , but it also neglects the idea that there is more to strategic cultural change than to focus solely on observable outcomes in terms of practices (e.g. institutionalized patterns of behaviour). Second, the problem with a fixed understanding that cultural change is primarily driven by structural determinants risks the danger of tautological reasoning, since culture is often understood via the notion of 'social structure'. Without a clearly articulated framework that differentiates culture as a social structure from other structural factors it is difficult to avoid the impression of structural determinism, because unless one makes an ontological distinction between 'culture' and 'action', culture either explains everything or it explains nothing. This relates to the problems that were detectable in Gray's account regarding culture understood broadly as 'the context' but it also highlights the problem in the opposite argument in the second generation scholarship of strategic culture, namely, that culture exists as a resource that can be harnessed by cultural actors in an instrumental fashion.

In the following, based on the analysis of the existing accounts of strategic cultural change discussed above and the discussion of critical realist metatheory regarding causality from the beginning of Chapter 2, I present an analytical framework of strategic cultural change which understands change both in terms of processes and outcomes:

---

[186] Swidler, Ann 1986, 'Culture in Action: Symbols and Strategies', American Sosiological Review, Vol. 51, No.2 (Apr., 1986), pp.273-286.

[187] For more on contingency and change, see Chapter 5.4.

Table 2. Analytical Framework of Strategic Cultural Change

THE PROCESS OF STRATEGIC CULTURAL CHANGE

SOURCES OF CHANGE	MECHANISMS OF CHANGE	NATURE OF CHANGE
external shocks	primary	fundamental
threat images, security challenges, crises, conflicts, wars, systemic shifts	the experience of warfare	major changes in the ideational/normative structure of strategic culture and introduction of new strategic practices (institutionalized patterns of behaviour)
other external factors	secondary	fine-tuned
alliance patterns, level of technology, status of economy	peer pressure, persuasion, benchmarking, imitation, socialization	ideational/normative adaptation, shifts in the security policy preferences, changes in procurement practices
internal factors	secondary/tertiary	fine-tuned
level of ambition in security and defence policy, status of economy, the role of the executive vs. legislative powers in matters of security and defence, civil-military relations, specific traditions in strategic culture	generational change, mediatized crisis learning, public opinion	ideational/normative adaptation, introduction of symbolic practices

A few clarifications and specifications regarding the above analytical catego-rization are necessary. First and importantly, as an analytical framework, the above illustration of the process of strategic cultural change is not intended to be understood as corresponding to empirical reality as it is presented, but to simulate the likely constellations of sources, mechanisms and outcomes of

change on a general level. Subsequently, when conducting an empirical analysis or a case-study on strategic culture, we cannot hope to cover every aspect of this process in detail, because the different mechanisms of change operate on a multitude of epistemological levels. In this study, I will mainly focus on the mechanism of the experience of warfare specifically from the viewpoint of coming to terms with the German past.

Second, the difference between external and internal factors as sources of change cannot necessarily be so readily conceptually distinguished, because these factors sometimes overlap in the same fashion that external and internal factors constituting 'security' overlap (for example). However, I believe these distinctions are necessary in terms of analytical clarity. The sources of change can be regarded as either necessary or sufficient conditions for strategic cultural change to take place, i.e. for it to be 'actualized' in the fashion of the proposed categories.

Third, regarding the mechanisms of change, the order from primary to tertiary is meant as a general distinction because unanimous scholarly agreement exists that strategic cultures are prone to maintaining the status-quo and this is why internal factors alone are insufficient in explaining change.[188] This also highlights the traditional prevalence of the aspect of continuity in the study of strategic culture, and speaks volumes in favour of a 'status-quo' view of strategic culture. In other words, what this framework is not trying to argue is that socialization or mediatized crisis-learning (for example) can never lead to fundamental changes in strategic cultures, but rather that it is less likely than when initiated by external shocks filtered through different forms of experiences of warfare.

Fourth, as I argued when discussing Hilpert's account, observable outcomes e.g. institutionalized patterns of behaviour are not the only or necessarily a sufficient indication of change in strategic culture because strategic cultures operate on a socio-cognitive level which goes beyond the notion of observable policy practices.

Fifth, it needs to be stressed here that while this thesis has made no specific arguments or claims regarding the role of agency within strategic cultural change beyond the notion that it is hardly possible without some form of it, it goes without saying that almost all the mechanisms of strategic cultural change necessitate political agency in some way, shape or form. Perhaps the reason why I haven't touched upon the issue of agency in more detail lies in my principal criticism of the second generation scholarship, who argued for an instrumental understanding of strategic culture. I believe this to be a crude simplification of the subject matter of strategic culture, but it is also

---

[188] This is reflected in practically every piece of scholarly work on strategic culture that has elaborated on the question of change at some depth. See e.g. Lantis, Jeffrey 2002, 'The Moral Imperative of Force: The Evolution of German Strategic Culture in Kosovo', Comparative Strategy, 21:1, pp. 21-46.; Longhurst 2004; Meyer 2006; Wilke 2007; Hilpert 2014.

necessary to note that the role of political agency, and that of individual actors, may vary in the different phases of the process of change.

Indeed, while political agency in the form of political leadership may be critical in the phase when external shocks are filtered through (e.g. Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer's role in the debate concerning the 'never again' – framework in the 1990s, to be discussed in Chapter 3) or when it comes to the pace of the change in terms of strategic practices (e.g. German defence ministers' role in Bundeswehr reforms, to be discussed in Chapter 5)[189] it is also important not to overstate the role of political agency regarding the nature of change, not to mention that of individual actors, at least if we follow Gray in this respect (and while we do, we need not follow him all the way).

Finally, it needs to be noted in the spirit of reflective analysis that the above framework is limited in that the workings of the systemic/macro level (i.e. *inter*national or global relations) are more or less reduced to the function of the theory of strategic culture. However, as discussed in the next subchapter, system-level analysis includes several logics of interaction apart from wars or warfare. One way to highlight the potential diverse effects that the system level has on national strategic cultures is to contemplate on Wendt's account regarding the different logics of anarchy, because it can be argued that while rather generic in posture, these logics cover different and relevant types of interaction on the international/global level. This is where the thesis turns next.

2.4. WENDTIAN CULTURES OF ANARCHY AND THE STUDY OF STRATEGIC CULTURAL CHANGE

First of all, the notion that international relations and world politics are governed by anarchy (the absence of centralized authority) is one of the core assumptions and claims of rationalist theories (realism/liberalism) in the field of IR. What scholars like Wendt sought to accomplish by reintroducing a constructivist account of anarchy to systemic theorizing was not only the famous notion that 'anarchy is what states make of it' but rather that the specific distribution of ideas in the system can lead to different kinds of anarchies governed by different logics, or in Wendt's words, cultures of anarchy and that therefore, as Wendt argued, "we would do better to focus first on states' ideas and interests they constitute, and only then worry about who has how many guns".[190]

Theoretically, Wendt's approach differed from the top-down approach of realism (logic of international politics on system level is singular and does not depend to any degree of the units that constitute the system) and from the bottom-up approach of liberalism (logic of international politics depends

---

[189] See Dyson, Tom 2007, *The Politics of German Defence and Security*, Berghahn 2007.

[190] Wendt 1999, p. 256.

entirely on actors on the unit level) in that it embraced the idea that anarchic structures construct their elements but that these structures vary at the macro-level and may therefore possess multiple logics. The point Wendt was trying to get across was that in international politics, 'structure' should be understood first and foremost in its social dimension (even though Wendt by no means argued that all structures are social) because 'social' implies that actors take each other's behaviour into account in choosing their actions.[191] Before considering Wendt and cultures of anarchy, it needs to be pointed out that the purpose of this section is not to elaborate in detail on whether and to what degree these cultures of anarchy actually manifest themselves empirically in international politics, but rather what the different logics of anarchy imply in terms of strategic culture and its change. In the following, I will discuss Wendt's account of anarchy in a condensed form, because the purpose is not to discuss the merits and demerits of his whole theory but rather to pinpoint some interesting aspects of it by linking it to our discussion on strategic cultural change.

Wendt distinguishes between three logics that are characteristic of three 'cultures of anarchy'. These logics are epitomized in the specific 'role' structures that underpin each of these logics. Importantly, as Wendt points out, 'roles' should not be understood as properties or qualities of actors but rather of structures (roles can then be filled by different actors).[192] These logics are Hobbesian logic of enmity, Lockean logic of rivalry and Kantian logic of friendship, resulting in respective 'cultures of anarchy' the stability of which depends on the degree of internalization of the normative structure by the units (states) that operate within these cultures.[193] Wendt further argues that there are three degrees of internalization: coercion, self-interest and altruism, which basically translate into (de)stability arguments regarding the structure of the system because the level of internalization defines the 'acceptance' level of the shared norms and ideas within the system. These levels of internalization can also be seen as the minimal sustain-requirements for each of these cultures, respectively (coercion in Hobbesian, self-interest in Lockean and altruism in Kantian) because they form the primary logics of interaction within these cultures.

Hence, it seems that for the given logic of anarchy to function as intended by the role structure, there has to be a critical mass of units (states) willing to support this logic and hence fill the role of enemy, rival or friend depending on the prevailing logic (coercion, self-interest or altruism) at any given time, otherwise these systems may become unstable. Theoretically, a 'critical' mass of units in this regard might consist of just two units if they agree to the same

[191] Ibid., pp. 247-249.

[192] Ibid., p. 257.

[193] Ibid., pp. 266-268.

logic as is indicated by Wendt's discussion on 'Ego' and 'Alter'[194]. Moreover, this is also echoed in Wendt's example that if two states agree to the principles of a Kantian culture while the rest do not, the prevalent logic in the system won't change unless those two particular states are in a dominant position in the system and hence the others are likely to follow suit, which, in turn, would in principle suggest that the most powerful state in the system could ultimately make others internalize its culture. However, Wendt would argue that what counts as power would depend on the definitions of the situation.[195] Indeed, dominance as such need not be based on physical coercion or raw military force (or the threat of it).

Wendt further specifies four 'master variables' that can bring about structural change, i.e. change in the structure of anarchy, which for Wendt is a collective identity.[196] These are independence, homogeneity, common fate and self-restraint. For Wendt, actors are independent when the outcome of interaction between them depends on the choices that those actors make. Moreover, interdependence does not occur only in co-operative relations but also in hostile as well as more benevolent relations.[197] In turn, actors face a common fate when their own survival depends on that of the group but it differs from interdependence in that common fate does not necessarily imply any kind of interaction between actors because common fate is brought upon them by a third party.[198] Homogeneity refers to actors being alike in either their corporate identities (the degree to which actors are isomorphic in terms of their functions, institutional forms, causal powers etc.) and in their type identity (organization of political authority).[199]

According to Wendt, the first three are 'effective causes' whereas self-restraint is an 'enabling cause'. He posits that interdependence, homogeneity and common-fate by themselves are insufficient to explain structural change and that only when they occur under the condition of self-restraining units can they bring about change, even though the likelihood of change increases if there is more than one effective cause at work simultaneously. Self-restraint is a necessary enabling factor because it alone ensures that there is a sufficient degree of trust among actors which means that they trust each other to act similarly when they interact. In short, Wendt's hypothesis regarding

---

[194] In terms of identity formation, Wendt assumes two actors, 'Ego' and 'Alter', who meet in a First Encounter, a world without shared ideas, which by assumption bring with them to their Encounter preconceived ideas about who they are that assign tentative roles and form the starting point for their interaction. For more on 'Ego' and 'Alter', see ibid., p. 328.

[195] Ibid, p. 331.

[196] Wendt argues that collective identity formation follows 'cultural selection' instead of 'natural selection'. Cultural selection consists of imitation and social learning. For more on cultural selection, see ibid., pp. 324-336.

[197] Ibid., pp. 344-345.

[198] Ibid., pp. 349-350.

[199] Ibid., pp. 354-355.

structural change is that when interdependence, common fate or homogeneity is on the increase, change is more likely to happen (under the condition of self-restraint). However, Wendt does not discuss the reverted hypothesis of what is likely to occur when these factors are on the decrease, or when interdependence turns into dependence etc. Wendt does not give an answer to the question of cultural regress, because according to him, history has shown that cultures tend to progress due to increasing interaction between units in the system.

Indeed, if these factors are supposed to bring about a collective identity i.e. form a structure of anarchy, it would seem logical to assume that their continued absence would not necessarily ensure the status quo of any given system of anarchy but would invert the process (and bring about change all the same). Wendt argues that it is unlikely for "cultural time to move backward unless there is a big exogenous shock".[200] It is important to point out, however, that Wendt's hypothesis was based on the notion that while states formed a Lockean system in the seventeenth century based on sovereignty, states were undergoing another structural change from a Lockean culture to a Kantian culture of collective security in the late twentieth century.[201] Hence, Wendt's hypothesis regarding these variables needs to be understood in this context.

However, Wendt also then somewhat confusingly argues that there is nothing in his theory that would necessarily point to the inevitability of cultural progression: "there is no historical necessity, no guarantee, that the incentives for progressive change will overcome human weaknesses and the countervailing incentives to maintain the status quo."[202] Technically, this may be so but then again the point of Wendt's model is to argue in terms of collective identity formation which in itself cannot occur without some degree of 'cultural progression' since, and as Wendt posits, "(i)t is possible for a Hobbesian anarchy to have no culture at all".[203] However, this confusion is cleared to a degree if we think in empirical terms how difficult it is for a Kantian culture to sustain itself in the contemporary international politics on the system level.

Table 3 illustrates the differences that these logics of anarchy imply for the conduct of international relations in in a summarized format. In terms of Wendt's model, we can formulate a couple of hypotheses regarding the link between cultures of anarchy and the strategic cultures of the units. First, Wendt's model would seem to suggest that strategic cultures change 'with the system', i.e. the continuity of their cultural patterns (ideas, practices) would

---

[200] Ibid., p. 312.

[201] Ibid., p. 314. However, Wendt also argues that there is nothing in his theory that would necessarily point to the inevitability of cultural progression (except historical evidence, it seems) and that and that the possibility of structural change depends on the malleability of social facts, see ibid., pp. 314-15.

[202] Ibid., p. 311.

[203] Ibid., p. 266.

depend on the stability of the overall system (i.e. the degree to which the prevailing norms have been internalized by the units as a whole) and on the degree to which a state's strategic culture has internalized the prevailing logic of anarchy, i.e. the collective culture on the system level.

Second, however, Wendt's model also at least implicitly suggests that this would ultimately depend on the specific logics of anarchy because in Hobbesian anarchy, a state would have to adapt to the condition bellum omnium contra omnes or accept its own demise, whereas in the Lockean and Kantian systems it would be presented with a logic that would either require self-interested behaviour (with the possibility of periodic violence) or with a logic that would require the acceptance of total self-restraint.

Table 3. Three cultures of anarchy

Cultures of Anarchy	Relations between units	The use of violence	Level of norms internationalization
Hobbesian culture	logic of enmity hostile relations between mutually perceived enemies states deny each other the right of existence	violence, war and the use of force is the 'modus operandi' of the Hobbesian self-help culture	as enemies, units are ultimately coerced to this logic and if they are weak they cease to exist units have no self-control or self-restraint
Lockean culture	logic of rivalry competition between mutually perceived rivals states' right of existence is accepted because it is based on sovereignty	wars and violence are not the norm but they may occur periodically disputes between units may be settled by war instead of negotiation	as rivals, self-interested units act in an international society that adheres to the principle of sovereignty units balance between external constraints and self-restraint
Kantian Culture	logic of friendship benevolent relations between mutually perceived friends states' right of existence is accepted and two rules adhered to: rule of non-violence and rule of mutual aid	interstate wars and violence are prohibited in the international law the use of military force is an aberration of the norm of peaceful co-existence	as friends, units identify with each other – units form a collective identity that can be expressed in the distribution of cosmopolitan ideas on a global scale units have full self-control and accept external constraints as legitimate the Self in effect becomes the Other

Hence, it would seem that systemic, external pressure would ultimately decide the terms on which strategic cultures are able to evolve (or regress, for that matter) even in a Kantian system. Indeed, as Wendt points out, in a Kantian system norm-breakers are quickly brought into line (ultimately by coercion if need be) if their behaviour threatens the identity of the shared security community, given the principle of mutual-aid.[204]

Thirdly, we could also posit that change at the level of national strategic culture depends on the degree to which Wendt's master variables are at work in the strategic practices of the state, because if we follow Wendt's logic, that would imply the degree to which the state itself is willing to change and follow certain logic of interaction.

Hence, in terms of German strategic culture we could formulate the following hypotheses based on Wendt's model (under the assumptions regarding the nascent Kantian culture):

1) Change in German strategic culture is dependent on the changes of collective identity formation at the system level, which, in turn, is dependent on the degree of interdependence, common fate and homogeneity of Germany with other units in a system in which states have agreed on the principle of self-restraint.

2) Change in German strategic culture is ultimately conditioned by external constraints and pressure (i.e. the prevailing logic of anarchy).

Hence, on one hand, these hypotheses would seem to fit as basic conditions (or rather claims regarding the basic conditions) for the functionality of the analytical framework of strategic cultural change, which I presented in Chapter 2.3, but, on the other hand, they would ultimately suggest a different kind of logic of change that highlight the explanatory power of macro-level phenomena. My argument is that these hypotheses alone cannot explain change in German strategic culture because they take the internal dynamics of unit level cultures other than identity formation largely as given. Moreover, Wendt's model ultimately indicates that identities are essentially social and political entities that can be negotiated between states, which is a point of criticism that could be made. Taken as a whole, however, Wendt's model can serve as either a contrasting or a complementary argument to the claims made in Chapter 2.3, because Wendt's model seems ultimately compatible with the one I presented. Indeed, another way to treat the unit-system level interaction is to argue that they focus on different parts of the same causal process in explaining change. I will return to discuss these contrasts at the end of Chapters 3 and 4.

---

[204] Ibid., p. 299.

2.5. SUMMARY

In this chapter, I have discussed methodological issues and argued that strategic cultural studies need to shift the focus from epistemology to ontology in order to be able to incorporate better the aspect of change to the study of strategic culture. In effect, a focus on the ontological question 'what there is to know' serves as an encouragement for us to move beyond the 'observable realm' of strategic culture. Indeed, the main argument regarding strategic cultural change posited was the notion that, besides of grasping strategic cultural change in terms of both processes as well as outcomes, we need to go beyond the observable if we aim for an explanation of strategic cultural change that takes into account the socio-cognitive features of (strategic) cultures.

In terms of the proposed analytical framework, the primary mechanism of change can be identified as 'experience of warfare' which is the causal mechanism through which sources of change (external shocks, threat images, crises, conflicts and wars etc.) are filtered and which may result in fundamental changes in strategic cultures (major changes in the normative/ideational structure of strategic culture; introduction of new strategic practices which become institutionalized as patterns of behaviour).

In the case of German strategic culture, the process of 'coming to terms with the German past' is a crucial part of this mechanism, because it deals directly with how Germans have dealt with the question of peace, war and the use of military force in terms of the lessons drawn from the (Nazi) past i.e. the historical experience of warfare. However, since the end of the Cold War, as Germany has increasingly taken part in international crisis management, these out-of-area operations provide for new experiences of warfare which, in turn, are gathered, filtered and mirrored against the lessons drawn from the past. In this sense, the 'experience of warfare' is not a static mechanism but one that is in constant flux operating in the mix of the experiences drawn both from the past and the present.

While the main argument in this chapter is that the experience of warfare is key in unravelling what strategic cultural change in Germany is all about, there are contrasting (or complementary) arguments to be made. For instance, the Wendtian account of cultures of anarchy points to the order of interstate relations on the system level that go beyond the notion of 'experience of warfare' to the question of 'order' and hence refer to the multiple logics of interaction at play on the system level that may affect the functioning of strategic cultures.

In the next chapters, the thesis provides a detailed elaboration of the development of German strategic culture since the end of World War II in order to provide the relevant contextual and historical frame for the rest of this study. The narrative spans from the early Cold War years to the fall of the Berlin Wall and beyond the unification of the Federal Republic of Germany. It depicts the political trajectory of Germany's security since 1990,

covering primarily the Gulf War (Operation Desert Storm), the wars in Bosnia and Kosovo (UNPROFOR, IFOR/SFOR, Operation Allied Force), Afghanistan (Enduring Freedom/ISAF) and Iraq as well as some of the more recent cases; Lebanon (UNIFIL), Libya (Operation Unified Protector) and Ukraine. Although there are a number of other cases that can be considered relevant to the debate on German strategic culture after the end of the Cold War, such as Cambodia (UNTAC) and Somalia (UNOSOM II), or Congo (EUFOR RD Congo), the Balkan wars, together with Kosovo, Iraq and the long mission in Afghanistan form the backbone of the debate within Germany from 1990 to 2015 concerning the changes and continuities in German out-of-area military deployments and in the attitudes, beliefs and practices on the use of military force. These cases also address issues that cover the whole strategic cultural spectrum, including the image of peace and war, the use of military force, security threats as well as civil-military relations and alliance commitments. However, it is also important to address the more recent developments because they are indicative of further evolution in German strategic culture.

First, the narrative is presented in analytical form, i.e. it will systemically assess the post-Cold War German discourse on the mentioned cases in chronological order, utilizing the Bundestag debates as the primary empirical source. This is supplemented by drawing on the wider German and international discourse surrounding German out-of-area operations, such as media coverage, speeches, defence and security policy documents and secondary literature. The analysis aims to identify and interpret the key shifts in the German discourse regarding the use of military force since the end of the Cold War. Second, by applying the analytical framework developed in this chapter to these cases, the analysis aims to showcase how the primary mechanism of change in German strategic culture, i.e. 'experience of warfare', functions and shapes German strategic culture.

The analysis follows certain principles that are characteristic of discourse analytical methods in general. First, I take discourse to mean 'a system of signifying meaning'. Hence, the idea of the analysis is to ascertain how the meanings given to peace, war and the use of military force are constructed and how and why they change. This is crucial in uncovering the potential tensions between key strategic cultural tenets. Second, the analysis covers the aspect of discourse productivity, i.e. how discourse produces policy choices (e.g. military participation vs. non-participation). This relates to the discussion in this chapter regarding 'norms' as 'reasons for action'. Third, the study acknowledges that discourses are contingent and open-ended (they require effort in terms of discursive actors to reproduce them).[205]

---

[205] For a discussion on the principles of discourse analysis in IR, see e.g. Milliken, Jennifer 1999, 'The Study of Discourse in International Relations: A Critique of Research and Methods', European Journal of International Relations, Vol. 5, No. 2, 1999, pp. 225-254.

One small but important remark is in order regarding the content of the next chapters: while the issue of military deployments is often at the pinnacle of strategic culture for a good reason, it does not mean that strategic cultural continuity/change would manifest itself only via the issue of the (non) use of military force or that the (non) use of military force would pose the most appropriate way to study continuity/change in strategic cultures at all times. This will become especially evident when we turn to discuss the issue of coming to terms with the German past in Chapter 5, which covers a 'small cosmos' of issues, which deal not only with the question of the use of military force, but also the very foundations of strategic culture in socio-cognitive terms.

3 THE EVOLUTION OF GERMAN FOREIGN AND SECURITY POLICY AND STRATEGIC CULTURE FROM 1945 TO THE WAR IN KOSOVO

3.1. BEGINNINGS OF A NEW STRATEGIC CULTURE: FROM 'STUNDE NULL' TO REARMAMENT AND 'WESTBINDUNG'

The importance of the so-called Zero Hour (*Stunde Null*), which marked the immediate post-war period, culminating in the collapse of the Third Reich and Wehrmacht's unconditional surrender to the Allied troops in the ashes of Berlin in May 1945, is contested till this very day, especially the impact it has had on German society as a whole. In May 1985, German Federal President Richard von Weizsäcker gave a famous speech to commemorate the 40th anniversary of the end of World War II. He argued that it would be better to just talk about a 'fresh start' (*Neubeginn*) instead of Zero Hour since the German society didn't change overnight but incrementally through the long Cold War decades.[206] The same could be said about German strategic culture, even though the importance and consequence of Zero Hour is perhaps more evident in the realm of security and defence policy than when observed through a broader societal lens. The significance of Zero Hour as a set of historical occurrences lies precisely in its formative power in the sense of simultaneously accounting for the end of an ideational structure upon which the hitherto strategic thinking and practice of Nazi Germany had been based and a beginning of a new one, that had no other alternative than to be based on the abolition of the old.

In that sense, Zero Hour indeed provides us with a beginning of strategic cultural change because it represents the beginning of the process of total renouncement of the principles, ideas and values that led to the most destructive five-year period in human history. The eschewal of the old ideational structure meant also that new strategic narratives had to be conjured which would not stand in conflict with Germany's new status in Europe. Kerry Longhurst has argued that the so-called foundational elements of German strategic culture (beliefs, ideas on the use of military force) were forged in the period 1945-1955. These meant effectively a denunciation of Clausewitzian principles – the use of war as a tool in foreign policy, redundancy of milita-

---

206 Speech by Federal President Richard von Weizsäcker at the German Bundestag to commemorate the 40th anniversary of the end of World War II, 8.5.1985. Available at: (http://webarchiv.bundestag.d e/archive/2006/0202/parlament/geschichte/parlhist/dokumente/doko8.html).

rism and statism and exhaustion of nationalism.[207] Moreover, the system of ideological indoctrination that had led to the glorification of war for tens of millions of Germans was finally at an end (only to be replaced by a totalitarian system in the German Democratic Republic). The contours of new German strategic thinking and practice were beginning to take shape with the formation of the new Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) in 1949, and its membership in the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) in 1951 and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in 1955. Germany was forced to abandon its Prussian militarist traditions and come to terms with Hitler's *Vernichtungskrieg* (war of annihilation), Holocaust and the innumerable atrocities committed by the Nazi regime (and later also, those of the Wehrmacht).[208]

Indeed, by linking the evolution of German strategic culture to European and transatlantic structures, the first German post-World War II governments made sure that the nascent German strategic culture was devoid of any form of the old German militarism (even though many former Wehrmacht officers were re-instated in the Bundeswehr and in the Peoples' Army in the GDR). The West German strategic culture was forged to correspond to the external realities of the Cold War and the internal requirements of making amends and taking responsibility for German actions in the past, especially for the destructive period of the Third Reich, even though the idea of ordinary Germans as the 'perpetrator people' (*Tätervolk*) came to be accepted more broadly only since the 1970s in West-German society.[209]

During the formative years of the FRG, two competing lessons of history came to dominate the debate on German security policy, lessons which still today significantly shape and constitute the substance of German strategic culture. According to Anja Dalgaard-Nielsen, these two schools of German security policy were formed around two differing lessons from World War II and German defeat: 'Nie wieder Allein' (never again alone) and 'Nie wieder Krieg' (never again war). She has argued that these two schools differed in "their core beliefs about Germany's role in international security, fundamental aversions and threat perceptions and in their operational beliefs about the

---

[207] Longhurst, Kerry 2004, *Germany and the use of force*, Manchester University Press, 2004, p. 46.

[208] This process, often generally referred to as 'Vergangenheitsbewältigung', coming to terms with the past, will be dealt with in detail in Chapter 5, since, as will be argued, it is the central cognitive process underlying continuities and changes and (re)interpretations of German strategic culture. However, the term might be misleading in the sense that the German word 'bewältigen' also means 'to overcome' and this clearly was not the original intent. In his commemoration speech, von Weizsäcker also argued that there is no such thing as 'overcoming the past' – the only thing what one can do as a German is to "look the past in the eye as best and as honestly as one only can". See footnote 206.

[209] For more on German 'guilt', see Chapter 4 and Niven, Bill 2006, *Germans as Victims. Remembering the Past in Contemporary Germany*, Palgrave Macmillan 2006.

efficiency of various instruments of security policy".[210] Significantly, it can be argued that the lessons of never again in themselves epitomized a radical shift away from Prussian militarism and the ethos of soldiery – a shift that had its origins in the formative years 1945-55 within the post-World War II German strategic culture.

The lesson of never again alone became the dominant one among the majority of the German population and the political centre-right, the CDU/CSU, the FDP, the Catholic Church and the German industry after the war. Never again alone meant that Germany should never again embark on a *Sonderweg* (special path), which was used here in a negative sense meaning German isolation from the rest of Europe.[211] This lesson found its early expression in the policies of *Westbindung* (Western orientation) of the first German post-war Chancellor Konrad Adenauer. Westbindung signified everything that Sonderweg did not, meaning the return to the family of Western nations and transatlantic political, economic and military integration and co-operation. In the emerging Cold-War context and the bipolar world order the relevance of 'never again alone' was in the idea that one had to be ready to defend Western (and Germany's) values and interests against the totalitarianism (and communism) of the USSR, a thing that was neglected both by the Germans themselves and the rest of the international community when Hitler rose to power during the run-up to World War II in the 1930s.

In contrast, the lesson of never again war, popular among the German political Left, the centre-left wing of the SPD, the Greens (in the Bundestag since 1983), the Lutheran clergy, trade unions and youth organizations, iden-tified the threat from coming 'within', meaning that the lesson to be drawn from World War II was that war should never again emanate from German soil. Hence, Germany should concentrate on furthering civilian means and ends in international politics and show self-restraint in all things military. Yet it would be wrong to argue that these lessons had everything to do with the past and (the then) present but nothing with the future or that the lessons provided ends in themselves *only*. This was clear in Adenauer's policies towards the West (never again alone) which culminated just as much in the effort to atone for German sins as in the effort to provide Germany with the means for regaining a sense of equality and political leverage in the future. In that sense, as Granieri has stated, German Westbindung was never about giving up national policies *per se*.[212]

---

[210] Dalgaard-Nielsen, Anja 2006, *Germany, Pacifism and Peace-Enforcement*, Manchester University Press 2006, p. 37.

[211] There is also a positive conceptualization of German 'Sonderweg'. It highlights the Germans as 'Volk der Dichhter und Denker' (people of poets and thinkers)and stresses the German special way and criticism towards European Enlightenment. I will discuss 'Sonderweg' in detail in Chapter 5.

[212] Granieri, Ronald J. 2003, *The Ambivalent Alliance. Konrad Adenauer, the CDU/CSU, and the West, 1949-1966*, Berghahn 2003, p.230.

Dyson, who has studied German strategic culture from the perspective of the Bundeswehr reform, has argued that during the Cold War, the German defence and security policy subsystem came to possess a basic structure formed around three advocacy coalitions: 'freedom', 'peace' and 'pacifist' coalition.[213] This definition highlights the role of actors more than structure, yet the freedom and peace coalitions are basically equivalent with 'never again alone' and 'never again war'. The difference in Dyson's account is that he refines the lesson of 'never again war' into two sub-advocacy coalitions, peace and pacifist. According to Dyson, the pacifist coalition comprised those who opposed the doctrine of territorial defence and conscription and shared a deep fundamental opposition to war. It was to be found on the fringes of German society and it was popular in German university towns and the radical right wing of the Green Party. However, until the Greens entered the parliament in 1983, the movement was an 'outsider' rather than an 'insider' coalition and its influence was rather felt in German civil society and mass peace demonstrations.[214]

The outbreak of the war in the Korean peninsula in 1950 had raised the stakes in the emerging nuclear race. This prompted the US to bolster the European defence capacity because fears regarding a possible Soviet aggression in Western Europe were growing. The de facto threat posed by the USSR meant that only a few years after the fall of the Third Reich, German armed forces would once again be established. It also meant that old enemies had to become partners and that France and the UK had to accept German rearmament. Increasingly, as Large has argued, a German contribution to the defence of Europe was seen not only as a military necessity but also as part of burden sharing and as a means of dismounting the security load of other Western countries. Additionally, burden sharing would be seen as a way of removing the advantages German economy could yield by enjoying its free-ride in the field of security.[215]

The rearmament of the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) was a heated issue especially in the first half of the 1950s, despite the Berlin blockade in 1948-9, Soviet atomic tests and the war in Korea, all of which raised the prospect of a re-establishment of the German armed forces as a response to the military threat posed by the USSR and the subsequent fact that a German military contribution was slowly perceived to be indispensable for the defence of Europe. Chancellor Adenauer had to overcome domestic opposition and win over public opinion in Germany, which did not support an extended German military role. Adenauer's concept of *Westbindung* initially had to compete with that of Jakob Kaiser's 'bridge concept' and that of Kurt Schu-

---

[213] Dyson, Tom 2007, *The Politics of German Defence and Security*, Berghahn 2007, p. 29.

[214] Ibid., p. 31.

[215] Large, David Clay 1996, *Germans to the Front: West-German rearmament in the Adenauer era*, Chapel Hill: University of California Press 1996, p. 39.

macher's 'democratic socialism'.[216] The CDU/CSU won a landslide victory in the 1953 elections and Adenauer was successful in turning the domestic opposition to German rearmament into a victory in the negotiations with the Western powers as he convinced the Western leaders that German rearmament was domestically implementable only in case the West accepted German sovereignty in return.[217]

After the plans for the European Defence Community (EDC) had failed because the French ultimately rejected the idea, the British and the Americans took the initiative and suggested that Germany should be incorporated into NATO structures as soon as possible. As the Germans agreed to join the newly founded Western European Union (WEU) and got reassurances that France would not stand in the way of German membership of NATO, a win-win situation emerged: French fears towards a new German 'Sonderweg' were alleviated and vital German interests secured.[218] Germany joined both the WEU and NATO in 1955 and this marked the formation of a new German army, the Bundeswehr, which was initially a force of 500,000 men based on general conscription. An important aspect of the German rearmament for the Western powers at the time was also that the new German army would not have a command structure of its own but was strictly tied to that of NATO and WEU. In addition, Germany accepted a number of other military restrictions, including the offensive use of German military outside of the confines of NATO and the use of force for the purpose of German unification. Germany also renounced the production of ABC-weaponry on its soil.[219]

The rearmament of the FRG based on general conscription also meant that the civic-military relations had to be reorganized. The core of the reformulation of these relations was the concept of *Innere Führung* (inner conduct) which coincided with a reformulation of the responsibility of a German soldier as a *Bürger in Uniform* (citizen in uniform). According to Longhurst,

---

[216] Kaiser's (CDU) concept foresaw a united, block free Germany that could function as an ideological and political bridge between the east and west and lead to the end of the Cold War. Schumacher's (SPD) concept, in turn, envisaged a socialist Germany within a socialist Europe, which would clearly differentiate itself from Soviet-driven communism. Schumacher's idea entailed a vision of Germany as a military, democratic state which could function as a buffer between the two superpowers. The Soviet military authorities removed Kaiser from office as early as 1947 and the SPD lost the Bundestag elections to the CDU/CSU in 1953. As a consequence, the road for a successful advocacy of Adenauer's Westbindung was made possible domestically. For more on Kaiser and Schumacher, see Haftendorn (2006).

[217] Zangl, Martin 1995 'Ansatz der Zwei-Ebenen Spiele. Eine Brücke zwischen dem Neoinstitutionalismus und seinen KritikerInnen?', Zeitschrift für Internationale Beziehungen 2/1995, p.398.

[218] Gavin, Victor 2009, 'Power through Europe? The case of the European Defence Community in France (1950-1954)', French History, Vol. 23, Issue 1, pp. 86-87.

[219] Kocs Stephen A. 1995, *Autonomy or Power? The Franco-German Relationship and Europe's Strategic Choices, 1955-1995*, Greenwood Publishing Group 1995, p.17.

"(t)he Bürger in Uniform was the ideal and the reality which Innere Führung was to create [...] the Bürger in Uniform was to be a fully-fledged member of society imbued with full rights of political participation and responsibility – to be circumscribed only by law and only for the duration of military service, the aim here in the basic architecture of the Bundeswehr being to dispose of the ideological caste of the military and to initiate the flourishing of a wide array of political and social ideas."[220] This development was significant as it testified to the fact that Germany made structural changes to the code of conduct of the Bundeswehr which were not meant to be provisional but were to be permanent changes that highlighted especially the role of the individual soldier and his responsibility towards the German people. Also, the idea of a citizen in uniform was the central idea behind the understanding of the locus of the Bundeswehr, which should find itself amidst and not outside of German society. However, as Large has argued, this new German concept was in contrast to the initial thoughts of the other Western powers regarding the incentive of German rearmament given that the view on German soldiers as the best possible conventional bulwark against the Soviet threat based on the track record of an 'unbeatable Wehrmacht' in World War II was widely shared and acknowledged.[221]

During the 1950s NATO's strategy relied on 'Nuclear Sword' and 'Conventional Shield', because an effective nuclear strike was seen as the only possible way to deter any Soviet aggression in Western Europe as it was deemed that Soviet Union had superior numbers in conventional armaments.[222] Yet towards the end of the decade, it was clear that the Soviet Union had reached nuclear parity with the US, if not superiority. This prompted the US to seek an arrangement with the Soviet Union based on status quo in Europe towards the end of the decade. European NATO countries became worried about the ability of the US to protect them from a Soviet nuclear strike as a result of a shift in the American policy towards a 'relaxation' in Europe. The then German defence minister Hans-Josef Strauss (1954-62) later argued that the best way to deal with the situation was to give Europeans more power in deciding about nuclear policies in Europe. Strauss argued that "(t)he West will not be in a position to fulfil the tasks it has set itself – victory over physical and spiritual misery in the world – until there is an Atlantic community standing securely on two legs."[223] In effect, this meant a supranational European body responsible for strategic command over nuclear weapons based on a federal political union in Europe – a concept within which Ger-

---

[220] Longhurst 2004, p. 42.

[221] Large 1996, p. 57.

[222] North-Atlantic Military Committee Decision on M.C. 48. A Report by the Military Committee on The Most Effective Pattern of Nato Military Strength for The Next Ten Years. NATO Strategy documents 1949-1969. Available at: (http://www.nato.int/docu/stratdoc/eng/a541122a.pdf).

[223] Strauss, Franz-Josef 1965, 'An Alliance of Continents', International Affairs, vol.41, no.2 (Apr. 1965), pp. 201-202.

many would not have any national control over nuclear weapons corresponding to Germany's agreement in the context of its WEU and NATO-membership. As Suri has argued, American Foreign Secretary Henry Kissinger basically agreed with this position since he often criticized American mismanagement of its European allies, but it was Kissinger who then implemented President Nixon's policy of détente that was based largely on direct negotiations with the Russians and "oversaw this period of extended European separation from substantive US strategic consultation".[224]

The issue of nuclear weapons was very difficult for Germany. Firstly, Germany did not want them to be deployed on German soil since there were fears in both German states that superpowers would play out their nuclear game using Germany as a proxy playground. Secondly, having a finger on the nuclear trigger would have effectively meant giving up on achieving German unification through political means. Yet the Federal Republic did not want to lose the possibility of the threat that the nuclear weapons provided in case the West would sacrifice the prospect for German unification in negotiations with the Soviets. However, as Nehring has stated, nuclear tests evoked mass protests in Germany against nuclear weapons in mid-to-late 1950s, orchestrated by the SPD and trade unions under the slogan 'Fight the Atomic Death' (*Kampagne Kampf dem Atomtod*) which was at first targeted at Adenauer's attempts to acquire nuclear-capable equipment for the German army. At the beginning of the 1960s, the focus of these protests shifted from nuclear disarmament to disarmament in general, which emerged as a vocal critique towards the Vietnam War in the UK and culminated in the Easter-Marches in the form of extra-parliamentary activity in Germany from mid-to-late 1960s.[225]

3.2. THE LEGACY OF WESTBINDUNG: FROM OSTPOLITIK TO THE CONFERENCE ON SECURITY AND CO-OPERATION IN EUROPE (CSCE)

In terms of German reunification, the policy of Westbindung did not bear the fruit Adenauer had hoped for. The establishment of the Warsaw Pact in 1955 cemented the division of Germany. This led West Germany to adopt the 'Hallstein doctrine', named after state secretary Walter Hallstein, according to which West Germany had the sole right to represent the German people and the German nation internationally. In practice, this meant that West Germany did not have diplomatic relations with any country that recognized

---

[224] Suri, Jeremi 2006, *Transforming NATO in the Cold War: Challenges Beyond Deterrence in the 1960s*, CSS Studies in International Relations 2006, p. 17.

[225] Nehring, Holger 2005, 'National Internationalists: British and West German Protests against Nuclear Weapons, the Politics of Transnational Communications and the Social History of the Cold War, 1957–1964', Contemporary European History, vol. 14, Issue 04, November 2005, pp. 564-565; p.581.

the GDR as a sovereign state (except for the Soviet Union). The Hallstein doctrine could be considered the first strategic unilateral foreign and security policy act of the Federal Republic and it remained the official West German foreign policy doctrine for a decade, until détente and Willy Brandt's Ostpolitik in the late 1960s. Yet during the Berlin crisis in 1958-61, the erection of the Berlin Wall in 1961 and the Cuban missile crisis in 1962 showed that Adenauer's Policy of Strength had been exhausted and offered little in terms of a solution to the German question, even though it had secured West German independence and security.

Adenauer's long era ended in the Bundestag elections in 1963 but leadership of the country remained in the hands of the Christian Democrats as Ludwig Erhard, the minister of economics in Adenauer's government, was elected Chancellor. In terms of German Westbindung, a political debate ensued in Germany between the so-called 'Atlanticists' and 'Gaullists' about the focus of German western orientation after the ratification of the Elýsee Treaty between France and Germany in 1963 – should Germany intensify its relations with France and Europe or should the transatlantic link be strengthened? Chancellor Erhard stressed NATO's significance for German strategic interests and went as far as to renounce Adenauer's Friendship Treaty with France because it wasn't supported by other NATO members.[226] Even though Erhard was successful in consolidating and strengthening the German economy, in terms of foreign and security policy, Erhard's term was encumbered with the differences between the French and German stances towards NATO culminating in the French withdrawal from NATO's military structures, the French policy of 'empty chair' and the Luxembourg compromise in 1966. Importantly, this has remained one of the most difficult aspects of the lesson 'never again alone' because the German balancing act between Paris and Washington has never been a matter of simple policy choice between Europe and the US. In addition to discrepancies within the Alliance, American interests seemed to be directed elsewhere than Germany and Europe starting with the Cuban missile crisis in 1962 and the beginning of the war in Vietnam in 1963. Even though it was clear that the Americans were the only ones able to provide for German security if push came to shove, the atmosphere in the European NATO countries in the beginning of 1960s was one of suspicion towards the US policies, which was only exacerbated by the war in Vietnam.

In the mid-1960s, the government of Kurt Georg Kiesinger (CDU) made the first tangible diplomatic steps towards the east in an attempt to intensify the relations with the Warsaw Pact members on all 'economic, cultural and political levels'.[227] The results remained modest at first. Eventually, the late 1960s and early-mid 1970s marked a change in Germany's international pos-

---

[226] Suri 2006, p. 20.

[227] Bange, Oliver 2005, 'Kiesingers Ost- und Deutschlandpolitik von 1966 bis 1969', Buchstab, Günter, Gassert, Philipp & Lang, Peter T. (ed.), *Kurt Georg Kiesinger 1904-1988 – Von Ebingen bis Kanzleramt*, Freiburg 2005, p. 457.

ture in the sense that time was ripe for a policy of rapprochement towards the Eastern neighbours, particularly the GDR, Poland and Czechoslovakia as the Cold War in Europe entered into a period of détente. This period was marked by Chancellor Willy Brandt's Ostpolitik which cultivated a fundamentally different approach to Adenauer's Policy of Strength, since it sought to sustain peace not by rearmament or economic or diplomatic embargos but was based on the concept of *Annäherung* (rapprochement) with the Eastern neighbours.[228] In essence, Brandt's Ostpolitik did not try to contest the political and territorial status quo of the Cold War but rather based its foundations on this settlement. This was an important strategic difference to the policy of Adenauer. The early 1970s unfolded in active German diplomacy towards the Eastern European states and the USSR and resulted in the signing of the so-called *Ostverträge* (German Eastern Treaties).[229] The Brandt government sought an understanding with Moscow on the renunciation of the use of force in Europe and linked it with a settlement over the Berlin question. Intense diplomatic negotiations during 1970-71 led to an agreement concerning Berlin and hence to the Treaty of Moscow (1972) between Germany and the Soviet Union, within which Germany and the Soviet Union agreed to the existing borders east of the Oder-Neisse river line and agreed to the principle of renunciation of the use of force in Europe.[230] Likewise, the conclusion of the Basic Treaty (*Grundlagenvertrag*) in 1972 (within which the existence of the two German states as representatives of the German people was acknowledged based on the status quo in Europe) established diplomatic relations between the FRG and the GDR and ended the policy of the Hallstein Doctrine. In terms of German strategic culture, this resonated well with the lesson 'never again war' since Germans had firmly come to believe that the unity of Germany, let alone Europe, could not be achieved by the use of military force or the accumulation of nuclear arsenal but rather by policy of political and societal rapprochement.

Ostpolitik paved the way to the CSCE in 1975 in Helsinki which was a culmination point in the era of détente during the Cold War years. Strategically, Brandt's Ostpolitik was as important for entailing the integrity and identity of a one German nation between two German states as was Adenauer's Westbindung for reassuring the international community in general and

---

[228] Kleuters, Joost 2009, 'Between Continuity and Change: Ostpolitik and the Constructivist Approach Revisited', German Politics, vol. 18, issue 4, 2009, pp.522-524.

[229] German Eastern Treaties were a series of diplomatic treaties signed between West Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia and the USSR in 1970-1973, stressing the renunciation of the use of force in Europe as well as accepting the Cold War status quo as a baseline for state borders. The Basic Treaty between the two Germanies and the Treaty of Berlin signed by the quadripartite powers fall into this category as well.

[230] For an illustrative description of the 1970-1 negotiations between West-Germany and the USSR, see Merkl, Peter H. 1974, 'The German Janus: From Westpolitik to Ostpolitik', Political Science Quarterly, vol. 89, no. 4 (Winter, 1974-1975), pp. 803-824.

Germany's closest partners in particular, that West Germany was a reliable partner and committed to the liberal democratic development of its society according to Western standards. In a way, the successful German Westbindung was a necessary prerequisite for a successful rapprochement to the East. The policies differed in method but were united in the overarching objective of German unity. Hence, at the time, both of the lessons of German history, taken together, offered a viable way for pursuing foreign and security policy because 'never again war' was preconditioned on the premise of 'never again alone', meaning that for Germany peace in Europe could only be achieved by the policy of co-operation and multilateral institutional arrangements.

3.3. TOWARDS THE END OF THE COLD WAR: NATO REARMAMENT AND GENSCHERISM

Even though the new Ostpolitik and the CSCE had established a political modus vivendi with the Warsaw Pact states, the strategically important question of nuclear weapons and disarmament were not part of the CSCE agenda. As Readman has argued, the CSCE had little effect on hard security in Europe because the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) excluded non-strategic nuclear weapons and the Mutual and Balanced Force Reduction talks (MBFR) did not concern nuclear weapons at all and were making hardly any progress.[231] After the CSCE, the Soviet Union began replacing its old nuclear weapons systems with new SS-20 mid-range nuclear missiles. The purpose of these missiles was to pose a direct threat to European NATO members by enabling a massive first strike capability, which would make the US nuclear shield obsolete. This threat was considered a severe blow to the politics of détente but also for the security of Western Europe. German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt (SPD) was the first European leader to raise concerns about the Soviet rearmament and argued for the importance of NATO rearmament in the area of mid-range nuclear missiles. This was a necessary evil in order to save the détente.[232] Schmidt was very vocal in his criticism towards Russian deployment plans and made several unsuccessful diplomatic attempts to deter Russians from further nuclear deployments in Europe. After the US had decided to deploy the neutron bomb in 1978, the negotiations over a NATO response quickly followed. The NATO members agreed at Guadeloupe in 1979 that they would adopt a double-track strategy: firstly, they would demand that the Russians withdraw from the SS-20 deployment

---

[231] Readman, Kristina S. 2011, 'Conflict and Cooperation in Intra-Alliance Nuclear Politics: Western Europe, the United States, and the Genesis of NATO's Dual-Track Decision, 1977–1979', Journal of Cold War Studies, vol. 13, no.2, Spring 2011, p. 45.

[232] Unterseher, Lutz 2015, *Das Dilemma militärischer Sicherheit. Kritische Berichte aus den Jahrzehnten*, Springer VS 2015, pp. 33-34.

and in case the Soviet Union would not budge, NATO would proceed with its own counter nuclear deployment. As Wettig has observed, even though the German government agreed to Jimmy Carter's plan at Guadeloupe, it did it unwillingly, as Russian refusal to withdraw the missiles would have meant nuclear deployment on German soil, a thing which was politically sensitive and very unpopular in Germany, especially for the governing parties.[233]

The Soviet Union condemned the 'double-track' decision and warned the West against a new rearmament race. Russian Foreign Minister Gromyko had advised Schmidt during his visit in Bonn in late 1979 to review the link between Germany's support to the double-track decision and the German pledge to the maxim that never again should war emanate from German soil. At the concluding press conference, Gromyko warned that the double-track decision would spiral a new arms race in and beyond Europe.[234] The Soviets were particularly concerned about Germany's Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher's activism around the double-track decision. Russian newspaper *Pravda* wrote before Gromyko's visit to Bonn that Genscher was 'actively spreading anti-Soviet lies' and was functioning as 'advocate of the Pentagon'.[235]

The 1980s marked an intensification of the Cold War tensions as conflicts broke out in Africa, Middle-East and Afghanistan. In Germany, the acceptance of the NATO-dual track decision in 1983 to deploy Pershing mid-range nuclear missiles to West Germany to respond to Soviet rearmament created both fear of Germany becoming a nuclear battlefield and skepticism towards US policies. This also reflected Schmidt's personal attitude towards 'strategy' – in an interview with *the Economist* in late 1979 the Chancellor had argued that "it's wrong to use the word 'strategic' only in the context of intercontinental nuclear weaponry. It's a wrong perception of strategy. I use the word 'strategy' in the sense of the late Captain Liddel Hart's grand strategy which embraces not only all the military fields but of course also the political, the psychological, the economic fields."[236] These fears in West Germany were also shared by the GDR because of Soviet belligerence and the first war in Afghanistan. The dual-track decision was supported strongly by Chancellor Helmut Schmidt – support which ultimately led SPD to lose power over the chancellorship in the 1982 elections characterized by mass peace protests and fears of nuclear war. Over 350 000 Germans took part in peace demonstrations during US President Reagan's visit to Bonn in June 1982. Schmidt's coalition fell apart in September 1982 and in the 1983 elections a new government was formed under Helmut Kohl. Kohl was a strong supporter of the

---

[233] Wettig, Gerhard 2009, 'The last Soviet offensive in the Cold War: emergence and development of the campaign against NATO euromissiles, 1979–1983', Cold War History, vol. 9, Issue 1, 2009, p. 220-221.

[234] Press-konferentsiia A.A. Gromyko v Bonne, 23 November 1979, Izvestiia, 25 November 1979.

[235] ‚Abrüstung: Fronten in Bewegung‘, Der Spiegel, 12.11.1979, Nr.46/1979.

[236] Interview with Chancellor Schmidt, *the Economist,* 6.10.1979.

dual-track decision and after months of Bundestag debates the decision was approved by the German Bundestag in November 1983.

The period from 1974 to 1992 in German foreign and security policy is often referred to as an era of 'Genscherism', a term associated with the record long-time West German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher (FDP) whose political career had started during the Brandt government in the mid-1960s as the minister for the interior from 1969. Genscher was in office for almost 18 years and served in the Brandt, Schmidt and Kohl governments as foreign minister. Emil Kirchner has termed 'Genscherism' as follows: "a) elimination of hostility from international relations; b) demilitarizing and de-ideologizing East-West Relations and c) development of new peace structures."[237] It could be argued that these three ideas epitomized the ideational core behind German strategic behaviour, which had been launched by Brandt's new Ostpolitik; a policy which for its part made these later commitments possible. In the international press at the time, the term 'Genscherism' was often used as an equivalent to an overtly uncritical stance towards the success of Gorbatschov's perestroika and glasnost and the misplaced belief that the changes in the USSR were substantial and long-lasting. Also, Genscher's persisting idea of Germany functioning as a bridge between the East and West was not welcome across the Atlantic at the time when the US expected Germany to be a reliable ally.[238] Genscher was also often accused of being the 'dove' in times of great superpower tensions, most notably because of his insistence on the discussions over short range nuclear missiles with the Warsaw Pact in 1989 but he also received a lot of credit after the end of the Cold War for his efforts towards European integration and German reunification.[239] Genscher, like Chancellor Kohl, was a strong supporter of European integration and the détente with the Eastern Europe and the USSR. His views were strongly influenced by the positive results of the CSCE in Helsinki 1975 where he made his international debut as the German foreign minister.

'Genscherism' was very popular among the German populace since it directly referred to German sentiments and skepticism about the continuing nuclear race between the superpowers and Germany becoming a pawn in the struggle between the rivalling ideologies and political systems, an issue which clearly posed one of the biggest threats to German security throughout the Cold War. Essentially, even though both Kohl and Genscher supported the NATO dual-track decision, the German leaders' stance differed from that of their NATO-partners in two crucial respects: the German question and the

---

[237] Kirchner, Emil J. 1990, 'Genscher and what lies behind Genscherism', West European Politics, vol. 13, issue 2, 1990, p. 164.

[238] 'The Triumphs and harrumphs of Genscherism', The Economist, 16.1.1988; 'Genscher at the Eye of Policy Debate', New York Times, 22.3.1991.

[239] Von Weizsäcker, Richard 2015, 'Praktizierte Verantwortungspolitik', Brauckhoff-Schwaetzer (ed.), *Hans-Dietrich Genschers Aussenpolitik*, Springer VS 2015, pp. 37-38.

de-nuclearization policies. Genscher himself talked about the 'policy of responsibility' (*Verantwortungspolitik*) instead of power politics. The policy of responsibility was an aversion of traditional power politics (*Machtpolitik*) and consisted of military restraint, human rights advocacy and multilateral co-operation[240] and could hence be interpreted as an incarnation of both of the post-war lessons, 'never again war' and 'never again alone'. Even though both German leaders acknowledged that the reduced threat from the Soviet Union due to its leadership change by no means equated with a relaxation of conventional defence policies, they also insisted that the deployment of nuclear weapons in Germany further served to cement the division of Europe, and therefore also the division of the two German states.[241]

In summary, especially the early Cold War years marked a formative period for the emerging strategic culture for West Germany. This formative period meant, first and foremost, forming a sense of 'Self' within the international community which in a first step meant a strong institutionalization, denazification, demilitarization and Westernization of German society and politics. As Kelly Longhurst has illustrated at length in her studies, domestically the reformation of civic-military relations on the basis of *Innere Führung* and *Bürger in Uniform* was inevitable in order to re-establish and justify the reformation of a new German armed force.[242]

Second, the Cold War years were an enormously difficult period for Germans in the sense that there existed two German states under one German nation – the GDR never managed to consolidate a sense of another German nation, but explicitly referred to the common German cultural tradition. As Schoch has observed, "(t)he [Socialist Unity Party of Germany] SED repeated its vindication of German militarism and Nazism on the soil of the GDR like a mantra. With a good conscience, the SED spread this message throughout the whole country beyond the confines of the party itself and could, therefore, blatantly refer to a national tradition" and that "(t)he SED employed a national terminology in its discussions on peace and détente during the 1980s [...] Already in the beginning of the 1950s the Marxist-Leninist historical nationalism embraced old Prussian heroes such as Stein, Scharnhorst, Gneisenau, Clausewitz, Heinrich von Kleist, Fichte, Arndt and Turnvater Jahn in its own ancestral gallery."[243]

---

[240] Baumann, Rainer 2005, 'Der Wandel des deutschen Multilateralismus. Verschiebungen im außenpolitischen Diskurs in den 1990ger Jahren', Ulbert, Cornelia & Weller, Christoph (eds.), *Konstruktivistische Analysen der Internationalen Politik*, VS. Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften 2005, p.118.

[241] See Wittmann, Klaus 2015, 'Genscher und der NATO-Doppelbeschluss', Brauckhoff, Kerstin & Schwaetzer, Irmgard (eds.) Hans-Dietrich *Genscher's Aussenpolitik, Akteure der Aussenpolitik*. Springer Verlag, 2015, pp. 141-165.

[242] See Longhurst 2004.

[243] Schoch, Bruno 1992, *Deutschlands Einheit und Europa's Zukunft*, Friedensanalysen 26, Suhrkamp Verlag Frankfurt am Main 1992, p.135.

Hence, beyond the fact that both German states faced similar military threats (nuclear war; Germany becoming a battlefield) and that both countries' security political agency was very limited, the same principal foundation of 'never again war' united all Germans on both sides of Checkpoint Charlie. This was also a factor which strongly underlined the continuity in the immediate post-Cold War German strategic culture. However, some differences seem to have persisted. According to Maull, even though there has been a considerable evolution in the views of the German electorate concerning the use of military force for other than solely defensive purposes, the former East Germans have remained much more skeptical towards NATO and the Bundeswehr deployments than their former Western counterparts after the end of the Cold War.[244]

Third, the German question was the underlying impetus for German strategic behaviour ever since the rearmament debates in the 1950s and the policies of Westbindung. Having to deal with the illusive long-term objective of reunification, besides the omnipresent fear of a worldwide nuclear war, was one of the biggest threat images during the long Cold War decades, because the advocacy of such a policy was anything but a risk-free enterprise in strategic sense. This of course did not mean that every German wholeheartedly supported the reforming of a new German state under one banner. In addition to a number of politicians, there were strong dissenting voices among prominent philosophers and intellectuals alike who were either strongly opposed to or very critical of a possible German reunification towards the end of the Cold War, including Jürgen Habermas.[245]

Finally, the superpower relations largely dictated the political room for manoeuvre for Germany (and the rest of Europe), even after it was formally recognized as a sovereign state (1949) and after it had joined NATO (1955). Given the international and domestic restraints on the development of German military capabilities, Germany's post World War II self-conceptualization as an emerging civilian power, and the subsequent redefinition of German national interests as striving towards world peace instead of world domination, meant that during the Cold War, the actual German influence on international security policy making was fairly limited and therefore the future

---

[244] Maull, Hanns 2000, 'Germany and the use of force: Still a Civilian Power?', Survival: Global Politics and Strategy, vol. 42, issue 2, 2000, p. 64.

[245] Philosopher Jürgen Habermas, the central figure in the German Historikerstreit, saw that the German Westernization had been a big intellectual accomplishment which also meant a denunciation of all ideas concerning a great power status for Germany or even sovereignty. Even after the process of re-unification had been long ongoing, Habermas never abandoned this position, which saw the nation as 'overcome'. However, many critics rightly noted that the Habermasian concept of 'Constitutional Patriotism' was unreal in the sense that there could not be patriotism without Patria, the Fatherland. Cf. Weissmann, Karlheinz 1992, 'Der „Westen" in the German historiography after 1945', Zitelmann, Rainer (ed.), *Westbindung: Chancen und Risiken für Deutschland*, Frankfurt a.M Propyläen 1993, pp. 343-364.

of the German strategic culture seemed to be determined first and foremost by foreign powers and the international relations of the superpowers – at least as long as the prospect of a reunified Germany seemed unrealistic. Overall, German security policy was a reaction to unfolding events rather than proactive policy making or substantial strategic planning that had a lot to do with the structural imposition of a permanent agency vacuum that Germany was occupying during the Cold War (notwithstanding Adenauer's Policy of Strength and Brandt's Ostpolitik). Germany was cultivating the image of a civilian power which served German strategic interests and the ultimate goal of German reunification but it was at odds with the prevailing logic of bipolarity and balance of power.[246] This would all begin to change on 19 October 1989 as the fall of the Berlin wall marked the prelude to the end of the long Cold War years and symbolized the reforging of a new Europe after the fall of the Soviet Union in 1991 and the end of the bipolar world order enabling the re-emergence of a unified Germany at the heart of Europe.

3.4. THE GERMAN REUNIFICATION, THE GULF WAR AND STRATEGIC CULTURE AFTER 1990

The German reunification has not spurred much meaningful debate in terms of German strategic culture (unlike the debates concerning foreign policy) besides the more general notion of a structural change, crystallized in the new security and defence political reality after the collapse of bipolarity. This is all the more surprising in the sense that the German reunification definitely marked a watershed moment in German political history if not another *Stunde Null*, since the reunification was a process that was both de jure and de facto pre-requisite for Germany to rethink, develop and especially execute genuine foreign, defence and security policies as a re-unified nation based on its own values and norms that were and are part of the one-of-a-kind German strategic culture. But perhaps at least as significant was the possibility that the re-unified Germans could really come to clearer terms with their Nazi past and the memory of World War II. These reflections on the past and how they con-tinue to shape the present German strategic culture will be dealt with in de-tail in Chapter 5.

However, there are a number of good explanations for the lack of academic debate on strategic culture and German reunification. Firstly, the lack of this debate is partly understandable since Germany's future had been institutionally, economically, politically and perhaps most importantly also militarily tied to the rest of Europe and the transatlantic alliance for decades and German policymakers had done their best not to convince anybody otherwise since the end of World War II. Perhaps this has also something to do with the inability of social sciences in general to predict the end of the Cold War or

---

[246] The question about Germany as a 'civilian power' will be discussed at the end of this chapter.

even fully grasp its meaning in terms of the development within specific poli-cy fields and institutions. But with certainty, it has even more to do with the fact that strategic culture is inherently built on the foundation of continuity that is most likely expected to last even after major structural shifts in the international system.

This continuity can be witnessed in the traditional ways different political parties and the whole German society have been disposed to the question of peace and war during and after the end of the Cold War which was closely connected to the respective threat images and lessons of history during the long Cold War decades. Interestingly enough, the post-Cold War threats such as the emergence of international terrorism with its global reach and conse-quences have had a profound effect on partly cementing the role played by the historical lessons of the World War II on German foreign and security policy making, but also facilitating policy change in terms of the substance of German strategic culture which can be seen for instance in a reconceptualiza-tion of German international responsibility, national interests and participa-tion in out-of-area peace-keeping and military conflict management.

However, even though the view of Germany as a civilian power came to be the most popular view outside the realist camp in the 1990s, continuity as such wasn't a particular mantra among the mainstream IR and FPA litera-ture on German foreign and security policy after the fall of the Berlin Wall. Realists found themselves watching the clock, waiting for the return of the belligerent *Boche* because in (neo)realist theory sudden gains of power will result in an unbalance of the international system which will be brought into balance through war.[247] The grand old man of (structural) realism Kenneth Waltz argued in 1993 that Germany was likely to be on its way to becoming a great power once again.[248] However, as the first Gulf War already showed, the long-awaited German 'return to normality' (*Wiederkehr zur Normalität*) did not materialize, if by normality we understand the realist account of statehood based on military power; and becoming 'normal' in that sense would suggest a Germany also actively aspiring for a great power status, a thing which has yet to materialize on realist terms. Yet equally important was the realization during the 1990s that the core idea of continuity in German strategic culture, based on the premise of civilian power, was no longer an omnipotent answer to the changing threat environment or the widening scope of German security political agency. The decade following unification was the most tumultuous in terms of redefining a strategic direction for a

---

[247] See Waltz, Kenneth 1988, 'The origins of war in neorealist theory', Journal of Interdisciplinary History, vol. 18, no. 4 (Spring 1988), pp. 615-628; Waltz, Kenneth 2000, 'Structural realism after the end of the Cold War', International Security, vol. 25, issue 1, pp. 5-41; Mearsheimer, John J. 1990, 'Back to the Future: Instability in Europe after the Cold War', International Security, vol. 15, no.1 (Summer 1990), pp. 5-56.

[248] Waltz, Kenneth 1993, 'The emerging structure of international politics', International Security, vol. 12, no. 2 (Autumn 1993), p. 50.

reunified nation in its search for a robust security political identity – understandably so given both the need and the demand for adjusting to the changes in the international system and the domestic political environment.

The strategic orientation of the reunified Germany was codified in the new German Basic Law (*Grundgesetz*), which basically endorsed the view of Germany as a civilian power and consolidated the meaning of the lessons Germany had drawn not only from World War II but also the long Cold War. The preamble of the German Basic Law states that "(c)onscious of its responsibility towards God and people, inspirited by the desire to contribute to the world peace as an equal member in a unified Europe, the German people has, based on its legislative powers, given this Basic Law."[249] Moreover, at the time, any German military deployment, notwithstanding the defence of German territory, was ruled out by the Basic Law – even though the debate concerning possible German participation in UN peacekeeping operations had been undergoing ever since Germany's membership in the UN in the early 1970s.

German strategic culture wasn't the most pressing issue on the agenda as the new German Bundestag convened for the first time on 12 December 1990 in Bonn. The period of German reunification was first and foremost a period of strategic cultural continuity in a very particular sense: it showed Germans that political objectives, which indeed seemed untenable as well as mostly unrealistic during much of the Cold War, could be met with peaceful means. Moreover, the unification had a direct impact on the further development of German strategic culture in the sense that it created both the external expectancy and the internal need for German strategic action in an unprecedented scope and depth; things which would unravel the discrepancy in the ideational structure of German strategic culture step by step – the tension between the different lessons of 'never again'. This discrepancy within the ideational structure would begin to unfold during the first major post-Cold War crisis, the Gulf War, and the German government's early adoption of the recognition policy towards Slovenia and Croatia a year later.

When the Gulf War broke out on 2 August 1990, German politicians were still negotiating the future status of a reunified Germany in terms of the unification treaty and the former Allied Quadripartite powers on the so-called Two-Plus-Four-treaty.[250] Negotiations were also underway on the issues of the Allied jurisdictional powers and their troop presence in Germany. Furthermore, the new Federal Republic was also preparing for its first elections as a unified country. The German left, most notably the SPD, had been very

---

[249] The Preamble of the German Basic Law. Available at: (http://www.bundestag.de/bundestag/aufgab
en/rechtsgrundlagen/grundgesetz/gg/245216).

[250] Two-Plus-Four-treaty between the two German states and the four victor states of World War II
established the shape of Germany as the combined territories of the FRG and the GDR, guaranteed the
country's borders, limited its weapons and military forces (from 490 000 to 370 000 troops), regulated
the withdrawal of former allied troops, and ensured Germany's continued membership in NATO.

supportive of the idea of collective security and a vocal supporter of strengthening UN's role in international politics.[251] But now, in the context of the Gulf War, these institutions required a vehement military response to Saddam Hussein's war of aggression – a line which the Social Democrats as a party were not willing to cross. Even more painful was the realization of the fact that some German firms had sold technical material to the Iraqis which enabled their troops to broaden the effective range of their SCUD-missiles so that they now threatened Israel with a gas-attack.[252] When the plea for military assistance was voiced to the Germans by the Israeli government, it caused massive disarray especially within the SPD and other parties as well. It was a political nightmare *par excellence*, since Germany's special responsibility towards Israel, besides being ever-present in the consciousness of the German nation as a whole, is also written down in the German Basic Law. Even so, Germany rejected the plea for deploying any German ground troops in the region but raised its economic aid to the participating countries to approximately €12 billion in 1990-1991[253]. Additionally, Germany functioned as the main transfer hub for the Western coalition troops that were sent to the Persian Gulf. Germany also supplied ammunition and artillery shells for the coalition troops and supplied Israel with eight armoured reconnaissance vehicles (*Fuchs Spürpanzer*) as well as agreeing to sending two submarines to Israel (three submarines were delivered between 1998-2000).[254]

In Germany, the refusal to provide military assistance was not scandalous behaviour by any means at the time but a rather well-established political practice during the Cold War decades, a practice which meant that the German military was to be deployed only in cases of defending German territory or considered to be deployed within the NATO operational area according to Article V of the North Atlantic Treaty. This practice was reaffirmed and seemed to back up the continuity in German strategic culture all the way to the final years of the Cold War as the German government refused to send military vessels to back up Kuwaiti oil tankers in the Persian Gulf in 1987, in

[251] For an extensive analysis of SPD positions on security in the period after reunification, see Gerster, Florian 1994, *Zwischen Pazifismus und Verteidigung. Die Sicherheitspolitik der SPD*, Nomos Verlag 1994.

[252] See Hippler, Jochen 1991, 'Iraq's Military Power: The German connection', Middle East Report, No. 168, Jan-Feb 1991, pp. 27-31; Cooper A.H. 2004, 'Media framing and social movement mobilization: German peace protest against INF missiles, the Gulf War, and NATO peace enforcement in Bosnia', European Journal of Political Research, 41:2002, p. 37-80.

[253] Bennett, Andrew, Lepgold, Joseph & Unger, Danny 1994, 'Burdensharing in the Persian Gulf War', International Organization, vol 48, No.1 (Winter 1994), pp. 39-75.

[254] Nassauer, Otfried & Steinmetz, Christopher 2003, Rüstungskooperation zwischen Deutschland und Israel, Research Report 2003.1. Berliner Informationszentrum für Transatlantische Sicherheit (BITS), p. 18.

response to a request of the US to do so.[255] Germany referred to the prohibitive nature of its Basic Law and refused to send military assistance beyond the NATO operational area. This practice was ended – or rather further refined – by the decision of the German Constitutional Court in 1994 which allowed the deployment of German troops in out-of-area missions as part of the institutions of collective security and *de facto* neglected through the German participation in the NATO airstrikes in Kosovo in 1999 (without UN authorization).[256]

Importantly, the end of the Cold War and the subsequent international crises revealed the first cracks in the German foreign policy consensus that had lasted for decades. The first Gulf War was the first real test for the old consensus. Externally, Germany was referred to as engaging in 'cheque-book diplomacy' that averts risking its own neck in tough situations that might require the use of military force.[257] Internally, some politicians began to question the foreign policy direction and asserted that Germany might have to reconsider its position as a mid-sized European power and that Germany should also begin to take more responsibility militarily.[258]

To sum up, the German reunification and the Gulf War certainly created more confusion as to the future German strategic orientation that was intended by the Germans themselves. It showed also that the urgent need that was expressed both externally and internally for bearing international responsibility and taking a more active role in world affairs might not so easily be transformed into a behavioural credo of military abstinence. Hence, the importance of German reunification lies not only in the growth of both German capabilities and external/internal expectations towards a more active role in international security affairs but also in the fact that German strategic culture had to reconcile two interpretations of German historical responsibility. These interpretations which culminated in the principal norms of never again were not under pressure during the Cold War decades because they conformed to the realpolitik of the Cold War and offered viable policy choices for Germany whose international agency was quite limited at the time and ensured a domestic political consensus on the issues of war and peace. However, the difficulty of conforming to these principles became apparent as the Gulf War revealed the discrepancy between 'never again alone' and 'never

---

[255] See Baumann, Rainer & Hellmann, Gunther 2001, 'Germany and the Use of Military Force: 'Total War', 'The Culture of Restraint' and the Quest for Normality', German Politics, April 2001, pp. 68-89; ‚Bundeswehr – Billige Worte', Der Spiegel 3.8.1987, 32/1987.

[256] For more detail, see Chapter 3.3.

[257] See Bjola, Corneliu & Kornprobst, Markus 2013, *Understanding international diplomacy: Theory, Practice and Ethics*, Routledge 2013, p.105 ; See also Lantis, Jeffrey 2002, *Strategic Dilemmas and the Evolution of German Foreign Policy Since Unification,* Greenwood Publishing 2002, pp. 17-18; ‚Die Deutschen an die Front', Der Spiegel, 4.2.1991, 6/1991.

[258] Schwab-Trapp, Michael 2002*, Kriegsdiskurse.Die Politische Kultur des Krieges im Wandel 1991-1999,* Springer Verlag, 2002, pp. 87-111.

again war' in terms of what they meant for German strategic behaviour. Moreover, the Gulf War also disclosed that the question which historians had more or less deemed settled a few years earlier – namely that Auschwitz and the Holocaust should be seen as *sui generis* historical events generally incomparable with other atrocities in the world history, did not seem as politically clear-cut an issue given the wide comparisons between Saddam Hussein and Hitler at the time, comparisons, which were repeated during the run-up to the Iraq war in 2003.[259] Beginning with the Gulf War, the pressure towards a re-interpretation of German historical responsibility reached its eclipse in the debates concerning German military involvement and the scope, depth and purpose of the use of military force in Bosnia and most notably, in Kosovo.

3.5. THE BALKAN WARS: FROM BOSNIA TO KOSOVO – CIVILIAN POWER IN WAR

"At the time of German unification hardly any observer would have ventured the prognosis that less than ten years later units of the Bundeswehr would be involved in combat in the Balkans, without the very thought of it provoking a global wave of indignation, not to mention the reactions within Germany."[260]

Indeed, throughout the 1990s, German strategic culture, that was built on the foundation of two principles, 'never again war' and 'never again alone', was challenged by Germany's partners and allies and was strongly affected by what was happening in international politics, most notably by the different crises and conflicts which raised the question of future German strategic behaviour. As a result, the ideational structure of German strategic culture underwent a significant process of change through which a new interpretation of the German past became a valid tool for legitimating certain policy decisions and formed the basis for widening and deepening strategic action. But before we assess this issue in more detail, it is necessary to depict the international and domestic political context in which Germany was operating.

Since the Gulf War, it had become apparent that the world would be looking quite closely at Germany and how it would deal with international conflicts that needed a swift and possibly also a military response. On one hand, foreign powers understood that the issue of using military force was of ut-

---

[259] See. Lakoff, George 1991, 'Metaphors and War: The metaphor system to justify war in the Gulf', Peace Research, Vol. 23, No. 2/3 (May 1991), pp. 25-32; Record, Jeffrey 2007, 'The Use and Abuse of History: Munich, Vietnam and Iraq', Survival, vol. 49, no.1, Spring 2007, pp. 163-180; Kempf, W. & Palmbach U. 1995, *Hitlers Wiedergänger – Medienpsychologische Analysen der Feindbildproduktion im Golfkrieg,* Universität Konstanz 1995.

[260] Schöllgen, Gregor 1999, *Die Außenpolitik der Bundesrepublik Deutschland: von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart,* Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung, Köln 1999, p.218.

most sensitivity for the Germans internally, but Germany's allies also harboured the hope and indeed a strong expectancy that Germany would take responsibility in the international arena also in military terms. This trend has been evident since the first Gulf War. These hopes also entailed Germany taking the necessary steps on the road of becoming a 'normal' European nation state after re-unification and for some of its partners this meant also becoming a *primus inter pares* given Germany's central geographic position and powerful economy which would then subsequently result in a more forceful posture in defence and security political matters as the *Zentralmacht* in Europe.[261] Moreover, the growth in the expectancy of a stronger German presence and involvement in solving the international security crises and conflicts went hand in hand with the realization that the times when Germany would pose a threat to its European neighbours and international security were finally over. However, the dissolution of Yugoslavia at the beginning of the 1990s and the resulting war in Bosnia proved that Germany was not on its way to becoming a neorealist mid-sized European military power but unveiled an extremely cautious and weary German strategic culture that had yet to come to terms with the fact that war had not become a thing of the past on the European continent.

In terms of German strategic culture, the conflict in the Balkans raised questions not only in terms of whether Germany would comply with the authorization of the use of military force in the region but also whether or not Germany was truly committed to the rest of Europe and NATO. In essence, the crisis in the Balkans not only questioned the German 'culture of restraint' and the notion of Germany as a civilian power but also the other lesson, 'never again alone'. This became apparent during the early German diplomacy towards the secessionist Yugoslav republics spearheaded by Foreign Minister Genscher. Indeed, at the beginning, Germany was very active in re-shaping the views of its European neighbours on how to approach the conflicting sides. German officials had been demanding an unconditional recognition of both of the breakaway republics of Slovenia and Croatia since June 1991. Jakobsen has argued that these events served to construct three myths concerning German behaviour: firstly, that Germany was on its way to acting according to the laws of power politics; secondly, that the German decision was determined by moral sentiment; and thirdly, that Germany's unilateral recognition policy was the root cause of the war.[262] Yet besides conjuring myths, the German policy had also direct consequences. As Crawford and Lipschutz have observed, the German attitude towards the conflict parties in the Balkans as seeing Serbia as the clear oppressor, exercising totalitarian domination and control over the other republics shifted the EC (The Europe-

[261] Hyde-Price, Adrian 2007, *European Security in the Twenty-First Century: The Challenge of Multipolarity*, Routledge 2007, pp. 117-138.

[262] Jakobsen, Viggo 1995, 'Myth-Making and Germany's Unilateral Recognition of Croatia and Slovenia', European Security, Vol.4, No.3 (Autumn 1995), pp. 400-416.

an Community) stance on the conflicting parties as well. Importantly, instead of looking at the conflict as a civil war, the prevalent interpretation of it would become one that supported the self-determination aspirations of the different Yugoslav republics mainly due to German pressure.[263] The sympathy in the reunified Germany towards the secessionist part-republics of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia was strong, partly because Germany had recently freed itself from communist rule and partly because there was a large vocal Croatian minority in Germany demanding independence throughout the 1991, supported by many prominent German politicians.[264]

Chancellor Kohl's and Foreign Minister Genscher's efforts in bringing Brussels and Washington into line with German thinking failed until the end of 1991, mainly because of British and French fears that an early recognition would torpedo the peace talks.[265] Yet the pressure towards recognition of independence was growing in Germany, also partly due to the escalating violence in the Balkans. In addition, the German press exercised a lot of influence on how the conflicting parties were seen in Germany and propagated the Balkan conflict as the fight for liberty from the communist rule. The prominent *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* (FAZ) released a series of articles, in which Croatia was portrayed as committed to 'European values', while Serbs were caricatured as hardly being European at all.[266] In December 1991 at a meeting of EC foreign ministers, Genscher was successful in getting other ministers to accept the German proposal of recognizing the defecting republics by 15 January 1992. Genscher was successful in his recognition policy even though there were many who thought that there were no guarantees that the consequences of recognition would lead to the cessation of hostilities. Many had warned of a German unilateralist stance leading to aggravated violence, such as the President of Bosnia Alija Izetbegović and the UN Secretary General Perez de Cuellar.[267]

Others, in turn, have argued that Germany's early recognition policy was not as reckless as has often been depicted. Libal, for instance, has observed that the EC announced in early October 1991 that it would decide on recognition after an absolute maximum of two months: there was thus no binding agreement among Germany's European partners for a non-recognition policy.[268] Libal also noted that once the international Badinter Commission de-

---

[263] Crawford, Beverly & Lipschutz, Andrew 1994, Discourses of War: Security and the Case of Yugoslavia. YCISS Occasional Paper Number 27, December 1994. pp. 7-9.

[264] Crawford, Beverly 1996, 'Explaining Defection from International Cooperation: Germany's Unilateral Recognition of Croatia', World Politics, Vol. 48, No. 4 (Jul., 1996), p. 519.

[265] Lucarelli, Sonja 1997, 'Germany's recognition of Slovenia and Croatia: An institutionalist perspective', International Spectator: Italian Journal of International Affairs, 32:2, pp. 69-74.

[266] Crawford & Lipschutz, 1994, pp. 7-8.

[267] Ibid.

[268] Libal, Michael 1997, *Limits of Persuasion: Germany and the Yugoslav Crisis, 1991-1992*, Greenwood Publishing, 1997, p. 65.

termined in early December 1991 that Yugoslavia was facing dissolution not secession, there was no longer any good reason to deny recognition. Failure to internationalize the conflict in this way would simply have allowed the Serbs – who had already occupied one-third of the country, destroyed the Slavonian town of Vukovar and besieged the Adriatic port of Dubrovnik – to maximize their advantage. At this point, Bonn could no longer solve the problem of discouraging both secessionist tendencies and attacks by the Yugoslav People's Army. As it happened, the fighting in Croatia stopped almost immediately after recognition.[269] Hence, the question of German unilateralist action shows itself under a different light in terms of German strategic culture, allegedly breaking with 'never again alone', highlighting the first German 'Sonderweg' after the end of the Cold War. I will return to the concept of Sonderweg in Chapter 5. Here, suffice it to say that Sonderweg – in any case – would be too strong a statement considering the political circumstances at the time. The claims that German policy towards Yugoslavia would have been 'unilateralist' at the core seem inconsistent if one looks at German efforts to internationalize the conflict and mediate a political solution.

Yet the failure of German diplomacy seemed evident as Bonn wasn't ready to back up its recognition policy with actual robust security assurances to Slovenia and Croatia. The UNPROFOR (United Nations Protection Force) which was established after the French and the British had taken the lead in the handling of the crisis, proved to be of little avail mostly because the Serbs were able to use the intra-European discord between the US and the rest of Europe to play against each other. Moreover, the US didn't want to commit any ground troops to a conflict in which none of its direct interests were at stake.[270]

The issue of German military involvement became acute when the UN Security Council decided to launch a sea embargo on Serbia and Montenegro and a no-fly zone on Bosnia in Spring 1992. The German government replied with faint optimism towards the early requests concerning German participation, but knew that such a decision would become the source of major domestic political friction. The whole political spectrum behind 'never again war' opposed this policy and the Social Democrats filed a complaint in the German Constitutional Court claiming that the government's decision to send troops to the Adriatic was unconstitutional. The atmosphere of uncertainty continued until the Constitutional Court decided in April 1993 that German crews could participate in AWACS (Airborne Warning and Control System) flights, which literally began the same day the Court had reached its decision. Germany also participated in the sea embargo by sending two destroyers to the Adriatic Sea. As Lantis has observed, the AWACS surveillance mission was not considered a traditional combat mission per se, but it none-

---

[269] Ibid., p. 80.

[270] Dalgaard-Nielsen, Anja 2006, *Germany, Pacifism and Peace Enforcement*, Manchester University Press, 2006, pp. 54-56.

theless caused some German MP's to doubt and even accuse the conservative-liberal government of militarizing German foreign and security policy.[271]

Moreover, the decision-making process behind German participation in the AWACS was rather peculiar. As Hellmann and Baumann have shown, the smaller government party, the FDP, pressured its major coalition partner the CDU/CSU to accept amendments in the Basic Law covering such operations. In a rather spectacular political move, the FDP supported German participation in AWACS but filed a complaint to the Federal Constitutional Court with the opposition parties the SPD and the Greens against this very decision.[272] The Social Democrats were sure to use this opportunity to criticize the government's policy but some members of the FDP argued that they had to file the complaint only because the SPD had not accepted the compromise proposal between the governing parties.[273]

Germany was also taking its first steps militarily beyond Europe as it participated in UNOSOM II in 1993, the UN's successor mission to the United Task Force, the purpose of which was to secure humanitarian aid to Somalia, a country which was on the brink of collapse. As Dalgaard-Nielsen has shown, the German government was unsuccessful in gathering support for its stance among the German left unlike in the case of the Balkans, because it could not posit a clear case that soldiers where needed for the tasks German soldiers were assigned to. In addition, the government was accused of harnessing *Grossmacht* aspirations after filing a request for a permanent seat in the UN Security council a few days after its decision to participate in UNOSOM II.[274] This development received rich coverage in the German press, coverage that was full of references to concepts such as the end of 'Sonderweg' and the beginning of 'Remilitarisation' and 'Interventionism'.[275]

The situation deteriorated rapidly in Bosnia during the first months of 1994. After Serb artillery had massacred a number of Muslims gathered at a Sarajevo marketplace, NATO placed an ultimatum on the Serb forces to withdraw from their positions around Sarajevo or else face NATO's response. Serbs complied but the pressure on the UN safe havens was mounting elsewhere which led to NATO airstrikes against Serbian targets. As Lantis has noted, NATO's position found wide acceptance in Germany.[276]

After many official complaints about the German military deployments in the previous year, the German Constitutional Court ruled in July 1994 in fa-

---

[271] Lantis 2002 ; see also Duffield, John 1998, *World Power Forsaken: Political Culture, International Institutions, and German Security Policy after Unification*, Stanford University Press, 1998, p. 214-15.

[272] Baumann, Rainer & Hellmann, Gunther 2001, 'Germany and the Use of Military Force: 'Total War', 'The Culture of Restraint' and the Quest for Normality', German politics, April 1, German Politics, 2001, p.74.

[273] Plenarprotokoll des Deutschen Bundestages, 240. Sitzung, 22.7.1993.

[274] Dalgaard-Nielsen 2006, p. 60-61.

[275] See e.g. ,... morgen die ganze Welt', Der Spiegel, 19.4.1993, 16/1993.

[276] Lantis 2002, pp. 99-100.

vour of Bundeswehr military deployment if the operation was conducted within the framework of collective security and institutions. Unsurprisingly, the decision of the Constitutional Court specifically referred to NATO as such an instance of collective security. In addition, the court ruled that the Bundestag had to establish a simple majority for every case of German out-of-area military deployment.[277] Hence, by tying each decision over military participation to a democratic majority, the court ensured that the decision over peace and war remained firmly in the hands of the German Bundestag. Significantly, however, as Dalgaard-Nielsen has observed, the Court decision did not spur a political debate on what the most favourable multilateral framework for such deployments would be nor what the geographical and military limits for these would be, even though it was commonly agreed that military means would only be used as a last resort and that Germany would remain a 'civilian power'.[278]

At the end of the year, the political tensions between Germany and its allies had surfaced again as the US requested the use of German Tornado jets for NATO operations under the mounting pressure towards UNPROFOR troops. As Lantis has observed, Chancellor Kohl was very hesitant in the issue for historical reasons and his argument was that such decisions have to be based on domestic consensus.[279] This was in line with his doctrine, according to which it was unthinkable that Bundeswehr soldiers would embark on a military mission in an area occupied by the Wehrmacht during World War II.[280] The Bundestag voted in favour of Germany's participation in the eventual UNPROFOR withdrawal in June 1995 but there were many who doubted the mission, not least since the NATO generals and the Bundeswehr inspector General Naumann had warned that the conflict could well escalate into 'another Vietnam'. German Tornados were deployed but Kohl insisted that Germany would not send any ground troops to Bosnia.[281]

The perennial question concerning German international responsibility in the post-Cold War world that had already been raised during the Gulf War, was intensively debated in the Bundestag again after the tragic events of the Srebrenica massacre in July 1995, when units of the Bosnian Serb Army under the command of notorious general Ratko Mladic killed around 8,000 Muslim Bosniaks, mainly men and boys.[282] The significance of these debates

---

[277] The decision of the German Constitutional Court on the Bundeswehr Auslandseinsätze, 12.7.1994. Available at: (http://www.asfrab.de/urteil-bverfg-1271994-2-bve-392.html).

[278] Dalgaard-Nielsen 2006, p. 62.

[279] Lantis 2002, pp. 112-114.

[280] See ‚Deutsche Aussenpolitik‘, Informationen zur Politischen Bildung, (Heft 304), 2009; Von Krause, Ulf 2013, *Bundeswehr als Instrument Deutscher Aussenpolitik*. Springer Verlag, 2013, pp. 199-200.

[281] Harnisch, Sebastian 2001, *Germany as a Civilian Power?: The Foreign Policy of the Berlin Republic*. Manchester University Press, 2001, p.111; ‚Kein Hurra geschrien‘, Der Spiegel, 19.12.1994, 51/1994.

[282] The Bosnian Serb Army was the military of Republica Srpska, a self-proclaimed state within the internationally recognized territory of the sovereign Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

should not be underestimated in terms of the further development of German strategic culture since for the first time they represented a major and extensive principal discussion on what German international responsibility would entail and whether or not the use of military force would be acceptable in some extreme cases, such as preventing genocide. The events in Srebrenica and their extensive coverage in the mass media at the time especially served the purpose of highlighting the fact of the unpleasant reality of the post-Cold War world, particularly for ordinary Germans, namely, that the Clausewitzian principle of war as a continuation of politics with other means was not buried in the mausoleum of history with the Iron Curtain.

Similarly, the later debates over participation in the NATO airstrikes during the Kosovo conflict, the debates over the Bosnian war as a whole and especially the events in Srebrenica presented probably the most intensive discussions about the German international responsibility on one hand and stance towards the use of military force since the end of the Cold War on the other. Given their intensity and relevance for our discussion in terms of strategic cultural continuity and change, it is worth to take a closer look into these debates and assess their meaning for the development of German strategic culture.

As mentioned earlier, the general German reluctance to use military force and participate in international crisis management was acknowledged but mostly also disapproved of by Germany's allies, which ever since the Gulf War, had been quick to remind the Germans that the time for cheque-book diplomacy was over. The German party-political spectrum was well aware of the allied concerns regarding German policy. For instance, in the discussion concerning German participation in the AWACS-surveillance mission in the no-fly zone over Bosnia and Herzegovina, one member of the SPD voiced the growing concerns quite clearly: "I'm asking the Federal Government, why it does not possess the courage of Japan? I know some German soldiers and German politicians who are crawling towards their mouse hole as soon as an American Colonel says: you Germans provide the bloodbags but we provide the blood."[283] These kinds of statements reflected the changing mood among the German political left for which the historical lesson of 'never again war' did not seem to provide answers for crisis situations such as the one that had been emerging in the Balkans. Hence, a growing sense that a discrepancy had begun to materialize between what was expected of the reunified Germany as an ally on one hand and what the Germans were willing to do, on the other, even though nobody was outright condemning the German stance at the time. As Dalgaard-Nielsen has noted, on the centre-right, German conservatives had basically accepted German military deployments that were in line with the UN Charter since the Gulf War in order to stress German reliability and partnership with Europe and the US, and liberals were to follow suit,

---

[283] Deutscher Bundestag, Plenarprotokoll, 12/151, (21.4.1993), p. 12969.

although disappointed in the inability of the institutions such as the UN or the EC to curtail the crisis.[284]

The growing uncertainty concerning the viability of the 'culture of restraint' came to light strongly in the debates concerning the German participation in the AWACS and then in the decision to send combat troops (albeit no ground forces) in order to protect the UNPROFOR peace keeping force and then later on in securing the Dayton Peace Accords as part of the UN/NATO-led IFOR/SFOR. This uncertainty resurfaced strongly in the debates over German participation in the NATO-airstrikes in Kosovo. The debate on participation in the AWACS-mission already showed how difficult it would be to discuss these issues at the political level and this was partly the reason why the German Constitutional Court was called upon to solve the politically seemingly insurmountable question over military participation at the time. Indeed, as Schlaffer has pointed out, the Balkans also provided a different context from the Gulf War for German security and defence policy making in the historical sense that the security political doctrine of Helmut Kohl, namely, that, German soldiers could not be sent to a region occupied by the Wehrmacht during World War II in principle also prohibited any German military involvement in Yugoslavia.[285]

To reiterate, the situation in Bosnia began to deteriorate drastically towards the end of 1994 and continued to decline in 1995. The surrounded city of Sarajevo was constantly under Serb artillery fire and people in the Eastern Bosnian enclaves, the so-called UN Safe Zones – Srebrenica included, were suffering on a day-to-day basis. The international community decided that the UNPROFOR peacekeepers needed protection and reinforcement in order to fulfil their mission. UN forces needed also to be prepared for the worst-case scenario in case the situation became unbearable and the forces would have had to be drawn out. Hence, the UNSC decided to launch IFOR (Implementation Force), a NATO-led peacekeeping force to implement the military aspects of the Dayton Peace Agreement, which took this responsibility over from UNPROFOR.[286]

The German government decided to participate in this mission and the Bundestag debate on the issue was held on 30 June 1995.[287] In the debate itself, the government position was clear. According to Foreign Minister Klaus Kinkel, Germany had to show solidarity towards its allies because Germany had a special political and moral responsibility from its own past.

---

[284] Dalgaard-Nielsen 2006, p. 54-55.

[285] Schlaffer, Rudolf 2010, 'The Significance of the Balkans as a Strategic-Operational Area for the Bundeswehr', Journal of Military and Strategic Studies, Vol. 13, Issue 1, Fall 2010, pp. 109-110.

[286] UN Security Council Resolution 1031/1995. Available at: (http://www.un.org/Docs/scres95.htm).

[287] Plenary Protocol of the German Bundestag, 30.6.1995, 48th session (13/48). The session in Bundestag began rather dramatically as the then President of the Bundestag, Rita Süssmuth, had to show the door to the PDS parliamentary group, many of whom were wearing T-Shirts with antimilitaristic slogans.

The Allies had helped Germany back onto its feet and into the international community. Also at stake was the respect towards German politics and the future of the Common Security and Foreign Policy of the EU. According to Kinkel, there was absolutely no other option for Germany. He underlined the fact that the decision to participate did not mean a lowering of the hurdle for German military deployments or waging a war but that it was necessary for the UN peacekeepers to fulfil their mission and to stop the war. Kinkel reminded the members of the Bundestag that the planned German contribution was small-scale in comparison to others and that Germany's partners understood that Germany was politically unwilling to send ground combat troops to Bosnia and that German Tornados would not wage war – they would only engage if the troops sent to support the UN peace keeping mission were fired upon. According to Kinkel, the UN operation was first and foremost a humanitarian operation.[288]

The leader of the SPD parliamentary group Rudolf Scharping reminded the Bundestag that Germany's recognition policy of Slovenia and Croatia in 1991 had led to a situation in which the rest of the EU had no other choice but to follow Germany and that this policy had had dire consequences and contributed to the deepening of the crisis. Moreover, Scharping saw that Germany's respect had dwindled in the eyes of its partners due to this policy. He further claimed that the aftermath of the recognition policy had led the government to a situation that concessions had to be made and that the foreign minister himself had even spoken of a policy involving forcing Serbia onto its knees (*Serbien auf die Knie zwingen*). Scharping also noted that the SPD had always supported the maxim of the Kohl Doctrine because the memory of the atrocities committed by the Wehrmacht would only lead to an escalation of the conflict and to the endangerment of Bundeswehr soldiers. However, Scharping argued that this policy had now been changed. He noted that the majority of the SPD supported the UN decision to reinforce the peace keeping contingent but that in many respects the SPD was against the government's proposal – he particularly raised the question of German Tornado jets, the sending of which the majority of the SPD would not support, because it would make Germany into a party to the UN mission proper as a troops provider, hence going against the former consensus of the Kohl Doctrine. Scharping also warned of fuelling the Great Serbian propaganda by sending German troops, because the atrocities committed by the Muslim SS-Division against the Tito partisans had not been forgotten in Serbia and the deployment of German military would only serve to exacerbate the propaganda.[289]

The leader of the Greens Joschka Fischer argued that the debate at hand was about a historical break with the 50-year-old tradition of German foreign policy, the culture of restraint (*Kultur der Zurückhaltung*). The break con-

---

[288] Ibid., pp. 3955-99.

[289] Ibid., pp. 3959-68.

sisted of sending German combat troops beyond the traditional geographical remit of NATO operations (the state borders of the NATO member states) for the first time since the end of World War II. He declined to support the government's motion outright on behalf of his party's pacifist tradition and argued that the Greens did not want a new German foreign policy and that Germany had never suffered from pacifism. He also questioned the government's claim about the need to uphold alliance solidarity by asking whether the fact that Germany does not send soldiers to all the places in the world make it less capable as an alliance partner.[290] Günter Verheugen (SPD) also referred to the historical scope of the decision and underlined its consequentiality for the future of German foreign and security policy in contrast to the decisions made on Bundeswehr deployments with regard to Gulf War, Adriatic Sea, AWACS and also Somalia.[291] The government's motion was accepted with a large enough majority with the support of a number of the SPD and a handful of members from the Greens.

The events in the UN safe zone Srebrenica, which was taken over by Serb militia, who then committed a mass execution of Bosnian Muslims while the UN forces eye witnessed the whole event because they were not legally mandated to intervene, caused massive disarray in the whole German political spectrum and among the German populace but particularly on the traditionally more pacifist/anti-militarist segments of the Alliance '90/the Greens. Having formerly distanced themselves from a consideration of any kind of military response in the Balkans – with or without a UN mandate – the events of Srebrenica caused a domino-effect (albeit not a very rapid one) among the German Greens in the sense that 'realpolitik' and the real, actual events and approaching the issue from the viewpoints of the civilian population of the victims took precedence in the consideration of the stance of the party towards accepting a military response in the Balkans in order to stop a genocide from taking place. The leading figure in this transformation process was the party leader and future foreign minister, Joschka Fischer, a former left-wing radical, one of the most famous representatives of the so-called '68ger' generation in Germany.[292]

Fischer wrote an open letter to the Greens on 30 June 1995[293] in which he contemplated the situation in the former Yugoslavia and the consequences he had drawn from this and what it would mean for the Greens as a party. In the letter, Fischer lamented the state of the Western alliance by arguing, that

---

[290] Ibid., pp. 3970-5.

[291] Ibid., pp. 3987-91.

[292] The term '68ger' refers primarily to the student movement in Germany in the 1960s. It was a social movement that protested against the existing societal order as well as the Vietnam War.

[293] Fischer, Joschka 1995, 'Die Katastrophe in Bosnien und die Konsequenzen für unsere Partei Bündnis 90'/Die Grünen. Ein Brief an die Bundestagsfraktion und an die Partei'. Available at: (http://www.gruene.de/fileadmin/user_upload/Dokumente/Gr%C3%BCne_Geschichte/JoschkaFischer_Die_Katastrophe_in_Bosnien_und_die_Konsequenzen_fuer_unsere_Partei_1995.pdf).

there were no Western nor any common interests towards the former Yugoslavia. He also questioned Germany's decision in 1991 to recognize Slovenia and Croatia without prior negotiation concerning ethnic minorities and the border questions – German policy was "trying to extinguish the fire with kerosene": there was no concept of order for the region behind the German recognition policy and therefore it inevitably led to chaos. He noted that the German Greens had opposed the German military deployment in Bosnia for the right reasons: because of the havoc that the Wehrmacht had wrought in Yugoslavia during World War II the party feared that a Bundeswehr deployment might aggravate the crisis instead of curbing it.[294]

Yet Fischer saw no alternative to a UN embargo and the UN peacekeeping mission (although Fischer also noted that the UN mission was not about peace-keeping in Bosnia anymore). Fischer argued that the West could not retreat because it would effectively mean the dissolution of the civilian efforts of the UN and would undermine both the future of European security and the credibility of the UN as being responsible for world peace. A retreat would effectively mean a victory for national power politics. And even if the UN and the West decided to retreat, to Fischer, the danger of the spread of fascism was clear. Fischer argued that the German Left was in danger of losing its moral soul if it started to turn a blind eye to the policies and violence of this resurging fascism.[295]

But Fischer also reminded the Bundestag that military involvement would bear little hope for a political solution. He also questioned whether the West actually knew what it was fighting for in Bosnia, because the Bosnian Serbs would never accept a Muslim Bosnia as an independent state. Fischer continued that the question was not even about German involvement as such, because the historical lessons had not changed overnight and that the principle of saying 'yes' to German humanitarian assistance but 'no' to German peacekeepers or combat troops (nie wieder Krieg) had been valid until then. For Fischer, the question went deeper still – it would require the Germans to choose between two of their fundamental values regarding German political self-conception: freedom and value of human life on one hand, and nonviolence on the other.[296] Even though Fischer and his party had voted against the government proposal on the same day, the conclusion he drew in the letter was that the West needed to guarantee the safety of the civilians and the safe-zones militarily – there was no other option on the table anymore. Later in an interview with *der Spiegel* Fischer defended his posture of military de-

[294] Ibid.

[295] Ibid.

[296] Ibid.

ployment against the accusations of harbouring a bellicose attitude and a re-militarization of German foreign and security policy.[297]

A group of prominent Greens who represented the pacifist wing in the party (Claudia Roth, Jürgen Trittin, Kerstin Müller and Ludger Volmer) replied to Fischer in a letter in October 1995. They accused Fischer of failing to explain who would do the intervening if the UN was not capable. The only answer would be NATO but there were risks of making NATO an intervention force which only used UNSC as a springboard and a 'rubber stamp' for its military operations. Moreover, according to these Greens, Fischer had not explained what the differences would be between the Greens' and the government's intervention policies. These Greens depicted the Green interventionism as a mirror image of the ideas of the US President Woodrow Wilson in the early 20th Century – basically legitimating the projection of military force in the name of freedom, security and democracy: "We are interested in the question of how we can prevent the Green military oriented human rights fundamentalism [...] from being used as a cover for other, real interests. Moreover, what should a military operation approved by the Greens look like? Joschka has countered the criticism towards his claims for a military operation in Bosnia with the argument that he was in favour of one also in the case of Rwanda."[298]

Fischer replied to these charges by arguing that the position of the 'Idealos' would mean international isolation and that the picture which they were trying to convey of German remilitarization was based on false interpretation on firstly, what Fischer had actually argued and second, what it meant to be a member of the political left in Germany. The highest principle of the German political left should be that of solidarity towards another people and that alone was a reason enough to intervene militarily in case of genocide. Fischer also criticized the one-dimensional depiction of the US as the "agent of evil" harboured by the Green pacifists.[299]

However, the issue was not only touching the Greens but also other parties as well and that this 'spiritual struggle' (*Seelenkampf*) involved the whole German nation and its people. For instance, German academics and intellectuals had seemingly been quiet until the events in Srebrenica. The reason for this, as German philosopher Jürgen Habermas put it in an interview with *der Spiegel*, was that until Srebrenica, a political and diplomatic, peaceful solu-

---

[297] 'Das wäre blutiger Zynismus', Joschka Fischer über die Kritik an seinem Bosnien-Papier und den Pazifismus der Grünen, Interview with German Foreign Minister Joseph Fischer, 21.8.1995, Der Spiegel 34/1995.

[298] 'Wohin führt die Forderung nach einer militärischen Interventionspflicht gegen Völkermord?' Available at: (http://www.gruene.de).

[299] 'Auf der Flucht vor der Wirklichkeit?' Eine öffentliche Antwort auf den offenen Brief von Kerstin Müller, Claudia Roth, Jürgen Trittin, Ludger Vollmer, 27.11.1995. Kommune 1/96. Available at: (http://www.oeko-net.de/kommune/briefe/kom200.htm). See also 'Grüne kämpfen um das Prinzip der Gewaltfreiheit', Die Welt, 29.11.1995.

tion had not been completely off the table and that is why the academics had not seen the need to intervene in the political discussion. According to Habermas, the atrocities committed in Srebrenica had opened his eyes to the painful truth that the use of force by the UN/NATO was now inevitable.[300]

Indeed, the incident in Srebrenica was key in triggering the re-assessment of the German policy towards Bosnia that was accompanied by the realization that the Western policy had effectively failed and that there were three choices left: to retreat and lift the weapons embargo, to provide military assistance to the UN safe zones that were actually not safe-zones to begin with, or to see the whole conflict through by treating it someway as 'business as usual'. The first and third options, at least if one considers Fischer's position, were unthinkable for Germans as alternatives if one wanted to reach some sort of conclusion in the conflict, guarantee European security and the future of European integration as well as the credibility of the UN and NATO.

Furthermore, in terms of strategic cultural change, the event in Srebrenica was perhaps the most important singular example in the post-Cold War track record of German foreign and security policy as an event that could trigger a reinterpretation of historical responsibility as was seen from Fischer's re-appropriation of 'nie wieder Auschwitz' and 'nie wieder Krieg' and to enable a course change in the hitherto accepted policies. But as Fischer himself argued, at the nub of the issue was primarily not whether Germany would send military troops as a reaction to Srebrenica (and this was clearly at the top of the agenda of Germany's allies), but rather it was a question of political identity: what would the consequences be for a pacifist who now has to deal with the issue that war is real and not a residual category of history and that safeguarding freedom and the value of human life are, therefore, not necessarily compatible with the value of non-violence? This was, and, to a certain extent still is, the most prevalent question within the contemporary German strategic culture. In a sense, the Historians' controversy[301] repeated itself in terms of what political lessons should be drawn from the past after the event of Srebrenica; even though Fischer strongly argued that Auschwitz was historically and empirically an incomparable crime[302], the lesson from it could only mean the deployment of military means if genocide could be prevented.

The debates continued throughout the latter part of 1995 and the IFOR mission was approved by the Bundestag in December 1995. The voting re-

---

[300] ‚Ein Abgrund von Trauer‘, Interview with Jürgen Habermas over German intellectuals and the war in the Balkans. Der Spiegel, 7.8.1995, 32/1995, pp. 34-35.

[301] This debate will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 5. Suffice it to say here that the re-appropriation of Auschwitz and the Holocaust as a political tool for legitimating one's changing stance was very controversial at the time and some even accused Fischer of starting a new Historians' controversy (Historikerstreit).

[302] Fischer's speech at the Greens party conference in Bielefeld, May 1999. Available at: (http://staff-www.uni-marburg.de/~naeser/kos-fisc.htm).

sults corresponded to the situation in the German left: around two-thirds of the Social Democrats supported the mission while only half of the Green delegates voted in favour. Yet it was clear that the tide was turning and that at the time, it seemed as if 'never again Auschwitz' had triumphed over 'never again war'. This trend continued more forcefully in terms of the decision on the participation in SFOR in December 1996, the follow-up mission to IFOR, the purpose of which was to deter any resumption of hostilities between the former conflict parties in Bosnia. The mandate of SFOR was more robust than that of IFOR and it included an armed German contingent, which, unlike in the case of IFOR, was also charged with security tasks.[303] The debate on SFOR was held on the same grounds as the one on IFOR. Even though the mandate of the SFOR troops was more robust and involved basically a de facto denunciation of the Kohl Doctrine as German troops were now stationed directly in Bosnia as opposed to Croatia during IFOR, the decision was accepted by an even larger majority than that for IFOR.[304] However, even if it seems that the question was mainly about 'Germany Crossing the Rubicon'[305], at least as important for the Germans themselves was the emerging question whether or not Germany was willing to accept the role of a security provider instead of enjoying a free-ride in the backseat of the European military convoy. In short, at stake was the other big question regarding the German strategic culture as a whole: German responsibility internationally as well as in relation to Europe.

Hence, on one hand, ever since the Bosnian war, and particularly after the atrocities in Srebrenica, Germany has had to come to terms with the fact that the use of military force might be indispensable in order to save human life and prevent things such as genocide from happening. This can be clearly witnessed in the intra-party disputes at the time which did not only concern the Greens but also other parties, particularly the SPD. The only exception was the Party of Democratic Socialism (PDS) which had its roots in the East German SED (today known as Die Linke); a party which categorically continues to reject German military involvement in international crisis management. However, on the other hand, the 'primacy of politics' (*Primat der Politik*) remained in the sense that there was a wide parliamentary consensus on the use of military force as being and always remaining the last possible means, *ultima ratio*.

What these debates stressed in terms of the process of strategic cultural change during this period is that sources of change presented themselves initially in the form of threat images (the threat that Milosevic and his regime

---

[303] UNSC Resolution 1031 (1995) on IFOR. Available at: (http://www.nato.int/ifor/un/u951215a.htm); UNSC Resolution 1088 (1996) on SFOR. Available at: (http://www.nato.int/ifor/un/u961212b.htm).

[304] Von Krause 2013, pp. 206-213.

[305] A comparison often used as marking a point of 'no return', specifically the process of *Enttabuisierung des Militärischen* in Germany. In the Kosovo Konflikt, the reference was used as pointing out the first German combat mission since the end of World War II.

posed not only to ethnic minorities in Bosnia and Herzegovina, but understood more broadly as a threat to German and European security in terms of conflict escalation). These factors alone provided an incentive for the German political elite to act militarily, and the Constitutional Court's decision in 1994 had paved the way legally to do so. However, the triggering factor for change was the massacre at Srebrenica (external shock) in 1995, which initiated the shift from 'never again war' to 'never again Auschwitz'. While it was undoubtedly important for Germany to abide by its alliance commitments, those alone would not have brought about a fundamental change in German strategic culture. This could already be seen during the run-up to the Gulf War, when Germany faced strong peer pressure to act. Indeed, while the alliance patterns reinforced the incentive for Germany to act militarily at the time, they were not sufficient to bring about change at the more fundamental level, which was only triggered after the events at Srebrenica. This event set in motion the primary mechanism of change, as the experience of Srebrenica was projected against the backdrop of German experiences and lessons drawn from the German past.

Kosovo

> *„Im Krieg beginnt die Berliner Republik"*[306]

Following the decisions to support the UNPROFOR mission and subsequently in the IFOR and SFOR missions with a sizeable force, the decision was made to participate in AWACS. During these missions the number of Bundeswehr soldiers was raised from an initial 2,000 to 8,000 soldiers, which laid the groundwork for a substantial Bundeswehr presence in the Balkans. Yet the decision to participate in the NATO airstrikes against Serbia in 1999 – in the operation Deliberate Force (Allied Force) – was of historical proportion in the sense that this was the first time Germany participated in a large-scale military campaign against a sovereign state without the mandate of the UN Security Council and under a new Red-Green government. In Germany, the Bundestag elections in September 1998 brought about the first democratic change of government in the re-unified Federal Republic. The long reign of the conservative-liberal Kohl government, the Chancellor of German Unity, was brought to an end. The situation was as dramatic as it was historical. The traditional torch bearers of German anti-militarist and pacifist sentiments, the parties of the German Left – the SPD and the Bündnis '90/the Greens (with the exclusion of the PDS which remained in opposition with conservatives and liberals) were forced to begin their term by deciding over German military participation in the NATO airstrikes against Serbia.

---

[306] 'In war begins the Berlin Republic', headline of *Die Tageszeitung*, 20.4.1999, a few days after German Tornados had bombed Serbian targets as part of the NATO squadron.

The situation in Kosovo, which traditionally has always been one of the main sources of political friction in the Balkans, began to deteriorate drastically towards the end of 1997 when clashes between the Serbian security forces and the Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA) began to intensify. The fighting continued in early 1998 as the KLA attacked Serb installations in Kosovo and during the summer Serb forces pushed KLA back using artillery and other heavy weaponry. In the autumn of 1998, the situation looked grim indeed – with around 2,000 dead and almost 200,000 refugees within the province, another 100,000 Albanians had fled from Kosovo. International diplomatic efforts had been made, aiming to get Belgrade to change its position by considering lifting the sanctions that had been introduced in late 1997 by the efforts of the Contact Group.[307] These efforts proved to be in vain and as a consequence, the UN Security Council passed its first Resolutions on Kosovo (UNSCR 1160, 1199) in March and September 1998 but failed in the attempt to base these on Chapter VII of the UN Charter due to Russian and Chinese opposition. Therefore, the most viable option left for solving the crisis seemed to be the threat of the use of military force. NATO had initially made its military threat public against Belgrade in the spring of 1998 and as Serbian President Milosevic seemed to hold his course, the threat was renewed in September 1998. After Milosevic failed to respond to the demands made in UNSC Resolution 1199, the NATO Council decided to keep the activation orders (ACTORDS) for 'limited air operations' against Serbia during October 1998 in order to prevent a human catastrophe in Kosovo.[308]

The Bundestag debate over participation in the NATO bombing campaign was held on 16 October 1998 still under the old government leadership but in mutual understanding and agreement with the newly elected Red-Green government.[309] The Free Democrats, spearheaded by the then Foreign Minister Kinkel, argued that NATO was right to issue the order to begin with the limited air campaign because, according to the discussions between US ambassador Richard Holbrooke and Milosevic, it did seem to make Milosevic realize the gravity of the situation if he didn't react to the UNSC demands of Resolution 1199. Kinkel noted that US President Clinton was right in saying that the cemeteries in the Balkans were filled with Milosevic's broken promises. Milosevic simply could not be allowed to continue his 'game of cat-and-mouse' which he had begun in Bosnia and that he had to comply with the demands of the international community or face the consequences. Moreover, the threat of NATO escalation had to be kept intact in order to bring the agreement reached between Holbrooke and Milosevic into practice as soon as possible. Germany had to show solidarity towards its allies and its alliance

---

[307] Contact Group consisted of the US, Russia, Germany, UK, France and Italy.

[308] UNSC Resolution 1199. Available at: (http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/R ES/1199(1998)); NATO Headquarters Website on Operation Determined Force (Allied Force). Available at: (http://www.jfcnaples.nato.int/page7196179.aspx).

[309] Deutscher Bundestag, Plenarprotokoll 13/248, (16.10.1998).

capability (*Bündnisfähigkeit*) and to bear the responsibility for peace in Europe. However, the possible NATO operation should not be understood as the transition of *Gewaltmonopol* (monopoly on the legitimate use of force) from the UN to NATO and that the NATO operation did not constitute a precedence case in that sense but rather was an exception. The decision had first and foremost to be based on legitimate (as opposed to legal) grounds in order to protect human rights and prevent a humanitarian catastrophe. If the UN *Gewaltmonopol* could not be carried out to prevent this then it would be problematic for the interpretation of international law since "reality was, indeed, much more complicated and more layered than as depicted by international law".[310]

The Social Democrats stressed the importance and novelty of putting the lives of young Germans on the line and pointed out in particular that the political culture for it was only now being developed. A strong emphasis that reflected the German past was based on making a clear distinction between the perpetrators of the regime exercising a fatal policy and the ordinary people opposing this policy. While the argument was that the German Bundestag would not allow a 'second Bosnia' to take place, Germany also had a vital security interest in solving the crisis in the light of the potential refugee crisis, since it would arguably hit Germany the hardest. However, the conclusion was that since it had been Germans who had been responsible for the atrocities in the region in World War II, the only logical consequence for Germany was never to allow it to happen again. While the legal basis for the operation was deemed questionable, it was still ultimately acceptable, given the importance of the effort of getting Russia to agree with NATO should there be another UNSC Resolution based upon the agreement between Holbrooke and Milosevic.[311]

Union MPs highlighted the importance of German participation, reflecting 'never again alone' – had Germany not supported the NATO policies, the result would have meant a withdrawal from the integrated security and military structures of the West. There were occasions when the use of force was immoral but it would also be highly immoral not to send troops if it was the only way to stop the war and massacre. A critical remark was also directed at the Greens as it was deemed inappropriate for the same Greens, who now had to bear international responsibility by sending German soldiers into harm's way, to protest against the Bundeswehr at home. The Union politicians also stressed that the use of military force as *ultima ratio* was only meaningful and effective if Germany was also prepared to act accordingly, which, in turn, was indispensable for a successful NATO strategy.[312]

The Greens highlighted the fact that the decision was not an easy one for the party and that it was extremely important that there not be any self-

---

[310] Ibid., pp. 23127-31; 23143-5.

[311] Ibid., pp. 23132-3; 23135-8.

[312] Ibid., pp. 23133-5; 23138-40.

mandating of NATO in the issue. The question of German military deployment was not about re-instating interventionist policies based on uncontrolled nationalism, but in trying to prevent that from happening because the threat to European peace and security which Milosevic presented was real. If Germany did not act with the international community, the result would be another great war in the Balkans. Joschka Fischer in particular argued that it was also the reason why he changed his attitude towards pro-deployment during the Bosnian war. If Germany wanted to take responsibility for peace in Europe, it had to be ready to defend it, with military means if necessary. However, some Greens were clearly opposed to the government decision and would vote against it – the power of the strong had to be replaced with the power of legality. Also, some of the Greens took issue with the fact that the same actors who were considering the bombing of Serbia allowed its participation in the football World Cup. The argument was that "all of the experts agreed that preventing Serbia from participating would have been much more effective than the threat of bombardments in turning the mood of Serbian people against Milosevic."[313]

The PDS stressed that it was consequently the only party in the Bundestag to oppose "the militarization of German foreign policy and international relations". While it was not the first time that UNSC resolutions had been disregarded, nobody had hitherto come to think that the use of military force could be bestowed upon something else. Hence, criticism was raised by arguing that Kosovo would present a precedent case for military intervention without a UN mandate. Therefore, according to the PDS those who supported Germany's participation in the NATO bombing campaign were ill-situated to argue that it was a special case but not a case of precedence.[314]

In summary, this debate shows that even though there were strong concerns about the legality of NATO policies among the German policy elite, the newly elected government had to follow suit since it realized that there were few other options if Germany wanted to be seen as a reliable partner. Especially important was the role of Fischer, as he knew that the fresh coalition would break up even before the actual litmus test of whether the Greens would accept the Bundeswehr participation or not. The decision to participate in the NATO air campaign was accepted with a large majority of the Bundestag. Indeed, as Hyde-Price has put it, it took the government initially no more than 15 minutes to agree to US President Clinton's plea for German military participation.[315] Given this background, the German government's decision could be seen as being made rather hastily, but there are some well-grounded reasons for the government's rapid decision-making process in this particular issue. First off, the situation as such did not come as a sudden sur-

---

[313] Ibid., pp. 23141-2; 23150-1.

[314] Ibid., pp. 23145-7.

[315] Hyde-Price, Adrian 2001, 'Germany and the Kosovo War: Still a Civilian Power?', *New Europe, New Germany, Old Foreign Policy? German Foreign Policy since Unification*, Routledge 2001, p. 21.

prise for the government, as it had already been made aware of the US stance towards German participation during the Schröder-Fischer visit to Washington a few weeks earlier, when the German leaders had pledged their support in favour of the NATO airstrikes.[316] Secondly, during the Bundestag debate over the issue, all parties except for the PDS were unanimously behind the government decision. This also reflected the broad sentiment within German society, which, according to the polls at the time, was united with its government on the issue of German military deployment with a majority of over 75% – considerably more than at the time of the Bosnian War.[317] Still, there were dissenting voices among both the political elite and the wider population about the military deployment. Some critics even argued that the German deployment seemed to be less controversial than a proposed law against graffiti artists.[318]

The OSCE mission that was launched to oversee the implementation of the armistice brokered by Holbrooke failed in January 1999 because the Serbs had massacred a number of Albanian civilians in the village of Racak. After this, the mood on both sides over the Atlantic shifted quite rapidly in favour of military action. Germany was still trying to find a political solution to the conflict but as the Rambouillet and Paris discussions proved to be of no avail since the Serbian side wasn't ready for any concessions. Arguably there was no other option left than realizing the military threat of NATO.[319]

Chancellor Gerhard Schröder appeared on German television on the eve of NATO airstrikes on 24 March 1999. He famously stated that "we do not wage war" but that "we are called upon to achieve a political solution via military means".[320] The beginning of the NATO air operation and German involvement was debated again in the Bundestag on 26 March 1999.[321] In the debate, Chancellor Schröder noted that there was no alternative for the international community other than to act militarily, because the Serb delegation had repeatedly refuted any diplomatic efforts to come to a settlement in the discussions in Rambouillet and Paris. He also pointed to the fact that this was the first time since the end of World War II that German soldiers had participated in an actual military mission but did not contemplate this fur-

---

[316] ,Man kennt sich, man duzt sich', Der Spiegel, 12.10.1998, 42/1998.

[317] Biehl, Heiko 2001, 'Wendepunkt Kosovo? Sicherheitspolitische Einstellungen in den alten und neuen Ländern', SOWI-Arbeitspapier, Nr. 128. Available at: (http://www.mgfa-potsdam.de); ,Stimmungsgefälle', Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, 14.4.1999, p. 16. It needs to be noted that there were drastic differences in the acceptance of the NATO mission between the West and East Germans. Whereas around 70% of the West Germans were in favor of the airstrikes, only around 40% of the East Germans supported the bombings.

[318] Hyde-Price 2001, p.22.

[319] ,Marsch in die Sackgasse', Der Spiegel, 22.3.1999, 12/1999.

[320] Schwab-Trapp 2002, p.294; Pressemitteilung Nr. 111/99 vom 24. März 1999, Presse- und Informationsamt der Bundesregierung, Bonn.

[321] Deutscher Bundestag, Plenarprotokoll 14/31 (26.3.1999).

ther. Rather, Schröder concentrated on the successes of the Berlin EU Summit and the compromise achieved in pushing through the so-called Berlin-package, Agenda 2000.[322]

Union MPs noted that they supported government policy on Kosovo and that the decision to partake in the airstrikes was right, inevitable and necessary to stop the ever -escalating murder in Kosovo. He also said that it was time to put any suspicions about the legality issue aside since the Federal Constitutional Court had rejected all the complaints about the issue.[323] Social Democrats argued that the decision to send combat troops for the first time was one that would affect all Germans in the realization that a break with past policies had occurred. This was done, however, to prevent another Srebrenica. The argument was that many still harboured doubts about the NATO operation, including some from within SPD but that the prevention of genocide weighed more than the respect for the veto right of two UNSC members. These members [Russia and China] abused their veto-right for reasons that had nothing to do with Kosovo. The West's joint military operation was not targeted towards Serbian citizens but was solely for the purpose of preventing genocide and stopping the 'dictator' and 'violent hazard' Milosevic, who was acting against the interests of his own people by isolating Serbia from the rest of Europe. There was also the argument put forward that the horrors in Kosovo had shown the German people that the only possible way to peace and prosperity in all of Europe was through European integration.[324]

For the SPD, as was portrayed earlier, the issue of German military participation was difficult to deal with during the Gulf War and the Greens had faced a similar, perhaps even more dramatic situation during the Bosnian War in the aftermath of the events in Srebrenica. The decision to participate in the NATO air offensive threatened not only to break the thin intra-party consensus on the issue of military deployment but it also presented a serious litmus test for the integrity of the newly elected government. The sentiments of the Greens became abundantly clear during a special 'Kosovo Parteitag' in Bielefeld in May 1999 under the headline 'Combining peace and humaneness'[325] – held under police protection because of the general unrest surrounding the meeting as an infuriated delegate threw a plastic bag filled with red colouring at Joschka Fischer to illustrate that the Green leader had blood on his hands. The rift inflicted by Kosovo was serious between the so-called

---

[322] Ibid., pp. 2571-5.

[323] Ibid., pp. 2575-9.

[324] Ibid., pp. 2579-81.

[325] ‚Frieden und Humanität vereinbaren', Sonderparteitag der Grünen, 13.5.1999. For the competing petitions on the party conference, see (http://www.gruene.de/ueber-uns/35-gruene-jahre-35-gruene-geschichten/35-gruene-jahre-22-kosovo-sonderparteitag-in-bielefeld-1999.html).

Realos and Fundis[326] within the Greens and it not only threatened to split the party but also the freshly elected German government. Fischer, however, kept his cool during his speech – which many have deemed the most important one of his entire career – and argued that it was time for 'unconditional pacifism' and 'moral overkill' to end if it meant that people were being persecuted and murdered as a result. Hence, Germany needed to act and take international responsibility in the issue. He questioned the position of the Fundis by arguing that Milosevic had disregarded 18 armistice proposals and 73 UNSC Resolutions since the conflict had begun in Yugoslavia. At the end of his speech Fischer famously noted that "[f]or me personally, the lessons of history mean never again war and never again Auschwitz but also never again genocide and never again fascism."[327] One could perhaps go as far as to argue that the shift in the leftist German strategic thinking was crystallized within this sentence which would translate into practice in the form of military action as a form of humanitarian intervention.

The Auschwitz rhetoric of the Green foreign minister was accompanied by similar sentiments within the SPD. Defence Minister Rudolf Scharping said in an interview with *der Spiegel* in March 1999 that Germany had not given up the credo of never again war but that the credo was based on a 40-year period of Cold War during which the threat of nuclear war was omnipresent. Scharping argued that even still, "a part of our soul had always held an outbreak of such a war completely unrealistic and hence also the outbreak of war itself" but that more recently since Srebrenica, things were different: "We have war in this part of Europe. Our responsibility is to end it."[328] Scharping caused a lot of unrest with his claims at the end of March 1999 surrounding the so-called Rugovo Affair, which dealt with the arguable execution of Albanian civilians in the village of Rugovo by the Serb police in January 1999. In April, Scharping presented photographs of the supposed victims to the German and international press. The German minister had also argued that the football stadium in the Kosovo capital Pristina was being used as a concentration camp of sorts and that it was impossible as a German just to watch as

---

[326] The Realos and Fundis are the two traditional groups within the German green movement. Realos, most notably represented in the person of Joschka Fischer, were seen to be the 'Realpolitiker' in the party, exercising pragmatic politics and concentrating on present issues and reforms. Fundis, in turn, were labeled 'fundamentalist' because they were arguably idealistic in their policies and represented the voice of opposition and protest as well as a fundamentally pacifist stance. Most prominent Fundis are Jutta Ditfurth, Jürgen Trittin and Hans-Christian Ströbele. See Kleinert, Sebastian (1992), Vom Protest zur Regierungspartei. Die Geschichte der Grünen, Eichborn Verlag, 1992, p. 110-118; Sattler, Dieter (2014), ‚Realos und Fundis‘, Frankfurter Neue Presse 22.9.2014; ‚35 grüne Jahre, Realos und Fundis‘, http://www.gruene.de/partei/30-gruene-jahre-30-gruene-geschichten/30-gruene-jahre-8-realos-und-fundis.html.

[327] Transcript of Fischer's speech at the Sonderparteitag der Grünen in Bielefeld, 13.5.1999. Available at: (http://staff-www.uni-marburg.de/~naeser/kos-fisc.htm).

[328] ‚Alle hatten Skrupel‘, Der Spiegel, 29.3.1999, 13/1999.

people were being detained there. A group of German journalists, who had interviewed locals in Kosovo, released a film called *Es begann mit ner Lüge* (It all began with a lie) claiming that Scharping's evidence was false and that his arguments were lies, attempting to soothe the deteriorating support for the NATO air campaign in Germany. Scharping's maneuvering became clear after some key German OSCE officials were interviewed, including a former German general who sharply criticized Scharping's comparison of Auschwitz with the situation in Pristina, that Scharping had clearly waged propaganda war in favour of German support for the NATO operation and that the Serb *Hufeisen-Plan* (Operation Horseshoe) was Scharping's own invention.[329] Later it became clear that the journalists had also left vital evidence and testimonies of local Albanians out of their film, that witnessed the mass expulsions of Albanians from Kosovo before the NATO bombings had started.[330]

Many observers have considered Kosovo to be an important milestone, if not in the traditional power-driven sense of foreign policy normalization, then certainly in terms of the evolution of German foreign and security policy and strategic culture.[331] In terms of strategic culture, however, the importance lay not only in the historic decision to allow German troops to participate in the actual fighting as part of the NATO bombing campaign, but rather in the conditions and reasoning behind the decision. First of all and significantly, Kosovo was the first war in NATO history that was fought without a UN mandate, because Russia would not allow military strikes against Serbia because they were political allies (and as was the case later on, Russia accused the West of double standards when confronted with the question of Chechnya, Georgia and recently the crisis in Ukraine). In the Western media, politicians argued in favour of NATO airstrikes because it seemed the only way to stop the killing and prevent a humanitarian catastrophe. German Chancellor Schröder also argued strongly in favour of the airstrikes because the sending of German ground troops to Kosovo would have been politically too costly, if not impossible. Second, Kosovo became the first war during which military action was strongly legitimized by the need for a 'humanitarian intervention' since it was clear that the West could have done more to prevent some of the atrocities that took place during the Bosnian war a few years earlier and even before that in Rwanda. The novelty of the issue for German strategic culture since the Kosovo crisis – besides sending combat troops –

---

[329] Loquai, Heinz 2000, *Der Kosovo-Konflikt. Wege in einen vermeidbaren Krieg. Die Zeit von Ende November 1997 bis März 1999*,Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, Baden-Baden 2000, pp. 137-145. Operation Horseshoe was allegedly a Serb plan of ethnic cleansing, yet officials of German Defense Ministry later admitted that the whole plan was bogus.

[330] ,Schöngeredete Apartheid', Der Spiegel, 12.3.2001, 11/2001.

[331] See Lantis, Jeffrey 2002, 'The Moral Imperative of Force: The Evolution of German Strategic Culture in Kosovo', Comparative Strategy, 21:1, pp. 21-46; Baumann, Rainer & Hellmann, Gunther 2001, 'Germany and the use of military force: 'total war', 'the culture of restraint' and the quest for normality', German Politics, Vol.10, Issue 1, 2001, pp. 61-82.

was that 'humanitarian intervention' became something of a standard cue whenever the legitimacy and purpose of Bundeswehr deployment was in question. Moreover, the humanitarian intervention propagated by the West, Germany included, seemed to fit rather well with the re-interpretation of German historical responsibility. Not only did the Germans comply with the requests of their allies (never again alone) but did that in full conscience of their historically re-determined responsibility (never again Auschwitz).

Hence, against this background it is easy to perceive why many considered Kosovo to signify a break with the German past at the time, including many of the leading policy-makers. But there were those who argued that German behaviour was completely in line with the traditional antimilitaristic stance and the concept of Germany as a civilian power.[332] These assessments are more in line with the German actions outside of the battlefield – in the realm of diplomacy. German diplomats had left no stone unturned in order to achieve a peaceful settlement between the conflict parties, however unsuccessful these efforts turned out to be. Germany was also a strong supporter of a unified European response to the Kosovo conflict and was most vocal about the need to bring Russia in to achieve a lasting solution.[333] Moreover, Fischer had already envisaged a draft for a peaceful solution for the region which later came to be known as the Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe that included the prospect of EU-membership for the countries involved.[334]

Overall, the decision to participate in the NATO military campaign against Milosevic and his regime was without a doubt a historic one. The Kosovo conflict, and the crisis in the Balkans more broadly understood, brought an end to unconditional German pacifism and seemed ultimately to confirm that the old Clausewitzian principle that war was a continuation of politics with other means was still valid to a degree because military threats and threats to security and stability simply had not vanished with the end of the Cold War. In that sense, the often-stated argument about 'breaking foreign and security political taboos' (*Enttabuisierung*) in Kosovo is accurate. Yet the difference, at least in Germany, was that the ends of such policies were strictly determined by the humanitarian discourse involving a strong sense of historical awareness and not power politics or inter-state rivalries. Hence, it could be argued that the German policy in the Kosovo conflict could be interpreted as both continuity as well as change in the German strategic posture, because the ideational shift from 'never again' war to 'never again Auschwitz' that had taken place since Srebrenica had now been implemented. In the aftermath, this seemed to be the new course for German strategic culture for the fore-

---

[332] See Maull, Hanns 2000, 'German Foreign Policy, Post-Kosovo: Still a Civilian Power?', German Politics, Vol.9, Issue 2, 2000, pp. 1-24; Hyde Price, Adrian 2001, 'Germany and the Kosovo war: still a civilian power?', German Politics, Vol.10, Issue 1, 2001, pp. 19-34.

[333] ‚Mílošević wird der Verlierer sein', Der Spiegel, 19.4.1999, 16/1999.

[334] Friedrich, Roland 2005, *Die Deutsche Außenpolitik im Kosovo-Konflikt*, VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, Wiesbaden 2005, pp. 104-106.

seeable future as a result of the transformation process in the German Left. There remained only one party in the Bundestag which unequivocally retained its position as a defender of unconditional pacifism, the PDS (later die Linke). However, the 9/11 terrorist strikes in 2001 and the subsequently propagated war on terror would not only divide Europe but also Germans on the issue of military deployment once again. This was already the case prior to 9/11, considering the contradictory debate on the German contribution to the NATO-led operation in Macedonia in 2001.[335]

3.6. SUMMARY – STRATEGIC CULTURAL CHANGE FROM 1945 TO THE WAR IN KOSOVO

To conclude this chapter, I will now elaborate more closely the different cases in terms of the analytical model presented in Chapter 2.3. The purpose of this exercise is to knit the analytical framework more closely together with the individual cases as well as to provide a synthesis of the process of strategic cultural change in the given period. I will also briefly contrast this analysis with Wendt's conception of cultures of anarchy in order to bring a contrasting / complementary system-level view to the table.

Cold War

In terms of fundamental/incremental change, the most comprehensive change during the Cold War undoubtedly came in the form of a reformation of German strategic culture and of Germany turning towards the West. This was due to the external shock of the collapsing strategic culture of the Third Reich which was essentially caused by German defeat in WW II. The reformation of German post-WW II strategic culture stands out as a comprehensive change due to the process of rethinking and reconceptualizing German strategic thought and potential role in international security and defence policy. However, during the Cold War German strategic culture was poised towards maintaining the status quo firstly, due to the external constraints put on German armed forces and German ability to project military power and secondly, due to the socializing effects of Europeanization and Westernization on German polity. The reformulation of German strategic thought in the form of 'never again' was to ensure not only that Germany upheld its commitments to NATO and its allies but also to ensure that Germany would never again play the role of the aggressor in initiating war and conflict. The foundation of 'never again' also served the purpose of solidifying German

---

[335] See ‚Rühe warnt vor hohen Risiken bei Mazedonien-Einsatz', die Welt, 19.8.2001; ‚Mazedonien: SPD: Zustimmung für Einsatz sicher', der Tagesspiegel, 28.7.2001; ‚Parlament streitet über Marschbefehl', Handelsblatt, 19.8.2001. Available at: (http://www.handelsblatt.com/archiv/zahl-der-spd-gegner-eines-mazedonien-mandats-waechst-parlament-streitet-ueber-marschbefehl/2091012.html).

international role image as a civilian power, which was well established in German strategic culture throughout the Cold War. However, it is important to point out that these fundamental changes at the level of strategic thought did not materialize in fundamental change at the level of strategic action, because they principally underlined the notions of anti-militarism, restraint in all things military as well as German boundedness to NATO, UN and EC, i.e. the Western political institutions. Overall, the Cold War decades paint a rather static view of German strategic culture that had to operate carefully based on the fact that Germany was considered a front-line state in a nuclear, bipolar world.

Regarding Wendt's model of culture of anarchy, the early Cold War decades can be argued to be a transition period from a devastating war (5-6 years of Hobbesian anarchy?) back to a Lockean system where war certainly was an option, but not a logical means of interstate interaction given the destructive power of nuclear weapons. We can certainly argue that Wendt's major variables regarding structural change seemed to be increasing at a systemic level given the formation of collective institutions of security such as NATO, EC and the UN, which all underlined the importance of interdependence and expressed common fate among their members. However, and in contrast, self-restraint at the system level was internalized only to the degree that the existence of nuclear weapons forced states toward self-restraint. Also, states did not collectively renounce conventional warfare as a form of international interaction despite the fact that treaties were formed to express the contrary (e.g. the CFE Treaty).

In terms of the hypotheses made about the links between Wendt's model and strategic cultural change, we can argue that the early Cold War decades seem to confirm the first hypothesis, namely, that changes in German strategic culture (formation of a new strategic culture) were conditioned by structural changes after the end of World War II. Interdependence and common fate certainly played a key role for Germany, whose policies were firmly directed towards the West and its collective institutions. In addition, military self-restraint was not only accepted but was also established as a German *raison d'être*. These developments in the early decades after World War II seem at least partly to confirm the second hypothesis made regarding Wendt's model. Strategic cultural change, i.e. the formation of a new strategic culture after the end of World War II, was necessary for Germany's survival, but it was largely dependent on external constraints imposed on Germany. However, I would also argue that the process of domestic internalization of the principal lessons of never again played a crucial role in how that new strategic culture was established and more importantly, sustained throughout the Cold War decades. Even though it could be argued that this process was forced upon Germany externally since Germany was basically left without a choice, it would be far-fetched to argue that Germans would have learned different lessons from their past in the absence of external constraints given the devastation and 'total war' of World War II. Hence, system-

level features only partly explain German strategic cultural change during the Cold War. The experience of warfare (German defeat and the devastation of World War II) functioned as the primary causal mechanism in the reformation of German strategic culture.

Reunification, first Gulf War and Bosnia

The end of the Cold War did not specifically alter the content of strategic thought in Germany – 'never again' remained the cornerstone upon which it was built. However, the end of the Cold War functioned as an important stepping stone in facilitating the later changes in German strategic culture. Significantly, it provided the external conditions for an expansion in the scope and depth of German strategic action. But perhaps most importantly and somewhat paradoxically, the end of the Cold War and the structural changes with the destabilizing effects that came with it also brought 'war' back to Germany. This was immediately detectable during the first Gulf War during which Germany remained on the side-lines and received a lot of international flak for doing so. This conflict also revealed the extent to which the Cold War tenets of German strategic culture (antimilitarism, culture of restraint) seemed to be at odds with the emerging new world order. As argued above, in Germany, the situation after reunification and the end of the Cold War was politically very delicate. The Gulf War struck a chord in Germany since Germany was now faced with the external pressure that demanded exactly the opposite of Germany's decades-long commitment to self-restraint. In a way, the Gulf War could be seen as some sort of a wake-up call for Germany to the post-Cold War political reality, which seemed to reaffirm the Lockean logic of rivalry of the long Cold War years, even though in itself it did not present an external shock forceful enough to facilitate tangible change in strategic culture. Rivalry still remained the prevalent logic of post-Cold War international politics at the system level, which did not sit well with Germany's nascent strategic culture that at the time was built strongly on the notions of antimilitarism and self-restraint.

In essence, the shift from bipolarity to multipolarity meant that power was distributed more evenly among the units in the system which theoretically need not necessarily have anything to do with the logic of how states interact with each other. Indeed, while the end of the Cold War prompted the shift from bipolarity to multipolarity and led to the cessation of the rivalry between the two superpowers (US and USSR), rivalry between the US and Russia continued. However, with the Maastricht Treaty, the EU established

itself as one of the poles in the multipolar system[336] – the EU (and NATO) are perhaps the best examples of nascent Kantian cultures of anarchy because the interaction among their members is based on friendship.

Nonetheless, if we contrast the argument regarding the continuity of German strategic culture with the Wendtian model in the immediate aftermath of the Cold War, it was precisely the domestic developments and the institutionalization of the 'never again' normative framework which made German strategic culture substantially more progressive than the culture of Lockean anarchy that was driven at the system level. If we project this against Wendt's model, its explanatory power becomes questionable in terms of strategic cultural change and we have to reject the hypotheses made in Chapter 2.4. Firstly, strategic cultural change would seem improbable for Germany because in Wendtian terms, it would in effect mean cultural regress, not progress (if anarchy evolves from Lockean to Kantian as Wendt has claimed and if we accept the notion that the nascent German strategic culture after the end of the Cold War aimed to sustain a more progressive Kantian logic). Secondly, Wendt's model does not take into account that Germany's relative power vis-à-vis the system level and other units had grown considerably with the end of the Cold War and German reunification. Germany was hence able to resist the external pressure of the systemic logic better. Indeed, it was clear at the time that Germany was neither willing nor ready to abide by the Lockean logic of anarchy (if abiding by the logic in effect meant that Germany would periodically have the potential to use military force). Importantly, however, if we were to frame the issue in systemic terms, we could argue that it was precisely Germany's evolving relationship with the reality of the prevailing logic of Lockean anarchy that would cause problems for Germany and its strategic culture in the course of the 1990s. This particularly came to the fore in the break-up of former Yugoslavia and the wars that erupted as a result.

In contrast to the Gulf War, the war in the former Yugoslavia and particularly the massacre at Srebrenica in Bosnia stands out as an external shock that has had the most profound impact on German strategic culture since the end of the Cold War. Firstly, it facilitated the normative change in the 'never again' framework – from 'never again war' to 'never again Auschwitz'. Secondly, the escalating war in the Balkans basically led to the sanctioning of Bundeswehr out-of-area operations with the Constitutional Court's ruling in 1994[337], hence representing a major break from the Cold War credo of territorial defence. Thirdly, Bosnia not only problematized the Germans' relation-

---

[336] Van Langenhove describes 'poles' as "states endowed with the resources, political will and institutional ability to project their interests at the global level". See Van Langenhove, Luk 2010, 'The EU as a Global Actor in a Multipolar World and Multilateral 2.0 Environment', Egmont Paper 36. Brussels, Egmont Royal Institute for, International Relations, March 2010, p. 6. Multipolarity describes a situation at the system level in which power is relatively equally distributed across three or more poles.

[337] See pp. 104-105 for more detail.

ships to peace and war, but it also questioned German strategic behaviour, i.e. 'never again alone'. This could not only be detected in the alleged German 'unilateralism' regarding its recognition policy towards the secessionist Yugoslav republics, but also in the re-emerging debate regarding German 'normalization' and 'Sonderweg'. Most importantly, though, Bosnia and Srebrenica in particular questioned the continuity of the strategic foundations of German security and defence policy and scrutinized the position of 'ethical pacifists' in Germany.

Indeed, the developments since the Gulf War and particularly beginning with Bosnia and especially the massacre at Srebrenica brought into light the normative discrepancy which basically pulled German strategic culture in two different directions which were not compatible in political terms. I will argue about the causal relevance of Srebrenica in terms of German strategic cultural change in detail in Chapter 5 and it is therefore not necessary to delve into that discussion here. For the purposes of the argument and related to the claims of the Wendtian model of anarchy, let us here instead proceed with the claim that it was a causally significant event in bringing about the observed outcome, i.e. the change in the normative structure of German strategic culture (which then enabled the introduction of a new strategic practice – the use of force to prevent genocide, 'never again Auschwitz').

This is a hard case for the Wendtian model. The main reason is the fact that the Wendtian model implies that changes at the unit level regarding the use of military force are relatively unimportant unless they somehow drastically affect the process of change on the system level (otherwise they just contribute to the status quo / continuity of the given logic of anarchy). Hence, it is the argument of the Wendtian model that the prevailing logic at the macro level, not the individual logic at the micro level, ultimately decides how states react to issues that deal with the use of military force. The fact that the logic in the relationship between the Western coalition (NATO) and the Serbian government could be seen as based on something other than friendship (enmity, rivalry) at the time doesn't tell us very much about why Germany chose to reconsider its position in terms of the use of force. Neither does the fact that the interaction within NATO is based on friendship sufficiently explain why Germany took part in the conflict management operations militarily (even though it explains it to a degree since it aligns with 'never again alone'). Rather, as described above, these changes were not brought about by systemic variables, but by external shocks that fed directly into the German national experience of warfare. Hence, the above analysis on Bosnia and Srebrenica does not lend any particular support to a system-level explanation of strategic cultural change in Germany at the time, even though the structural change within the international system that was brought about by the end of the Cold War was a necessary precondition for the expansion of the scope and depth of German strategic action. In summary, while Bosnia and Srebrenica showcased the difficulty of maintaining continuity within German strategic culture and the fact that Germany was struggling with the

prevailing logic of Lockean anarchy, Germany did not change its stance towards the use of force due to a systemic logic of interaction.

Kosovo

The significance of Kosovo in terms of strategic cultural change in Germany lies in that it principally highlighted the effects of the normative shift after Srebrenica, that was now realized in terms of strategic action as Germany took part in the NATO bombing campaign. It seems plausible to argue that the normative shift after Srebrenica was a necessary precondition for German involvement in Kosovo. However, the fact that the Schröder government was under considerable pressure and seemed to go against the grain of the left supporter base seemed to indicate that other external factors actually played a crucial role in facilitating German participation in Kosovo. In terms of our analytical model, peer pressure stands out as one of the more important mechanisms as it was bolstered by 'never again alone' at the normative level, which seemed to surpass the very real problem of the potential Red-Green coalition break-up.

The case of Kosovo seems at first to be a rather solid case for probing Wendt's claims on anarchy. Firstly, German strategic behaviour in Kosovo seemed to correspond with how states are assumed to coalesce against a norm breaker in the system, according to Wendt. While this can also be argued to have been the case in Bosnia to a degree, the West acted much more cohesively and robustly in Kosovo. Secondly, the political consensus within the German government had shifted from 'never again war' to 'never again Auschwitz' which gave the political elite leeway in legitimating the decision of German military participation. Moreover, while especially the Greens had a hard time with the decision over Kosovo (as indicated by the debates during the party conference in Bielefeld in 1999), the argument can also be made that they moved due to external pressure since it is more than likely that the newly-elected Red-Green coalition would not have survived a Green compromise on the issue. The Green 'Realo' foreign minister Fischer clearly portrayed Milosevic and his regime as a 'rival' that had to be dealt with military force if necessary.

Importantly, however, as argued, NATO air war was deemed illegitimate in terms of the UN Charter because it wasn't based on a UNSC mandate, which was one of the reasons why the political debate surrounding Kosovo was controversial. The German Left (PDS/Die Linke) was consistent in its argumentation that the NATO's air war was illegal, which has basically been the position of the party on international interventions ever since it has been represented in the Bundestag. Moreover, Russia was vehemently against the NATO military intervention, a fact which was of great concern especially for German social democrats. In a sense, the West was breaking its own norms by coalescing against a norm breaker without the approval of the UNSC.

The NATO air war was clearly a violation of international law and the sovereignty of one of the members in the system, and was on one hand a blow to the credibility of international society to maintain its own principles, while maintaining international peace, on the other. These developments hampered the path towards a Kantian system because it seemed that the states system wasn't ready for a wide acknowledgment of self-restraint. The argument can also be made that Kosovo was the first litmus test for whether and to what degree German strategic culture would comply with the logic that it faced at the system level. The degree to which this would have occurred had the German polity not reinterpreted the meanings of the German past the way it did is uncertain. I will return to discuss this in Chapter 5.4.

To summarize, in terms of the causal mechanisms presented in the analytical model, the evolving experience of warfare stands out as the most crucial one in bringing about tangible change in strategic culture. However, it is crucial to point out that the actualization of this change did not manifest itself only in terms of the shift from 'never again war' to 'never again Auschwitz' and the subsequent German participation in military crisis management (outcome). It was also an important part of an ongoing process where the tenets of Cold War German strategic culture were pitted against the emerging post-Cold War political reality. Indeed, the 'second order' mechanisms that had ensured continuity in German strategic culture during the Cold War in form of socialization and peer pressure by establishing a strategic culture based on military restraint in a political and military alliance with the West were steering German strategic culture towards uncharted waters after German re-unification. Instead of non-action and military restraint, these mechanisms now pulled in the opposite direction, but not only that – they also reinforced the 'never again alone' principle. This came to the fore particularly during the Gulf War and later in Kosovo. What is more, the end of the Cold War created a 'capability-expectations' gap in German strategic culture that the Kohl government and the conservatives were committed to closing by policies often referred to as incremental change in the form of 'salami tactics'.[338] German participation in IFOR/SFOR and the NATO bombings in Kosovo testified to the fact that this gap had at least temporarily been closed. However, the evolving experience of warfare during the 1990s revealed another gap which had rather more to do with German willingness to use force than its capability to do so. While peer pressure and socialization within NATO and the nascent EU called for increased German activism in the field of security and defence, Germany was not willing to draw the conclusion that increased activism was inevitably to be equated with increased use of military force. The cases of Bosnia and Kosovo disclosed that the main reason lay in the mechanism of evolving experience of warfare - which by generating tangible change at the normative level simultaneously created a sense of uncer-

---

[338] See Chapter 5.4. for more detail.

tainty as to where German strategic culture was going and into what sort of an entity it was incrementally transforming.

Indeed, this seems to be the most important thing to take from this period in terms of the evolution of German strategic culture. Hence, the fact that Germany participated in actual combat alongside its NATO partners for the first time since the end of World War II is an interesting and a significant outcome in terms of strategic cultural change in its own right. However, the discrepancy that the experience of the Balkan wars created, with reflections on the German past within the normative structure of German strategic culture ultimately suggests that the causal mechanisms involved were also capable of potentially leading to different outcomes. To put it in another way, German military participation in the Balkans was anything but inevitable. Interestingly, however, it seems that neither persuasion, peer pressure nor socialization were sufficient to bring about German military participation and that the normative shift in the mid-1990s was a necessary condition for this outcome to be actualized a few years later in Kosovo.

The benefit of applying the proposed analytical framework of strategic cultural change can be detected in the strong case made about Srebrenica as an external shock that was crucial in triggering fundamental change in German strategic culture in the period from Bosnia to Kosovo – as exemplified in terms of the evolving process of experiences related to war and warfare. The added value of the framework also lies in the realization that external shocks are not necessarily determined by specific moments in time prompted by 'grand scale' historical events (e.g. the end of the Cold War), but can arise out of geopolitical situations of lesser magnitude that can lead to cultural adaptation and transformation. This differentiates the analytical framework from notions that stress the role of structure in facilitating change, i.e. 'critical junctures' or 'unsettled' periods during which it is argued that change is more likely to happen.[339] We can certainly describe the period from Srebrenica to Kosovo in terms of political uncertainty in German strategic culture (as opposed to the period from 1991 to 1993, for instance), but as will be argued in the next chapter, this did not lead to a period of 'structural stability' in terms of strategic culture, if we take that to refer to the overall stability of discursive and other practices of the entity in question. Hence, the argument that structural uncertainty facilitates strategic cultural change is too vague, because it refers to the instability of a set of structural conditions (institutional, economic, political etc.) without assessing the specific factors that were either sufficient or necessary in bringing about change.

---

[339] See Chapter 2.3 for a discussion on 'critical junctures' and 'unsettled periods'.

4 'IM EINSATZ' – GERMAN STRATEGIC CULTURE FROM AFGHANISTAN TO LIBYA AND BEYOND

4.1. THE WAR ON TERROR: FROM AFGHANISTAN TO IRAQ – A NEW GERMAN 'SONDERWEG'?

"We can't let the lie win the day, the lie which proclaims that the terrorists are fighting for the oppressed people of the world. Bin Laden is no Robin Hood."[340] (Peter Struck)

On the day after the 9/11 terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and Pentagon in New York and Washington, German Chancellor Schröder made a governmental statement at the Bundestag regarding the attacks. Schröder said: "Ladies and Gentlemen, I've expressed the deep sympathy of the German people towards the American President. I've promised him our unconditional – I stress: unconditional – solidarity."[341] The Bundestag discussed the situation in a long plenary session on 19 September 2001.[342] Schröder described how the Americans had freed the Germans from the Nazi yoke and that Germany was eternally grateful for the US for enabling German integration into the West and finally making German re-unification possible. But Schröder said also that German gratefulness, albeit an important and weighty category would not suffice as the sole basis for the 'existential decisions' that would perhaps have to be made. He made clear that the decisions would be made solely in terms of securing the future viability of Germany in a free world. Yet he referred to UN Resolution 1368 which made a new interpretation of the existing international law which could, according to Schröder, now enable firm actions, potentially also military ones, against international terrorism. Schröder said also that Germany fully supported the UNSC stance as well as the reinterpretation made by the NATO Council, namely, that a terrorist attack against a NATO-member state was in accordance with the interpretation of Article V of the North Atlantic Treaty as an attack against all NATO partners. Schröder argued that the US had the right to pursue the perpetrators and masterminds behind the 9/11 attacks including states which provided shelter for terrorist activities. This reinterpretation of the international law exemplified in UN resolution 1368 and the German 'unconditional responsibility' he had promised, would also have to be understood in this spirit. Schröder confirmed that Germany was ready for military action if necessary and required but would not venture into any

---

[340] Deutscher Bundestag, Plenarprotokoll 14/192, (11.10.2001), p. 18689.

[341] Deutscher Bundestag, Plenarprotokoll 14/186, (12.9.2001).

[342] Deutscher Bundestag, Plenarprotokoll 14/187, (19.9.2001).

kind of adventures. The Chancellor also noted that a fixation solely on military means was the wrong way to go and that Germany wanted an extensive concept for fighting terrorism, which had to be founded on the grounds of political, cultural and economic co-operation.[343]

The tone of the plenary session was consensual in the sense that the opposition parties mostly agreed with Schröder's notion of 'unlimited solidarity'. Yet there were some differences in how this was interpreted. Politicians on the right were more eager to interpret this as de facto military assistance to the US, whereas those on the left stressed the need for a collective anti-terrorist alliance, which should exhaust economic, political and cultural means and not only military ones. The whole Bundestag, however, had a joint understanding that 9/11 had changed the world and created the need to establish a new kind of security policy as a solid strategic fundament for tackling the upcoming challenges of the 21st Century. Many MPs also stressed the fact that the fight against terrorism was not about the clash of cultures but about a battle of civilization against barbarism. A common understanding emerged within the Bundestag (with the exception of the PDS) that now was the time for Germany to stand by the US, no matter what. Some MPs, such as Angela Merkel (CDU) raised the question of Germany's future role – whether Germany was capable of becoming a political power besides being an economic one. The underlying idea behind a new concept of security, which emerged in the discussion, was based on the interplay between civilian and military means in a bipartisan understanding. This occurred even though the need to reassess the Bundeswehr capacities and tasks and to review the freshly introduced budget in terms of defence spending was raised by the opposition.[344]

The Bundestag discussed the Operation Enduring Freedom and Germany's role in it three weeks later.[345] Chancellor Schröder's rhetoric had remained much the same. He deemed the American response to the terrorist strikes as 'necessary' and 'justified'. According to Schröder, Germany had to show the kind of solidarity, which did not only pay lip service but was appropriate to Germany's responsibility at the international stage. The US and Germany were not fighting a war against another state but against a criminal Taliban regime in Afghanistan. Schröder pointed to the necessity of German solidarity in the actual situation – a necessity which had not only historical and contemporary reasons, but which was also important considering Germany's future position in international politics. Importantly, he stressed that the time of cheque-book diplomacy was over and that it was time for Germans to take international responsibility. According to Schröder, this unmis-

---

[343] Ibid., pp. 18301-5.

[344] Ibid., p. 18315; p. 18325.

[345] Deutscher Bundestag, Plenarprotokoll 14/192, (11.10.2001).

takably meant the deployment of military force in the defence of freedom and human rights in order to create stability and security.[346]

Schröder's speech can also be interpreted as being aimed at shifting the focus in the debate concerning the future orientation of German strategic culture: he argued that the readiness to provide security also via military means was an important confession to Germany's alliances and partnerships. But not only that – Schröder also said that in order to come to terms with Germany's greater responsibility for international security, Germany had to develop a new self-understanding in its foreign and security policy. He also argued that accepting international responsibility and simultaneously avoiding every immediate risk could not be the guiding principle of these policies. However, Schröder acknowledged the fears in the German citizenry towards anti-terrorist military actions and noted that German civil society was more skeptical than ever towards the deployment of military means against terrorism. Schröder saw this skepticism as 'a progress in terms of civilization', even though it sometimes made it more difficult to argue in favour of the use of military means as a necessity.[347]

The Chancellor noted that for him personally, the well-justified restraint that existed within German society was always more welcome than any form of 'Hooray-patriotism'. He pointed to the links between terrorism and the continuing crisis in the Middle East, the peaceful resolution of which needed highest political priority in the current situation. Schröder concluded that the German concept of security was extensive and had already been introduced, and partly also implemented during the conflicts in the Balkans: it consisted not only of material security and social security, but also of legal security. The concept also entailed the ability to put up a fight understood in this context – hence the concept also had a special European quality to it.[348] However, there is no denying that while declaring unlimited solidarity with the US, Schröder remained skeptical concerning the ultimate motives of American politics. Nonetheless, the precariousness of the situation also made it easier to pick up the subject of German international responsibility in the field of military deployments in the domestic political arena.

The argument put forward by the CDU/CSU was that 9/11 had consequences but it would be wrong to say that everything had changed as a result. What remained were the values and the respect for human dignity and above all the chance to stand up for them and for freedom and justice stronger than ever before. Germans had to play a leading role in the fight for human rights and against terrorism in the 21st Century. This could be achieved by finally making Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) a reality and by making the EU a central pole in the *Weltinnenpolitik* (understood as a new concept of 'world domestic policy'). Alliances that were based on shared

---

[346] Ibid., pp. 18680-4.

[347] Ibid.

[348] Ibid.

values were important but the end of the Cold War had not led to value neutrality but was the result of advocating human rights and the values of freedom and democracy. The argument was that the common interests in the fight against terrorism could not lead to an immediate acceptance of Russia into NATO, for instance. The Union acknowledged that the use of military means was indispensable in the fight against terrorism but that it could not be the solution in the long term. 9/11 had blurred the boundaries of internal and external security in the sense that the terrorists had acted from the midst of open societies which posed a new kind of threat. That is why there should be no segregation between internal and external security – "there is only the threat", as Merkel posited. The threats had changed and that they required new thinking and above all resolute and coherent action: "The mission for Germany in the 21st Century will be to act consistently, considerately and consequently without compromise."[349]

Social Democrats argued that the whole extent of the fight against terrorism had become more precise since 9/11. A complex and multi-layered strategy against terrorism was deemed necessary – a strategy which had to be based on political, economic, financial, cultural and military elements and development aid. As Peter Struck put it: "We need an intellectual-political examination of the kind of thinking, which questions every value based on freedom and democracy. We can't let the lie win the day, the lie which proclaims that the terrorists are fighting for the oppressed people of the world. Bin Laden is no Robin Hood."[350]

The Greens argued in a similar vein that the answer to terrorism had to be extensive. Military aspects of that answer were currently in spotlight, but a focus on economic and political issues was also needed. In addition, a stronger cultural dialogue was indispensable in the conflict-ridden world. According to Foreign Minister Fischer, the task was no less than devising a draft for a peace policy in the 21st Century. In contrast to the Cold War days this policy meant establishing an 'international politics of order' pitted against international terrorism. This meant creating a world order which did not allow zones without or a complete loss of political order, as was the case in many parts of the world. This point was important not only in the sense of the dangers, which could arise within these zones without order, but even more importantly, in the sense of attempting to alleviate the suffering of the civilian population within these zones. If there was anything about the creation of the new world order everyone could be critical about it was the fact of living in the illusion of a peaceful world. Multilateralism would determine much of the international politics of the 21st Century and that was also an important consequence of 9/11. Among the objectives of Islamic terrorism was to destroy the state of Israel and that was something the Germans could never allow to happen because of Germany's historical responsibility towards

---

[349] Ibid., pp. 18684-8.

[350] Ibid., pp. 18688-90.

Jews and Israelis. Germany would resolutely condemn every act of such terrorism against Israel irrespective of its origins – whether instigated by Bin Laden, Islamic Jihad, Hezbollah or whomever. Germany was committed to securing the existential right of Israel and its right to secure borders and peace. As a 'friend of the Israeli people' Germany was just as committed to the peace process in the Middle East – a process which acknowledged the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people. These rights included autonomy and the possible option of a state of their own, but with the caveat of the existential right of Israel as well as taking into account Israeli security interests. Moreover, the central axis of the international politics was moving and Russia would also emerge more strongly on the world stage. This was in the interests of Europe but Europe would have to be united in its policies towards Russia unless it wanted to make a severe strategic mistake. A united Europe was one of the powerful poles of the 21st Century, not Great-Britain, France or Germany individually.[351]

The PDS argued in defence of its position that it had not resorted to radical pacifism. The PDS was arguably not a pacifistic party even though pacifists and their principal objection of armed violence were highly appreciated among the party's ranks: "There are more things between heaven and earth than just pure pacifism and unbound solidarity between the NATO members."[352]

The Bundestag debated the actual German participation in the Operation Enduring Freedom on 8 November and 16 November 2001.[353] Chancellor Schröder argued that Germany had to do more than just show solidarity because the terrorist attacks on 9/11 constituted not only a case against the American way of life but also against the German Basic Law and the values upon which it was built. Schröder said that Germany would meet the American requests and send 3,900 troops to be deployed as part of Enduring Freedom, consisting of reconnaissance, ground and naval units. Schröder stressed that the German deployment was not about participating in the actual bombing or fighting on the ground and that German participation in Enduring Freedom should be understood as proof that Germany had grown ready to bear more responsibility internationally. According to the rather confusing formulation of the Chancellor, the German deployment was not about implementing a foreign political strategy; it was about implementing Germany's own interests and protecting its values. Schröder also made clear that terrorism could not be won solely by using military means, which were an indispensable but only one part of a strategy for international security and peace.[354]

---

[351] Ibid., pp. 18690-92.

[352] Ibid., pp. 16895-6.

[353] Deutscher Bundestag, Plenarprotokoll 14/198, (8.11.2001); Deutscher Bundestag, Plenarprotokoll 14/202, (16.11.2001).

[354] Deutscher Bundestag, Plenarprotokoll 14/198, pp. 19283-7.

The Chancellor concluded by noting that Germany had participated in military deployments with the international community whenever these deployments had been deemed as necessary, objectively possible and justifiable, like in the Balkans. He stressed that the decisions to participate militarily had always been accompanied with sustained political, economic and humanitarian engagement and that this was also the basis in the German fight against terrorism. The Chancellor argued that the decision to deploy the Bundeswehr in the fight against terrorism was definitely 'a turning point' because it was the first time that the international situation and terrorism forced Germans to deploy the armed forces in a military operation outside the Alliance territory.[355] . Schröder had to be meticulous in navigating between the pledges made to the US and the domestic political terrain. Ultimately, he was forced to tie his policy on Afghanistan to a vote of confidence in November 2001, because of growing concerns among the governing parties, especially the Greens, regarding US actions in Afghanistan. Schröder won the vote but only narrowly – with the opposition parties CDU/CSU and FDP voting against it, even though they had principally supported the US policy on Afghanistan from the start.[356] However, at the SPD party conference in Nuremberg a few days after the debate, Schröder was re-elected as party chair with a record majority of more than 88% of the delegates.[357]

Social Democrats argued that the question about German military deployment was more important than just dispatching soldiers. Germany's reliability was at stake and that if Germany would say no to Enduring Freedom, it would have to sheer itself off from the international anti-terrorism coalition, which in turn would lead to isolation.[358] The war in Afghanistan was neither a traditional war between states nor a war of aggression but an attempt to destroy terrorist networks and prevent attacks such as that of 9/11 altogether.[359] The argument was that it had always been an essential requirement for both the SPD and the Greens that international law be upheld in the military operations as well as sanctioned by the UN. The problematic legal status of the Kosovo mission made its own mark on the discussion and certainly did not make a decision one way or the other any easier, as long as the international law was not evolving. As long as that was the case, the SPD argued, the UNSC should remain the authority on the issue. Germany was right to show solidarity to the Americans, which did not have to mean an unconditional support of US military strategy: "A culture of doubt has to have

---

[355] Deutscher Bundestag, Plenarprotokoll 14/202, pp. 19856-8.

[356] ‚Schröder besteht die Machtprobe', Süddeutsche Zeitung, 17.10.2010. Available at:

(http://www.sueddeutsche.de/politik/vertarauensfrage-schroeder-besteht-machtprobe-1.318253.

[357] ‚Schröder mit über 88% gewählt', Schwäbische Zeitung, 20.11.2011. Available at:

(http://www.schwaebische.de/home_artikel,-_arid,322159.html).

[358] Deutscher Bundestag, Plenarprotokoll 14/202, pp.19862-5.

[359] Ibid., pp. 19871-3.

some room, and this has to pertain to the discussion on the military deployment as well."[360]

The Greens had not shaken their deep skepticism towards all things military, but the sentiment within the party was that a clear majority would vote for Bundeswehr deployment in Afghanistan. The Greens referred to Chancellor Schröder's clarification regarding the Bundeswehr mandate, namely, that Germany would neither deploy combat troops on the ground nor participate in the bombing campaign against Taliban.[361] Foreign Minister Fischer referred to German history and argued that even though war had brought immense suffering and destruction to Germany, it was because of the domestic oppression and the dictatorship that had trampled human rights which made the outbreak of World War II possible in the first place. That is why the present-day Germany had the responsibility to act not only based on the lesson 'never again war' but to oppose violence wherever it threatened the most basic elements of peaceful coexistence. Fischer acknowledged that war was despicable and that he understood the emotions considering the unavoidable civilian casualties that accompanied every war. Yet he reminded everyone that it wasn't America who had attacked but America was the one which was under attack and argued that even though it was dreadful, there was something such as 'pacifistic real-political consequence'. Hence, the consequence was to act militarily, even though the background of the Greens stemmed from the lesson 'never again war'. If Germans had something to criticize about themselves, then it was the fact that during the last decade, Germany had harboured the illusion of collecting peace dividends without investing in the peace itself. In concrete terms, this meant that the US should not revert to a unilateralist track but should work with Europe and embark on a preventive peace-policy throughout the world – peace policy meaning something else than the use of the military means, which would always remain, so Fischer, *ultima ratio*.[362]

The opposition (CDU/CSU and FDP) backed the government position on German military participation but would not vote for it since Schröder tied the decision of Bundeswehr deployment to a vote of confidence. Criticism was voiced on how Heidemarie Wieczoreck-Zeul (SPD), Minister for Development Aid, had publicly stated that a ceasefire was needed and that the conservatives, who backed the government policies, were simultaneously denigrated as warmongers. The Union argued that the successes in Afghanistan showed that Germany's solidarity comes very late, if ever: "It is similar to a fire brigade which deploys only when it has made sure that the fire has already been put out. Bundeswehr wields a similar role as does our whole

---

[360] Ibid., pp. 19883-5.

[361] Ibid., p. 19868.

[362] Deutscher Bundestag, Plenarprotokoll 14/198, pp. 19293-6; Deutscher Bundestag, Plenarprotokoll 14/202, pp. 19877-879.

country".[363] The FDP claimed that a major break in German foreign and security policy was at hand which was due to the change in the self-conception of German responsibility. This change entailed the notion that Germany could no longer remain neutral in the face of international terrorism.[364]

In summary, Germany stood politically united behind its Western partners, particularly the US and there were very few dissident voices in considerations about the German support for the operation in Afghanistan (with the usual exception of the PDS). The reason why Germany was as united as it was in its actions was mainly because the fears of a possible war were silenced by the tragedy of 9/11 and the sympathy and solidarity that the Germans felt towards Americans in its immediate aftermath. Overall, the message that the Federal government was trying to convey was clear: the changes in international security after 9/11 posed challenges to such a magnitude that now was the time for Germans to 'remove the military taboos' (*Enttabuisierung des Militärischen*).[365] And yet, despite the initial feelings of solidarity towards the US, the overall sentiment in Germany did not reflect Schröder's optimism, and this was echoed among the governing parties, the SPD and the Greens. As was already evident during the latter debates, the German position of 'unlimited solidarity' would not translate into a wholesale acceptance of the US military strategy. As these debates showed, German preference was still clearly on the political and economic end of the spectrum, even though it was willing to act as a reliable partner in the fight against international terrorism. Hence, after the vote of confidence was narrowly passed, Germany could begin with the deployment of the planned 3,900 troops to the Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF). OEF mainly focused on the fight against terrorism, whereas the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) that was deployed after the Petersberg meeting in December 2001 was the military component of NATO's Afghanistan operation. Mandated by the UN and led by NATO since 2003, ISAF was tasked with addressing the overall security situation in Afghanistan and aid local governance via counterinsurgency (COIN) activities. Crucially, however, the original purpose of ISAF according to UN Resolution 1386 was to assist the Afghan government in the area in and around Kabul[366], and therefore German politicians originally referred to ISAF as a 'peace-keeping' mission. Bundestag approved of sending 1200 troops to ISAF in December 2001 and the vote was almost unanimously accepted, in stark contrast to the vote on OEF. This was clearly due to the difference in the original roles envisaged for OEF on one hand, and ISAF, on the

---

[363] Deutscher Bundestag, Plenarprotokoll 14/202, pp. 19873-7.

[364] Ibid., pp. 19879-81.

[365] See e.g. ,Eine Neue Form der Selbstverteidigung', Bundeskanzler Gerhard Schröder über die Bedrohung der westlichen Zivilsation und Deutschlands Rolle in der Welt, DIE ZEIT, 18.10.2001.

[366] UN Security Council Resolution 1386 on the situation in Afghanistan (2001). Available at: (http://www.un.org/Docs/scres/2001/sc2001.htm).

other.[367] However, German involvement in the OEF turned out to be rather uneventful whereas the ISAF slowly turned from providing assistance to taking part in counterinsurgency operations. Hence, the shift from peacekeeping to peace-enforcing was evident as the operation progressed.

German deployment as part of the OEF/ISAF contingent in Afghanistan was literally new and uncharted territory for Germany and its strategic culture. It was the first time Germany had dealt with counter-terrorism and counter-insurgency operations of major international scale. This was initially reflected in the debates concerning the Bundestag approval of German participation: Germany would participate primarily to show solidarity in the alliance and hence prove to be a reliable partner. As Hilpert has noted, the debate on the military threat of Taliban was barely mentioned.[368]

The security situation in Afghanistan began to deteriorate in 2003. In the summer of 2003, four German soldiers were killed in an attack against an unarmoured bus transporting German soldiers to the airport. As a result, ten armoured personnel carriers (*Fuchs-Radpanzer*) were sent to take control over the transport between the German base and the airport.[369] However, patrols continued to be conducted in unarmoured vehicles, which was a symptom of a discrepancy between the German political elite still viewing Afghanistan primarily as a 'stabilizing mission' and the deteriorating security situation for Bundeswehr troops on the ground. Given the US' priority on the war in Iraq over Afghanistan, the then German Defence Minister Peter Struck (SDP) began to think about Germany expanding its operational remit to the northern part of Afghanistan in 2003. Struck justified his decision by stating that Germany faced a turning point in Afghanistan: Germany had both to expand and export security beyond Kabul to more insecure regions, or to withdraw completely and leave the country to the Taliban and Al Qaeda, which were now increasingly active in the southeastern part of the country. In order to coordinate the work of the Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRT) operating under ISAF better, NATO formed regional commands throughout Afghanistan.[370] Germany took control of Regional Command

---

[367] Deutscher Bundestag, Antrag der Bundesregierung. Beteilung bewaffneter deutscher Streitkräfte an dem Einsatz einer Internationalen Sicherheitsunterstützungstruppe in Afghanistan auf Grundlage der Resolutionen 1386 (2001), 1383 (2001) und 1378 (2001) des Sicherheitsrats der Vereinten Nationen. Drucksache 14/7930, 21.12.2001. Available at: (http://dipbt.bundestag.de/dip21/btd/14/079/140 7930.pdf).

[368] Hilpert 2014, pp.52-65.

[369] Szandar, Alexander 2003, 'Wortgefechte am Flughafen', Der Spiegel 31/2003, 28.7.2003. Available at:(http://www.spiegel.de/spiegel/print/d-27970531.html).

[370] See ,Struck drängt es über Kabul hinaus', Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, 11.8.2003. Available at: (http://www.faz.net/aktuell/politik/afghanistan-einsatz-struck-draengt-es-ueber-kabul-hinaus-1115316.html); Weiland, Severin 2003, ,Truppenbesuche: Strucks Werbefeldzug für Afghanistan', Spiegel Online, 8.8.2003. Available at: (http://www.spiegel.de/politik/deutschland/ truppenbesuche-strucks-werbefeldzug-fuer-afghanistan-a-260490.html).

North and as a result, a new German base was built in Mazar-i-Sharif in mid-2004.

The situation in Afghanistan kept deteriorating further and German troops were caught in armed fights with the insurgents who had now made their appearance in the hitherto relatively peaceful northern part of Afghanistan during 2006-2007. This was reflected in the growing rift between the political discourse and the situation on the ground. One of the more prominent examples was the so-called Tornado debate, when Germany decided to send reconnaissance aircraft to the southern part of Afghanistan upon request to provide support for its allies. However, the decision was made dependent on the planes not providing close air support to the ground troops – the use of force was allowed only as self-defence.[371] This was in stark contrast to the existing practice for the German troops who, according to Hilpert, had received close air support 19 times from others by early 2009.[372] Germany's allies were clearly irritated by this decision and it was not the first time Germany was blamed of applying double standards in implementing the Rules of Engagement (RoE). Indeed, as Hilpert has argued, "the Tornado debate showed again that the taboo on the military was still an issue".[373]

In December 2009, US President Obama declared a new strategy for Afghanistan at West Point the aim of which was to root out Taliban and Al Qaeda and bolster the fragile situation by sending an additional 30,000 troops. Obama's strategy relied on the COIN concept (Counterinsurgency) initially adopted by the US forces in Iraq.[374] Essentially, COIN included offensive operations and expected combat despite its 'partnering' principle, which were targeted at the civilian population. This aspect of COIN is perhaps better known as 'winning hearts and minds' – a slogan which became infamous after it came to light that US special troops operating under COIN were responsible for civilian casualties. As Hilpert has argued, the German response to Obama's new strategy was lacklustre given the gravity of the situation in that it did not, in effect, adopt the more offensive measures of the strategy.[375] Indeed, a day before the Afghanistan Conference in London, in January 2010, Chancellor Merkel gave a government declaration through which she argued that the Conference was about "developing a strategy for handing over responsibility".[376] At the Conference, Merkel pledged to send another 850 troops to support the existing German contingent, totalling

---

[371] ,Bundeswehr: Kabinett beschließt Tornado-Einsatz in Afghanistan', Spiegel Online, 7.2.2007. Available at: (http://www.spiegel.de/politik/deutschland/bundeswehr-kabinett-beschliesst-tornado-einsatz-in-afghanistan-a-464833.html).

[372] Hilpert 2014, p. 84.

[373] Ibid., p. 85.

[374] See 'Obama's Afghan Strategy: Regional Perspectives', Atlantic Review. Available at: (http://www.atlanticreview.org/archives/1351-Obamas-Afghan-Strategy-Regional-Perspectives.html).

[375] Hilpert 2014, pp. 137-140.

[376] Deutscher Bundestag, Plenarprotokoll 17/18, 27.1.20130, p. 1522.

thereafter 5,350 troops. However, even though NATO commended Merkel's pledge, the number of troops requested was originally a lot higher (2,500)[377], which clearly indicated that Germany wasn't buying wholeheartedly into the US approach. The German plans included the training of the Afghan army and police force as well as economic contributions – there was no mention of offensive operations of any kind despite the fact that ground combat had become the new normality for those German soldiers who actively operated in patrol duties outside the safety of their bases.[378] The last couple years of ISAF were spent on increasing Afghan ownership of their own affairs, training and schooling police, as well as providing security for the PRT's. Also, with the help of better equipment compared to the early years of the deployment, German soldiers were able to keep their casualty count at zero – a striking contrast to years 2007-2010 with 33 fallen soldiers (with a total of 56 casualties during 2002-2014).[379] The last German ISAF contingent flew home in December 2014.

Indeed, the German stance during its 14-year tenure in the Hindukush, the preference for political over military solutions proved to be remarkably resilient, and it wasn't scrutinized even after the external shock of the Kunduz airstrike in 2009 brought home the brutal reality of the 'warlike' circumstances, that Bundeswehr troops had been operating under ever since the security situation had taken a turn for the worse sometime in 2007 even in the German controlled northern part of Afghanistan. Indeed, without the notion of traditionally strong strategic cultural continuity in the form of military restraint, the discrepancy that ensued between the German political elite 'living inside their own discourse' and the actual everyday reality for Bundeswehr soldiers on the ground might seem unfathomable given that the purpose of strategic culture is to establish clarity regarding the question of peace and war and the use of military force. However, and as will be discussed in detail in the next chapter, the critical re-interpretations of the German past, while culminating in the debate on German international responsibility and hence playing a major role as a legitimation for German participation in OEF/ISAF, did not showcase a German strategic culture which would have been willing to change to the degree that seemed necessary for establishing clarity in terms of the use of military force. Indeed, this was highlighted by the clear differences in the experience of warfare at the level of high politics and the level of operational reality. Even though German partic-

---

[377] ,Kanzlerin Merkel stockt die Afghanistan-Truppe auf', Die Welt, 26.1.2010. Available at: (http://www.welt.de/politik/deutschland/article5985463/Kanzlerin-Merkel-stockt-Afghanistan-Truppe-auf.html).

[378] Geis, Mathias & Lau, Jörg 2009, ,Das Wahre Gesicht des Krieges. Der Angriff von Kundus und die Nachrichtenpolitik der Regierung stellen den Afghanistan-Einsatz in Frage', Die Zeit, Nr. 52, 17.12.2009.

[379] Todesfälle im Auslandseinsatz, 2.10.2015. Bundeswehr Statistik. Available at: (http://www.bundes wehr.de).

ipation in Afghanistan can be grasped in terms of change (particularly with regard to certain strategic practices), it also highlights the traditional lines of restraint in German strategic thinking.

When we apply the analytical framework developed in Chapter 2 to the case of Afghanistan, we can make a number of observations. Firstly, the experiences of warfare gathered on the ground were mostly limited to the latter period (from around 2007) onwards. This partly explains the rather slow pace of German adaptation during the early years of ISAF. Indeed, as Zapfe has noted, the initial German reluctance to adapt to the COIN–concept was striking, even though Germany acted on COIN principles at latest from 2009.[380] Secondly, the Bundeswehr was not initially ready for wide-ranging counterinsurgency operations in terms of military capacity. This was not only reflected in the lack of specific military equipment, but both in the initial depiction of ISAF as a rather limited 'peace-keeping' mission and the Bundestag mandate of the ISAF deployment. Moreover, the word 'insurgency' has a negative echo in Germany due to the German past (the suppression of the resistance movement by the SS and Wehrmacht during World War II). In addition, the lack of readiness for this type of military action was reflected in the debates pending the decision of military participation and the general understanding of a rather limited role for the Bundeswehr. Thirdly, the rift between the elite discourse and the operational reality on the ground that was caused by a steady mission creep from peace keeping to peace enforcement was a disruptive factor in terms of the overall German experience of warfare and hence in the mechanism of strategic cultural change. While the operational level required adaptation, the political level was not ready (at least until the Kunduz incident) to draw the necessary conclusions. Fourthly, incremental adaptation did take place on the ground, however. As Zapfe has illustrated, this occurred in form of 'Alliance Shortcut' that was applied incrementally after the US had sent strong reinforcements to Afghanistan in 2009. The practical needs resulting from combined and joint operations with the US forces under the ISAF depended on "a harmonized operational approach as well as shared Tactics, Techniques and Procedures (TTPs), and in turn reinforced this operational alignment, even without a distinct national doctrine on COIN."[381] Hence, this functional requirement pitted the bottom-up dynamic of adaptation against the top-down dynamic of strategic deliberation, and hence, was a disruptive factor in terms of strategic culture providing clarity regarding the use of military force.

---

[380] Zapfe 2015, p. 253.

[381] Ibid., pp. 253-354.

Iraq

> *"We feel solidarity towards the United States but that does not mean we will embark on an adventure" (Gerhard Schröder)[382]*

The Iraq, along with Kosovo, has often been considered to be one of the watersheds in German foreign and security policy since the end of the Cold War. The reasons for this are manifold but the main one is the fact that this was the first time when Germany openly challenged the unilateralist policy of the Bush administration by declining to play any part in American 'adventurism'. However, the discord in the German-American relationship was not solely the result of the Bush administration's unilateralist policies but rather of the whole process of renewing American security and defence policy thinking towards NATO, Europe and its stance in the fight against terrorism. It can be argued that US unilateralism, the strategy of pre-emptive conflict resolution and the way some states were written off as 'rogue' states and imprinted as the 'axis of evil'[383] stood in diametric opposition not only to the traditional German concept of the 'culture of restraint' but more significantly to the ideological cornerstones behind the Red-Green security and defence political thinking, the focus of which was on strengthening the EU's own defence political capabilities, pursuing multilateral avenues in global security policy issues and highlighting the role of civilian measures and actions in conflict resolution. Hence, the rift that ensued within German-American relations cannot be explained only by US neo-conservative policies or the governmental change in Germany from Atlanticist to Europeanist orientation. It was rather the result of a deep conflict in views of how the fight against terrorism should be conducted, on the ground as well as in the cabinets of international politics.

Chancellor Schröder had argued as early as in September 2001, shortly after the Twin Towers in New York had collapsed, that Germany would not partake in any American military 'adventures'. To many observers, this sounded hasty at best after he had proclaimed "unconditional solidarity towards the US and the American people" a couple weeks earlier. Yet, as Harnisch has noted, there was no firm German stance in the issue during the

---

[382] ,Schröder: Keine Beteiligung an einem Krieg gegen den Irak', Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, 5.8.2002; Regierungserklärung von Bundeskanzler Gerhard Schröder zu den Terroranschlägen in den USA und den Beschlüssen des Sicherheitsrates der Vereinten Nationen sowie der NATO vor dem Deutschen Bundestag am 19. September 2001 in Berlin, Bulletin der Bundesregierung, Nr. 61-1 vom 19.9.2002, p.4.

[383] US President Georg W. Bush's State of the Union Address, 29.1.2002. Available at: (http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2002/01/20020129-11.html).

run-up to the Iraq War between late 2001 and early 2003.[384] Indeed, at times it seemed as if Germany was ready to participate militarily in Iraq provided there was a UNSC resolution. However, (and this was the more common position) the more consistent German interpretation was that even the UNSC resolution would not establish an automatism for war.

The Red-Green coalition tried to soothe the rift with the Bush administration after its re-election in September 2002 especially during the NATO Prague Summit in November 2002, at which it pushed for a common position regarding Iraq. The NATO member states agreed that Iraq had to comply fully with the requirements of USNC Resolution 1441 if it wanted to avoid the consequences of non-compliance. These soothing efforts also consisted of the German agreement to provide for the security of the American military bases in Germany and to open up German airspace for American transport flights. However, as a *der Spiegel* report vividly illustrates, German and French delegates were facing their US and UK counterparts "shoulder to shoulder" but on the opposite sides of the table.[385] In addition, after an initial veto against the Turkish invocation of the NATO defence clause Article 4 in the face of potential Iraqi aggression late 2002, Germany agreed to provide Turkey with Patriot -missiles which were already being sent to Israel for the same purpose.[386]

However, by the end of 2002 the German position had become firmly entrenched against any kind of military participation in Iraq especially as it became clear that only a military option would suffice for the US administration regarding Iraq. The French and German qualms towards US policy had caused an outbreak by US Defence Secretary Rumsfeld who argued to a reporter that "(y)ou're thinking of Europe as Germany and France. I don't. I think that's old Europe. If you look at the entire NATO Europe today, the centre of gravity is shifting to the east and there are a lot of new members."[387] During the prelude to the war in Iraq, the German conservative-liberal opposition accused Chancellor Schröder and his government of breaking with the long German tradition of balancing between Paris and Washington and world security, hence arguably moving away from one of the cornerstones of German post-WW II strategic culture and of driving a wedge both within the NATO and the EU hence embarking on a new 'Sonderweg'. Schröder was also personally accused of harnessing German foreign policy for the purposes of election campaigning. The Chancellor was called 'a pacifist with the spiked

---

[384] Harnisch, Sebastian 2004, 'Deutsche Sicherheitspolitik auf dem Prüfstand: Die Nonproliferationspolitik gegenüber dem Irak', *Deutsche Sicherheitspolitik. Eine Bilanz der Regierung Schröder, Baden-Baden*: Nomos Verlag, pp. 173-200.

[385] ‚NATO: Feuer in den Kulissen', der Spiegel, 48/2002, 25.11.2002.

[386] ‚Verheerende Entscheidung', die Welt, 28.2.2003.

[387] 'Anger at Rumsfeld attack on 'old Europe'', The Guardian, 24.1.2003. Available at: (http://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/jan/24/germany.france).

helmet', 'the Tin Drummer' and there were even comparisons in the German media between Schröder and Kaiser William II.[388]

However, these accusations were not completely unfounded as there was also a certain 'adventurism' to be detected in the way Schröder himself navigated through the international diplomatic waters at the time for which he received both domestic and international flak. As early as August 2002, before anything was decided and before anyone had asked for a robust German contribution in Iraq, with the UN report on Iraq still pending, Schröder declared that Germany would not participate in any kind of military action against Iraq, even if the UNSC so decided. This was seen by Germany's partners, the political opposition and many observers alike as unnecessary and misplaced, because Schröder seemed to shrink Germany's room for manoeuvre without any comprehensible reason.[389] One of the main explanations for Schröder's bold behaviour was that unlike in the case of Afghanistan in 2001 when he had to tie the decision about partaking in the war against terrorism to a vote of confidence, the governmental "no" to Iraq was much easier to manage thanks to the traditional anti-militarist and pacifist sentiments within both the Greens, the SPD and the German public as a whole. Hence, unlike in the case of Afghanistan, Schröder could count on the support within his own ranks and face international pressure that was put on his government by the US and the 'coalition of the willing' with a resolute 'no'.

In the crucial Bundestag debate over Iraq on 13 February 2003, Schröder argued that the decision about the use of military force and deployment of troops would never be easy and that Germans would never make these decisions easy for themselves.[390] Moreover, Schröder noted that such decisions are based on universal values of freedom, peace and justice and that this would also form the future basis of German security political behaviour, in questions concerning the use of force as well as Germany's alliances and partnerships. He also expressed the main concerns of the German government concerning the possible military solution to the Iraqi conflict, which would exacerbate the rift between the West and the Islamic countries and would also potentially destroy the worldwide alliance in the fight against terrorism. Schröder said that there was absolutely no doubt that Germany would stay in the forefront of combating terrorism, as the example of German engagement in Afghanistan as part of the alliance testified, but that showing solidarity towards the US concerns since 9/11 would also give Germany not only the right but also the duty to express their own opinions. In the effort of downplaying the differences between the German and American stances and appeasing the domestic opposition, Schröder praised the Ger-

---

[388] ,Diplomatie am Rotwein', Die Welt, 16.2.2003; Interview with Hans-Ulrich Wehler, Deutschlandfunk, 13.2.2003. Available at: (http://www.deutschlandfunk.de/der-vergleich-gerhard-schroeders-mit-kaiser-wilhelm-ii.694.de.html?dram:article_id=58776).

[389] ,Schröder sagt definitiv Nein zu Irak-Krieg', Die Welt, 10.8.2002.

[390] Deutscher Bundestag, Plenarprotokoll 15/25, (13.2.2003).

man contribution in the ISAF-operation in Afghanistan and argued that without Germany there would be far less going for it in this difficult region.[391]

Yet Schröder made it clear that Germany was not going to play by the unilateralist rules set by the most powerful nation of the world and reiterated Germany's commitment to Europe and the Franco-German axis: "Today, we are not arguing about the details of security politics or the ostensible strategic or economic gain. We are not arguing about whether NATO should exist or not either, by the way. For us, the concern is whether the decision-making process remains multilateral or not. This is also about the current and above all the future role of Europe, the whole of Europe mind you. It has always been a common recognition within the Bundestag that this continent, our Europe, cannot fulfil its role without the most closely-knit co-operation between France and Germany."[392]

Schröder raised the issue of why Iraq was suddenly threatened with a military strike and occupation even though it had been proven that North-Korea possessed Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMDs), a fact not yet proven in the case of Iraq. In fact, Schröder argued that Iraq did not possess WMDs and that threatening Saddam Hussein with military strike would not make it any easier to make the regime in Iraq budge in response to UN resolution 1441, disarmament and complete co-operation with the weapons inspectors. For the Chancellor, the most important task of international politics was to prevent wars and that it was imperative for the UN to withhold the sole and only right in making the decisions about peace and war. Importantly, he argued that "(n)o Realpolitik nor security doctrine may lead to a situation, where we have slowly gotten used to treating war as a normal means of politics, or as it has been once said, as the continuation of politics with other means." This stance echoed the difficult decisions concerning the use of military force that had been made within the German Left during the conflict in the Balkans and later Kosovo where the authority and credibility of the UN was severely undermined.[393]

Schröder noted that international law had been developed for centuries based on the principle of non-violence. He argued that according to this principle, "the power of the strong should be replaced by the power of justice". Schröder said that even though Iraq had to comply with the requirements of UNSC Resolution 1441, the Resolution itself did not create any automatism towards war and that the inspections had to continue and that they had to be reinforced.[394]

The Greens criticized the domestic opposition, particularly the CDU/CSU for not bringing a credible option for peace to the table. Foreign Minister Fischer noted that the position of the German government was a majority

---

[391] Ibid., pp. 1874-1879.

[392] Ibid.

[393] Ibid.

[394] Ibid.

position noticeable all over Europe, where anti-war sentiments were high. However, the argument was that even though the majority of European people were against a possible war in Iraq, it didn't make these majorities anti-American, an accusation thrown at the government occasionally during the Iraq-crisis.[395] Firstly, the Greens argued that the German Basic Law obliged Germany to do everything in its power to avoid war. Secondly, what was at stake was regional stability – a point on which Germany disagreed with the US concerning Iraq. In the case of Afghanistan, according to the Greens, Germany had no alternative because it was clear that Afghanistan provided the basis for Al Qaeda's terror operations. Yet the case of Iraq was different, because the work of the weapons inspectors was still on-going and there was still a possibility to solve the crisis via peaceful means. Foreign Minister Fischer pointed out that the German government, with its French and Russian allies, stressed three points as an alternative to war: 1) full compliance by Saddam Hussein with the weapons inspectors; 2) intensifying the inspections; and 3) establishment of a long-term verification- and control regime for WMDs for the whole region.[396]

To provide the government's anti-war stance with as much domestic political leverage as possible and to counter some conservative reservations, Fischer told Bundestag about his meeting with the Pope who had argued that the biggest fear was "a war between civilization and Islamization of the Arabic-Muslim world in the mid-term with fatal consequences."[397] Therefore, there was no more room of manoeuvre for Hussein besides full co-operation with Blix. Fischer agreed and argued that "(i)n a world where instability is increasing, we cannot seriously consider war as part of a strategy with the purpose of disarming the WMDs".[398]

Social Democrats were also critical of the opposition's stance on the issue, arguing that while it appeared that the opposition did not want war with Iraq either, it had not introduced any steps how to prevent the war and that the conservatives were wrong to accuse the government of "embarking on a Sonderweg", which the Social Democrats had explicitly denied.[399] In addition, Defence Minister Peter Struck voiced his concerns about the American mistrust, especially that of his American colleague Donald Rumsfeld towards Germany, which, according to Struck, was totally misplaced and unfair. Struck noted that the Americans had already accepted that Germany would not send any kind of troops to Iraq during talks in the previous summer. Yet Germany was ready to fulfil and had already fulfilled a number of other American wishes: Germany was ready to provide security for the American transports from Rhineland-Pfalz to Bremerhaven if necessary; Germany was

---

[395] Ibid., pp.1884-7.

[396] Ibid.

[397] Ibid.

[398] Ibid.

[399] Ibid., p. 1890; pp. 1904-5.

already securing the Gibraltar sea route and the entrance to the Suez canal in the framework of Operation Active Endeavor in the fight against international terrorism; the German navy was deployed at the Horn of Africa; and that Germany would say yes to the AWACS surveillance operation in Iraq. Against this background, it was incomprehensible that Rumsfeld would pretend as if it was nothing and why he compared German leadership to Fidel Castro and Muammar Gaddafi.[400] However, the Germans did not fare a lot better in the diplomatic language considering Struck's own outbursts and those of his comrade and fellow minister Hertha Däubler-Gmelin, who argued that the Bush administration was instrumentalizing the Iraq conflict to draw attention away from a deteriorating domestic economy, a tactic used also by 'Adolf the Nazi'.[401]

The CDU/CSU criticized Schröder for having steered Germany into a foreign policy crisis which was without precedent. In general, the CDU/CSU questioned the credibility of Germany's 'no' in light of the Kosovo example. In addition, comparisons were made between Saddam Hussein and Hitler, the purpose of which was to remind the Bundestag what the consequences had been as Hitler was left unopposed both domestically and internationally. An argument was also made that the peace movement did not have the means to get Hussein to capitulate to UN demands, and that while the ideological-ethical pacifism might be completely acceptable as a stance of an individual, it was not viable in securing world peace or in containing dictators – hence the need for 'ethics of responsibility' instead.[402]   In addition, Angela Merkel pointed out that Schröder was driven more by domestic political tactics than concerns for Germany's future as a reliable alliance partner. She accused Schröder of pitting Washington against Paris and abandoning the principle which endured from Adenauer through Brandt to Schmidt: 'never again war' which according to Merkel in praxis meant 'never again Sonderweg'. Merkel argued that Schröder, while committing to his 'no' so early on, had lost all 'political weight' unlike the French, who were diplomatically much more experienced. She also commented that the Chancellor had to resort to a vote of confidence in the deployment of German troops in the case of Afghanistan since he could not count on the unconditional support of his own party. According to Merkel, this is why the Chancellor could not withstand another vote in the case of Iraq, since it would mean new elections – hence the vehement early 'no' on the Chancellor's part.[403]

Merkel also wrote a piece in *The Washington Post* which received much international attention at the time. She argued that "Schröder doesn't speak for all Germans" and that "(i)t is true that war must never become a normal

---

[400] Ibid., p. 1894.

[401] ‚Schröder schreibt an Bush/Ministerin spricht von Verleumdung', Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, 20.9.2002.

[402] Deutscher Bundestag, Plenarprotokoll 15/25, pp. 1891-4.

[403] Deutscher Bundestag, Plenarprotokoll 15/25, pp. 1879-84.

way of resolving political disputes. But the history of Germany and Europe in the 20ᵗʰ century in particular certainly teaches us this: that while military force cannot be the normal continuation of politics by other means, it must never be ruled out, or even merely questioned as the ultimate means of dealing with dictators, as has been done by the German federal government."[404] The FDP mostly echoed the CDU/CSU's positions and added that Germany had to abide by the rule of international law and stand by the UNSC Resolution, even if it demanded military action, otherwise Germany would be sending a false message to Hussein that 'anything goes'.[405]

To summarize, in terms of German strategic culture, the war in Iraq seemed to confirm the continuity in the practice of military restraint. Importantly, however, Iraq was the first case when Germany directly opposed the US's unilateral policy. It represented the first major break in terms of its commitment to multilateralism due to Schröder's unconditional 'no' and hence to the other side of its civilian power identity (the first break being the participation in the OAF mission during the Kosovo crisis). Yet the importance of Iraq for German strategic culture was not in the famous German 'no' as such but rather what it actually implied: a picture of a fundamentally more active Germany on the issues affecting global security. Germany wanted to provide an alternative way of reacting to terrorism that was not solely military in nature and was willing to commit its political and economic weight in order to achieve this. This alternative was reflected on the behaviour of the red-green government throughout the crisis, even though there were times when German military participation was not completely ruled out. Secondly, the Iraq crisis revealed the inherent discrepancy within the normative structure of German strategic culture unlike any other previous conflict including the Balkans and the incident of Srebrenica massacre in 1995. In practical terms, the traditional balancing act between Washington and Paris was impossible given the principal ideological differences between the Bush and Schröder governments and the German commitment to a policy of non-aggression. Hence, Merkel's and the conservatives' interpretation of 'never again war' understood in practice as 'never again alone' was turned upside down by the red-green government as was clear from Chancellor Schröder's remark during the Bundestag debate that a course of action had to be available other than "to fight a war with friends or give peace a chance without them".[406]

In light of the analytical framework of strategic cultural change, we need to answer the question of how it can contribute to our understanding of change and continuity regarding the case of Iraq. At first glance, it would seem plausible to argue that German 'no' was significant because it testified

---

[404] Merkel, Angela 2003, 'Schröder doesn't speak for all Germans', The Washington Post, 20.3.2003, p. A39.

[405] Deutscher Bundestag, Plenarprotokoll 15/25, pp. 1898-9.

[406] Ibid., p. 1879.

to the continuity of German strategic culture. However, as argued earlier, while the actual German decision to participate in the NATO bombing campaign in Kosovo was significant in its own right, the question of what the participation implied for the evolution of German strategic culture (whether participation in military crisis management was established as an institutionalized practice in German strategic culture, for instance) was even more important. Therefore, it seems that the significance of the German 'no' is linked to the German participation in the NATO bombings in Kosovo and to the deployment in ISAF in Afghanistan, which somehow rendered the German non-military participation in Iraq more significant than it actually was in terms of the discussion regarding the issue of the use of military force. However, while the German 'no' implied a well established strategic practice of military non-participation (and hence continuity in German strategic culture), the process of strategic cultural change was not thwarted by Germany's 'no' in the case of Iraq, but continued throughout the German deployment during the ISAF in Afghanistan. Indeed, what the Iraq case shows, most of all, is that strategic cultural change and continuity can be two coincidental processes that highlight the different tenets of (German) strategic culture. Again, the more important thing in terms of change was not that Germany said 'no' to the war in Iraq (i.e. decided not to participate in it militarily), but rather what the 'no' implied in terms of the further evolution of German strategic culture, namely a break with the policies of Germany's long-time ally, the US. As was portrayed in the analysis of the Bundestag debates, the German 'no' was constructed on the basis of deep skepticism on behalf of the red-green government towards the Bush government's political motives and conduct regarding Iraq specifically but also regarding the Middle East in general. Hence, what the case of Iraq shows in the context of the analytical framework of strategic cultural change in particular is, that while German non-military participation implied continuity in the German strategic practice regarding the use of military force, it simultaneously signified a break with Germany's alliance with the US and led to the rift in the transatlantic relations. However, it did not facilitate change in terms of 'never again alone' in the sense that Germany was not acting unilaterally in its opposition to the US policy in Iraq.

4.2. POST-IRAQ: EUROPEANIZATION INSTEAD OF TRANSATLANTICISM?

With regard to further evolution of German strategic culture, the transatlantic rift that ensued based on the differences regarding the Iraq war and US unilateralism, was not a factor that would have clearly underlined the aspect of continuity. This was so despite the fact that the German rejection of Bush's 'adventurism' was strongly framed in terms of the German culture of restraint and 'never again war'. Indeed, the firm 'no' on behalf of the Schröder

government raised serious questions regarding Germany's alliance policies and partnerships, and seemed at first to indicate a change in terms of 'never again alone/Sonderweg' principles. First and foremost, US unilateralism and the issue of interventionist warfare raised questions regarding the use of military force for Germany that went beyond the war in Iraq and the question of WMD's. Even though Germany continued to be skeptical in terms of the effectiveness of the use of force especially as a pre-emptive means to topple dictatorships or regimes, the shift from multilateralism to unilateralism in US grand strategy, the repercussions of the transatlantic crisis for the functioning of NATO and subsequently, the decrease in Germany's ability to be able to influence the US and its other partners via traditional avenues of cooperation within the transatlantic security community all seemed to undermine the idea of Germany as a civilian power.[407] The German post-Iraq policy towards buttressing the process of CFSP and ESDP[408] can hence not only be seen as an attempt to steer clear of US unilateralism but also as an aspiration to preserve what was left of the idea of Germany as a civilian power.

CFSP and ESDP seemed particularly viable for the Germans in this regard, because they strengthened the foundations of multilateralism in foreign, security and defence policy and functioned not as an alternative for NATO, but as a way to decrease European dependency on NATO in the realm of security.[409] Moreover, the professed more active role for the EU as a security provider underlines a rather complex transformation process. This needs to occur on the level of EU member states' strategic culture before we can continue to argue for the evolution of a genuine European strategic culture. However, CFSP and ESDP continue to be of utmost relevance to this process and as Gross has argued, offer Germany an avenue to project and protect its interests.[410] Furthermore, this policy framework aligned itself gradually in the German efforts to maintain a balance between civilian and military means in crisis management, with a clear national accent on the former. This had already been highlighted in the Action Plan Civilian Crisis Prevention, Conflict Resolution and Post-Conflict Peace Building which was passed by the German government in 2004. One of the main objectives of the Action Plan was to enhance the interconnectedness of actors and structures within crisis management and conflict prevention which paved the way for the introduction of 'networked security' (*Vernetzte Sicherheit*) in terms of 'Whole of Government Approach'. Even though the inclusion of CFSP in the Maastricht Treaty's pillar structure and the integration of WEU and CFSP within

---

[407] See e.g. Rudolf, Peter 2005, 'The Myth of the 'German Way': German Foreign Policy and Trans-Atlantic Relations', Survival, Spring 2005, Vol. 47, Issue 1, p. 135.

[408] With the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty in 2009, the EU's European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) has been re-baptized the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP).

[409] Ibid., p. 136.

[410] Gross, Eva, 2007, 'Germany and European Security and Defence Cooperation: The Europeanization of National Crisis Management Policies?', Security Dialogue, Vol.38, No.4, p.514.

the Amsterdam Treaty in 1997 would hardly have materialized without strong Franco-German co-operation, Germany remained on the sidelines when France and Britain took the St. Malo initiative in 1998 in order to enhance the EU's military capability and operability. Allens has argued that this was because "Germany had neither the ability nor a strong interest in leading an initiative that would make the EU more operative militarily".[411] However, the Schröder government gradually shifted its stance towards the ESDP because it enabled the German government to "develop the role of the WEU in line with the result of the Amsterdam Treaty and to use the ESDP in order to strengthen the EU's capacities in the area of civilian conflict prevention and peaceful crisis management."[412] Moreover, as Berenskoetter and Giegerich have observed, "(t)he [German EU] 'Presidency Conclusions' presented in Cologne in June 1999 clearly shows the German attempt to build up ESDP as an alternative to NATO, more precisely as a preferred alternative whose activities resonate with German ideas of appropriate mandate, missions, and means."[413]

While it can be argued that Germany had been a steadfast supporter of both CFSP and ESDP since their introduction into the EU policy framework (ESDP especially since the St. Malo Declaration 1998), cases such as Operation EUFOR RD Congo and Operation EUFOR RD Chad have shown that Germany has fallen short in terms of implementing this support into concrete policy action. What is more, if we take a look at some of the crisis management tools created within CSDP framework, such as the EU Battlegroups concept, German reluctance to act is evident. When faced with actual decision, Germany has rejected calls to deploy Battlegroups that consist primarily of German troops (e.g. in the case of the Congo), even though it has been a strong supporter of the concept verbally. As Becker has argued, the official reasons given by the Germans for rejecting the deployment of the Battlegroups include financial deficits, an overstretched Bundeswehr as well as a lack of military capability of the Battlegroups, which, in turn, were connected with pooling and sharing at the EU level. However, the problematic nature of the Battlegroups concept was already visible in the different roles envisaged for them by France, the UK and Germany. While France and the UK treated EU Battlegroups primarily as a way to a more effective burden-sharing of EU crisis management, for Germany the Battlegroups concept underlined the idea of multilateralism in common defence policy and the German insistence

---

[411] Allens, Robin Marc 2016, 'Are We Doing Enough? Change and Continuity in the German Approach to Crisis Management', German Politics, p. 7.

[412] Ibid.

[413] Berenskoetter, Felix and Giegerich, Bastian 2010, 'From NATO to ESDP: A Social Constructivist Analysis of German Strategic Adjustment after the End of the Cold War', Security Studies, Vol. 19, p. 442.

on the inclusion of smaller member states indicates that the Battlegroups primarily served the function of EU integration for Germany.[414]

Despite the elevated profile of CFSP and ESDP/CSDP in German post-Iraq security and defence policy, it can be argued that NATO (together with the UN) remains the primary multilateral platform considering the issue of the use of military force in particular for Germany. This is regardless of the problems that the transatlantic crisis created and even though Germany has often been considered a 'lukewarm' or 'status quo' alliance partner.[415] Keller, for instance, has argued that Germany never fully subscribed to the shift in NATO's strategic posture towards out-of-area operations because of "fear of overstretch and a perception of insufficient threat".[416] However, the German military contribution to the NATO ISAF mission in Afghanistan can be seen not only as the German commitment to upholding its alliance commitments but also as a token of the significance of NATO in German strategic thinking without forgetting German preference for civilian measures in crisis management and its long term policy of intensifying the co-operation between the EU and NATO. This can be witnessed in the context of the perceived security challenge that Russia posed to the security of Europe and the transatlantic security community after the War in Georgia in 2008 and in the light of the current crisis in Ukraine, where Germany has played a key mediating role. It needs to be noted that the German preference for NATO in military matters also includes keeping the US vested in the developments in Europe and by so doing decreasing the pressure on the German leadership in expanding its role in military crisis management that has been on the increase ever since the fall of the Berlin Wall. Ultimately, as is reflected in the recent publication of the new German White Paper on Defence (July, 2016), NATO, unlike the EU, will continue to guarantee peace in Europe, even though it underlines the importance of the further development of the European Pillar in NATO.[417]

In the following section, I will present an assessment of some of the key post-Iraq developments in terms of out-of-area operations for Germany and highlight the reasons why they matter in the discussion regarding the evolution of German strategic culture after the end of the Cold War. As the majority of the post-Iraq War crises and conflicts have occurred in the Middle East or in neighbouring regions in North-Africa as a result of the Arab Spring, it is worthwhile providing a more extensive overview of the German strategic stance in the region. Finally, I will also discuss the recent crises in Europe,

---

[414] Becker, Sophia 2013, 'Germany and War: Understanding Strategic Culture under Merkel Government', Paris Papers, 2013, No. 9, IRSEM Publication (Institut de Recherche Sratégique de l'Ecole Militaire), pp. 31-33.

[415] Keller, Patrick 2012, 'Germany in NATO: The Status Quo Ally', Survival, Vol. 54, No.3, p. 95-110.

[416] Ibid, p. 99.

[417] White Paper 2016, pp. 64-70.

particularly the crisis in Ukraine from the viewpoint of German strategic culture.

4.3. FROM LEBANON TO LIBYA AND BEYOND: BACK TO THE FUTURE?

Overall, as we have witnessed since the end of the Cold War, the German strategic stance towards the whole Middle East has been alternating between a more distant and a more active role while strategic continuity, in turn, can be detected in terms of Germany's political and moral conviction to guarantee Israel's security and territorial integrity. As Behr has noted, after the first Gulf War, strategic continuity seemed to persist as Germany continued to support US hegemony in the region and for Israel while exercising a policy of self-restraint in terms of the other parts of the Middle-East.[418] Hence, while keeping close to Israel and its interests, Germany distanced itself from other parts of the region, only occasionally interceding on behalf of its historical partners, Turkey and Iran. This 'distancing' was also highlighted in the Franco-German agreement at the EU level that while Germany takes the lead in Eastern Europe, France concentrates on the Mediterranean.[419]

However, as Jünemann has argued in detail, Germany became incrementally more vested into the Mediterranean area through the introduction of institutionalized political co-operation such as the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership (EMP) and its successor, the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP). Crucial in this regard was the growing awareness among German policymakers over the new security challenges posed by the instability of the Middle East after the removal of internal borders at Schengen and the stepwise consolidation of EU foreign policies at Amsterdam, which, in effect, made Germany a 'Mediterranean country'.[420] Behr points out that a notable rise in the German interest toward the Middle East became apparent after the Middle East Peace Process had failed and when it seemed clear that the US had embarked on a war against Iraq.[421] Indeed, increasing US intransigence created windows of opportunity for the Schröder government to increase Germany's foreign policy profile in the Middle East. This was reflected in the so-called Idea Paper for the Middle East (*Nahost Ideenpapier*), drafted by the then Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer, which included concrete steps towards a

---

[418] Behr, Timo 2008, 'Enduring Differences? France, Germany and Europe's Middle East Dilemma', Journal of European Integration, Vol. 30, No.1, p. 90 (79-97).

[419] See e.g. Yirit, Nugettin 2015, *Arab Spring in Berlin and Paris. German and French Policy Between Continuity and Change*, Anchor Academic Publishing Hamburg, 2015.

[420] Jünemann, Annette, 2005 'German policies in the Mediterranean', Fernández, Haizam Amirah & Youngs, Richard (eds.) 2005, *The Euro–Mediterranean Partnership: assessing the first decade*, Madrid, Fride, p.113 111–120

[421] Behr 2008, p. 90.

lasting peace between the Israelis and the Palestinians. Elsewhere, Chancellor Schröder hinted on the possibility of German military participation in a conflict management mission sanctioned by the UN if that was in the wishes of the conflict parties themselves.[422]

Even though Germany has been a vocal supporter of Israel at practically every turn and while it has officially defended Israel against critical voices concerning the more robust Israeli policies rising within the EU (this was the case e.g. in the July 2006 war between Israel and the Hezbollah), Germany has also been an outspoken supporter of a two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and supported the Palestinian authorities in the West Bank and Gaza districts with sizeable financial contributions.[423] The majority of the German public does not, however, support a more visible role for Germany as an advocate for either the Israelis or the Palestinians. For instance, according to a survey conducted during the time of the crisis in Gaza in 2014, 69% argued in favour of Germany remaining on the sidelines.[424] On the whole, Germany's policies in the post-Iraq Middle East have attempted to harvest the benefits of being perceived as some sort of a counterweight to US supremacy and an interlocutor between divergent interests at times of rising unrest and turmoil (which was particularly pertinent at the time of the Iraq war and the subsequent period of crisis in transatlantic relations). At other times, Germany has sought a co-operative and multilateral approach to the US, both from within the EU and the CFSP framework and in its bilateral relations to other international actors in the region. Still, regardless of its resolute official support for Israel's security and territorial integrity, Germany has remained far more sensitive to Palestinian issues than many other actors that are among the Israel's closest allies in the region, particularly the US. Differences between Germany and the US were also detectable in the wake of the Syrian civil war at the G20 Summit in St. Petersburg in September 2013, when Germany refused to sign a US sponsored declaration which called for a strong, i.e. military response against Syrian President Bashar al-Assad and his cohorts. However, as Schumacher has pointed out, "24 hours later at an EU Foreign Affairs Council meeting in Vilnius, Germany performed a U-turn and acknowledged that some consequences will have to be

---

[422] 'Fischer legt Ideenpapier für Nahost-Lösung vor', Handelsblatt, 9.4.2002. Available at: (http://www.handelsblatt.com/archiv/ruestungslieferungen-nach-israel-eingefroren-fischer-legt-ideenpapier-fuer-nahost-loesung-vor/2155622.html).

[423] In 2014 for instance, Germany supported the Palestinians in terms of state-building, infrastructure and humanitarian assistance with around 225 Million Euro. For more information, see the website of German Foreign Ministry. Available at: (http://www.auswaertigesamt.de/DE/Aussenpolitik/Regionale Schwerpunkten/IsraelPalestinensischeGebiete/ZukunftPalaestina/Uebersicht_node.html).

[424] 'Umfrage: Deutsche gegen Engagement im Gaza-Konflikt', Spiegel Online, 7.8.2014. Available at: (http://www.spiegel.de/politik/deutschland/gaza-konflikt-mehrheit-der-deutschen-will-keinen-einsatz-a-985066.html).

drawn".[425] Germany's stance towards Syria (especially before the outbreak of the war) was much more accommodating in terms of a resolution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict than that of the US and Foreign Minister Steinmeier pushed hard for Syrian engagement in the issue. During the Syrian conflict, Steinmeier has been very active in his diplomatic efforts in the region. Germany's role has also been considered pivotal in the mediation of the Nuclear Agreement with Iran in 2015.[426]

Lebanon

> *"Germany's foreign and security policy has never been neutral."[427]*
> *(Angela Merkel)*

In terms of German strategic culture, the war between Israel and Hezbollah in the summer of 2006 (the so-called second Lebanon-War) sparked a considerable debate in terms of the use of military force, because it was the first time since the end of World War II that Germany's military assistance had been requested by both the Israelis (and the Lebanese) to participate in the UN peacekeeping operation (United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon, UNIFIL) as part of a Maritime Taskforce in the Mediterranean and the Lebanese coast. The conflict broke out in July 2006 as a result of the Hezbollah paramilitaries firing rockets across the border, killing a number of Israeli soldiers and kidnapping a further two. Israel Defence Forces (IDF) responded with air and heavy artillery strikes against Hezbollah military targets but also the civilian infrastructure. In addition, Israel imposed an air and naval embargo on Lebanon. Hezbollah continued to engage the Israeli forces through guerrilla -warfare and rocket strikes.

On 11 August 2006, the UNSC unanimously approved UNSC Resolution 1701 in an effort to end the hostilities. The resolution was approved by both the Lebanese and Israeli governments in the following days. It called for disarmament of Hezbollah, for withdrawal of the IDF from Lebanon, and for the deployment of the Lebanese Armed Forces and an enlarged UNIFIL.[428] UNI-

---

[425] Schumacher, Tobias 2015, 'Uncertainty at the EU's borders: narratives of EU external relations in the revised European Neighbourhood Policy towards the southern borderlands', European Security, Vol. 24, No. 3, p. 392. pp. 381-401.

[426] ‚Atomabkommen mit Iran: Wie wichtig Deutschland für die Verhandlungen war', Süddeutsche Zeitung, 14.7.2015. Available at: (http://www.sueddeutsche.de/politik/atomabkommen-mit-iran-wie-wichtig-deutschland-fuer-die-verhandlungen-war-1.2565136); ‚Westen begrüßt Atom Abkommen mit dem Iran', Focus Online, 17.1.2016. Available at: (http://www.focus.de/politik/ausland/sanktionen-aufgehoben-atom-abkommen-mit-iran-begruesst_id_5216644.html).

[427] Deutscher Bundestag, Plenarprotokoll 16/50, p. 4832.

[428] UNSC Resolution 1701, S/RES/1701 (2006). Available at: (http://www.unsco.org/Documents/Resolutions/S_RES_%201701(2006).pdf).

FIL was provided with an extensive mandate in terms of the use of force, including the ability to provide forceful protection from hostile activities their area of operations. Moreover, the use of force was allowed in terms of resisting attempts by force to prevent UNIFIL from conducting its mission.

In September 2006, upon requests from both conflicting parties, Lebanon and Israel, the Bundestag authorized a naval deployment of up to 2,400 troops as part of UNIFIL. The mission objective of the German contingent was to monitor the Lebanese coast to prevent weapons smuggling to Hezbollah forces in Lebanon. The preceding debate around the German deployment, discussed below, would span a period of couple months not only because a German military deployment to the Mediterranean would mark a historical first, but also due to the fact that it included the possibility of armed German soldiers finding themselves staring at Israeli soldiers across the border.

The Bundestag debates on the UNIFIL deployment were held on 19 September and 20 September 2006 and subsequently a vote on the participation followed. German military participation was accepted with more than a four-fifths majority of Bundestag votes. Social Democrats highlighted the historical dimension of the issue. For instance, Foreign Minister Steinmeier recognized the historical weight of the German decision by noting that "ten years ago nobody would have probably come to the idea of discussing sending German soldiers alongside other European soldiers to the Middle East", he also stressed that "[...] since then, the conditions around the world had changed fundamentally, and we [the Germans] have changed with them." Furthermore, for Steinmeier, German deployment in the Middle East was a sign of a maturing and the coming together of Europe, since he was certain that Europe would become a factor in moves towards peace in the Middle East. Moreover, while Steinmeier clearly recognized the pace of change and the novelty of the mission for Germany and the Bundeswehr, he tied it closely with 'good' German foreign policy tradition underlying continuity: "There is no doubt whatsoever: with this mission [...] we are stepping onto politically new territory. But I say: this mission, as any, is part of the good tradition of German foreign policy. Always when the Bundestag has approved of such a mission, we have done it in order to create peace, to secure peace treaties or to prevent people from having to flee their homes or of their persecution." Moreover, according to Steinmeier, the question of German deployment in UNIFIL was not a question of "the unprincipled breach with the taboos in foreign policy, which we ourselves have laid upon us after the era of National Socialists" but rather about "credibility and the recognition of normality, which does not protect us from demands anymore".[429]

Similarly, the CDU/CSU linked the deployment to the broader issue of German responsibility. Chancellor Merkel argued that "(t)his Bundeswehr mission in the Middle East is not like every other mission, it is a mission of

---

[429] Deutscher Bundestag, Plenarprotokoll 16/49, pp. 4799-4801.

historical dimension. Why is this word not highlighted, although it is factually not the first out-of-area mission of the Bundeswehr beyond Germany and Europe? We all know that German responsibility in the world has changed with the course of the change of 1989/1990 and German reunification. This has consequences, which are also of military nature."[430] However, partly contrasting the historical dimension of the issue, the CDU/CSU also argued that Germany needed to participate in UNIFIL mainly because its interests in the region predicated that it should do so. For instance, a reference was made to a recent apprehension of suitcase bombers in Germany, the purpose of which was to highlight that Germany was threatened by the volatile situation in the Middle East and had vital security interests in maintaining a peace in the region.[431]

The PDS argued against this logic. Gregor Gysi maintained that "you cannot establish normality by soldiers and artillery" and that the German deployment was controversial in terms of what was expected of the German soldiers: "It is known that both conflict parties have particular but very different expectations towards the German soldiers. The one hopes for responsibility because of our history and the other hopes that something of our history still remains. A German government, which knows this, should have already beforehand said no to a mission involving our soldiers."[432]

The FDP, while representing the opposition, seemed principally to be in favour of German military deployment. Hoyer, for instance, argued that "(t)here are colleagues, who – after a thorough deliberation – are of the opinion that the presence of the German military in the Middle East is a taboo. I highly respect this opinion, although I don't share it. Others think that our history explicitly does not legitimize or give us an excuse to stay out of there, militarily too if need be. Finally there are those who say that it is just as unwise to participate militarily, although we are without any doubt ready to bear a great responsibility. I support this last line of argument." Hoyer continued by legitimizing his party's opposition to German military deployment by arguing that if the military mission failed, it would inevitably lead to an endangering of the political process.[433]

However, it seemed that even the particular aspect regarding the relatively extensive rules of engagement included in the original formulation in the UN mandate that was based on UNSC 1701 (which were eventually watered down by the Lebanese requests and the Bundestag mandate) did not prove to be too hard to accept for the majority of the Bundestag (with the exception of PDS). Chancellor Merkel reflected on this as she argued that "it is not an out-of-area operation of the Bundeswehr as such nor is it the concrete formulation of the mandate, which would make this mission to stand out from the

---

[430] Deutscher Bundestag, Plenarprotokoll 16/50, p. 4831.

[431] Deutscher Bundestag, Plenarprotokoll 16/49, pp. 4813-14.

[432] Ibid., pp. 4804-6.

[433] Ibid., pp. 4801-3.

rest. It is the region, which makes this operation into a special mission, a mission of historical dimension. In hardly any another place on earth can the special responsibility of Germany, the special responsibility of every German government and German Bundestag for the lessons learned from the German past, be conveyed as clearly as here."[434]

Another significant topic in these particular debates was the question regarding values and neutrality. Chancellor Merkel was particularly outspoken in this regard, as she argued that "Germany's foreign and security policy has never been neutral. It was, it is and it will remain tied to values. Being tied to values is the opposite of neutrality."[435] However, this position had particularly been criticized earlier by FDP's 'grand old men' of German foreign and security policy, i.e. Walter Scheel, Hans-Dietrich Genscher and Otto Graf Lambsdorff for whom it was imperative to protect German soldiers from getting into conflict situations with Israeli soldiers – according to them, this was also in line with German 'responsibility'.[436] PDS also criticized the Chancellor's position of linking neutrality and values by arguing that there was a strong contradiction in the willingness to contribute to the weapons embargo on Hezbollah and the simultaneous delivery of weapons to Israel. The Arab world would not take the German position in this question for granted.[437]

Initially, Merkel had been much more reserved towards the deployment of a German military contingent in the Mediterranean, but the direct request from the then Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Olmert convinced her to reconsider. This ultimately led to the decision to send in the naval contingent. However, after the German contingent was deployed in October 2006, there were several reported incidents of Israeli fighter jets harassing German naval vessels which led to heightened diplomatic tensions between Germany and Israel and loud criticism about government policy from the German opposition.[438] Moreover, the Lebanese government had been able to negotiate a much more restricted mandate for the UNIFIL naval contingent than what was originally planned – German vessels needed the approval of Lebanese authorities to operate within a six-mile radius of the Lebanese coast, which

---

[434] Deutscher Bundestag, Plenarprotokoll 16/50, p. 4832.

[435] Ibid.

[436] FDP-Granden warnen vor deutschen Soldaten im Libanon', Handelsblatt, 18.08.2006. Available at: (http://www.handelsblatt.com/politik/deutschland/brief-an-bundeskanzlerin-fdp-granden-warnen-vor-deutschen-soldaten-im-libanon/2694618.html).

[437] Deutscher Bundestag, Plenarprotokoll 16/50, p. 4835-7.

[438] ‚Libanon: Zwischenfall bei deutschem Marine-Einsatz', Spiegel Online, 25.10.2006. Available at: (http://www.spiegel.de/politik/deutschland/libanon-zwischenfall-bei-deutschem-marine-einsatz-a-444741.html); ‚Falsch unterrichtet oder getäuscht?' Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, 27.10.2006. Available at: (http://www.faz.net/aktuell/politik/naher-osten/bundeswehr-im-libanon-falsch-unterrichtet-oder-getaeuscht-1357072.html).

considerably hampered German efforts to track potential arms shipments.[439] Indeed, the successes of the UNIFIL mission since the second Lebanon-war in 2006 have been few and far in between. Israel has always treated UNIFIL with a large dose of skepticism and even hostility, and considered the mission 'ineffective' and 'toothless' at best. However, it has always consented to the extension of the yearly mandate because there had not been a better alternative.[440]

In terms of German strategic culture, the UNIFIL deployment underlined the primacy of a historically conscious security and defence policy the principal aim of which is to bring about peace and peaceful relations, but added to the mix the notion of Germany defending its own interests and security through the deployment of military force – a factor which had not prominently surfaced in the similar debates before UNIFIL. The discourse surrounding German security interests was also reflected in the aspect of non-neutrality professed by Chancellor Merkel. However, even though strategic continuity was detectable in the German government's refusal to send ground troops to the Middle East, members of both governing parties (SPD and CDU/CSU) were surprisingly willing to consider it, and, as Belkin has argued, it was largely because the German ground troop presence had originally been requested by Israel. This was imaginable in a context in which the request of the Israelis seemed to indicate placing a high level of trust in German politics.[441]

Above all, the case of Lebanon particularly expressed the principled tension between the fact that Germany's decision on the UNIFIL deployment was described as a decision of 'historical dimension' and the fact that this notwithstanding, Germany in any case had security interests in the region that needed to be secured. Hence, it can be argued that the process of strategic cultural change since Srebrenica had come to a point where German participation in military crisis management could in principle be legitimized without an explicit reference to the lessons of the German past. However, in this case, the reference to the past was evident, since the UNIFIL deployment concerned the security and territorial integrity of Israel – the German *raison d'être*. In addition, this was highlighted in the notion that participation in military crisis management did not equal the 'militarization of German foreign and security policy' but rather entailed recognition of German 'normali-

---

[439] 'Israel versus Germany Confrontation off Lebanon Leads to Questions', Spiegel International Online, 30.10.2006.

[440] See e.g. Shpiro, Shlomo 2008, 'UNIFIL and EU BAM: The Limits of European Security Engagement in the Middle East Nathanson', Roby & Stetter, Stephan (ed.) *The Israeli European Policy Network Renewing the Middle East: Climate Changes in Security and Energy and the New Challenges for EU-Israel Relations*, Friedrich-Ebert Stiftung 2008, pp. 85-112.

[441] Belkin, Paul 2007, 'Germany's relations with Israel: Background and Implications for German Middle East Policy', CRS Report for Congress, January 19, 2007. Available at: (http://www.dtic.mil+ a464690.pdf).

ty'. However, the notion of 'normality' is problematic in terms of German strategic culture, because it would seem to suggest that the German past up until the point of Srebrenica was essentially something else than 'normal'.[442] In the Bundestag debate, the term 'normality' was used to not only pinpoint that military crisis management had more or less become a 'normal' practice for the Bundeswehr, but to detract from the inconvenient truth that was also expressed in the debate, namely, that there were no guarantees that the Bundeswehr soldiers would be able to evade every confrontation with their Israeli counterparts, even if it would not involve the use of military force.[443] This alone was a factor that warranted extreme caution on behalf of the Bundestag. Even though the Bundeswehr deployment in UNIFIL marked a historic first, UNIFIL deployment itself was rather uneventful and did not do much to shape the German experience of war and warfare. Despite this, however, the significance of Lebanon in terms of strategic cultural change can be detected in the way German 'responsibility' was linked with 'normality'. In order to act responsibly internationally, Germany had to come to terms with its 'normality'. However, that did not mean a 'normalization' of the use of military force in the sense of rendering it 'business as usual'. Rather, the idea was that Germany should accommodate the idea of 'normality' in the sense that military crisis management should be seen as acceptable strategic practice in Germany's toolkit, because Germany's international responsibility depended on it (which was criticized by the PDS as 'militarization' of German foreign and security policy). Hence, the argument was that Germany's 'international responsibility' could not be fully realized without the recognition of 'normality'.

Libya

"The Faustian bargain"[444]

In the wake of the Arab Spring in 2011, the conflict in Libya began when Libyans started mass protests against the regime of Colonel Gaddafi, a reign which had lasted for more than 40 years. The protests soon turned violent following brutal repression by the regime. The City of Benghazi in Eastern Libya became the stronghold of the armed rebels. Under an arms embargo

---

[442] For more on 'normality' and German strategic culture, see Chapter 5.3.2.

[443] Deutscher Bundestag, Plenarprotokoll 16/50, p. 4833.

[444] This term, which alludes to Goethe's drama and the 'deal with the devil' was used by the chief foreign policy editor of Süddeutsche Zeitung, Stefan Kornelius, to describe the problems that the West will face in the wake of the Arab Spring because of their earlier support of and deals with the dictators of the Middle East. See 'Der Faustische Pakt', Süddeutsche Zeitung, 13.1.2011. Available at: (http://www.sueddeutsche.de/politik/proteste-in-aegypten-rolle-der-usa-der-faustische-pakt-1.1053171).

and UN sanctions placed upon the Libyan regime, Gaddafi's troops pushed towards Benghazi and threatened to crush the rebellion and punish the Libyan population in early March 2011. Colonel Gaddafi himself announced that he would exterminate his political opponents and their supporters.[445] The UN responded to these impending mass atrocities by taking preventive action and issuing Resolution 1973, which called for protection of civilians under the principles of Responsibility to Protect (R2P). Resolution 1973 authorized member states, acting nationally or via regional organizations, to take all actions necessary to protect civilians under threat of attack in Libya. However, as Resolution 1973 ruled out the use of any form of a foreign occupation force on any part of Libyan territory, the protection was to be accomplished by overwhelming air power.[446] In support of the Resolution 1973, NATO took robust action and enforced a no-fly-zone. NATO operation Unified Protector lasted until the end of October 2011, and arguably succeeded in preventing mass atrocities against civilians. Colonel Gaddafi himself was captured and subsequently executed by armed rebels before the end of the NATO operation.

UNSC Resolution 1973 was adopted by a vote of ten in favour to none against, but with five abstentions (China, the Russian Federation, Brazil, India and Germany). Instead of aligning itself with its NATO allies, Germany chose to abstain from the vote. This raised suspicions about the country's commitment to a forceful see-through of the principles it so vehemently claimed to support.[447] Germany's UN ambassador Peter Wittig tried to explain his government's position in the issue. He stated that while Berlin was concerned about the safety and well-being of the Libyan people and lent its support to the Security Council in stopping the violence in Libya, the Federal Government still saw enormous risks in the implementation of the Resolution 1973. Particularly, he mentioned the likelihood of a large-scale loss of life not to be underestimated; the risk of participating countries running into a prolonged military conflict that could spread in the wider region and the possibility of failure in the implementation of the Resolution which would make a quick and efficient military action unlikely.[448]

[445] 'Qaddafi Warns of Assault on Benghazi as U.N. Vote Nears', The New York Times, 17.3.2011. Available at: (http://www.nytimes.com/2011/03/18/world/africa/18libya.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0).

[446] UNSC Resolution 1973, S/RES/1973 (2011). Available at: (http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/1973(2011)).

[447] 'Security Council Abstention: Germany Hesitates as UN Authorizes Action against Libya', 18.3.2011. Available at: (http://www.spiegel.de/international/world/security-council-abstention-germany-hesitates-as-un-authorizes-action-against-libya-a-751763.html); 'Germany has marginalised itself over Libya', The Guardian, 18.3.2011. Available at: (https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2011/mar/18/libya-germany-un-security-council).

[448] UN Department of Public Information, 'Security Council Approves No-Fly Zone over Libya, Authorizing All Necessary Measures to Protect Civilians, by Vote of 10 in Favour with 5 Abstentions', 17.3.2011.

In the following, I will discuss the Bundestag debates surrounding Libya and subsequently assess their repercussions in terms of German strategic culture. Indeed, German behaviour and its abstention in the UNSC vote raised a number of questions concerning the state of its strategic culture. Firstly, China, Brazil, India and Russia certainly made rather strange bedfellows for Germany in the vote on global security issues. Secondly, Germany took a conscious gamble by abstaining from the vote in terms of its effort to acquire a permanent seat on the UN Security Council – an effort that was set back considerably. Thirdly, German abstention might seem controversial from the outset given that Chancellor Merkel herself had earlier clearly set out two conditions for the establishment of a no-fly zone over Libya: regional support that had been received in the form of the Arab League vote and a pending UN Security Council authorization and the fact that Germany had been a vocal supporter of the earlier UN Resolution 1970 that condemned the violence in Libya and put economic and political sanctions on the Gaddafi regime. Finally, German abstention raised serious doubts about German reliability as an alliance partner and the future course of German security and defence policy – indeed of the very foundation of the 'never again alone' principle.[449]

The Bundestag debates took place before (16 March 2011) and after (18 March 2011) the vote on UNSC Resolution 1973. In the first debate, Foreign Minister Westerwelle made the government position clear by arguing that "we do not want and must not become a party of war in an African civil-war". According to Westerwelle, the effects of a military intervention would in all probability spread throughout the whole of North Africa and have repercussions in the Arabic world. Westerwelle also argued that while Germany respected and welcomed the decision of the Arab League to recognize the Libyan rebel movement as the country's legitimate government, he underlined that the primary responsibility of the international community was in the hands of the states in the region with reference to the Arab League's call on the UNSC to impose a no-fly zone over Libya. He added that Germany's behaviour in New York was conditioned accordingly. Ultimately, Westerwelle was skeptical towards the establishment of a no-fly zone because it would in effect be a military intervention as its implementation required the disabling of Libyan anti-aircraft positions.[450]

[449] See e.g. Kappel, Robert 2014, 'Global Power Shifts and Germany's New Foreign Policy Agenda', Strategic Analysis, Vol. 38, No. 3, pp. 341-452; Oppermann, Kai 2012, 'National Role Conceptions, Domestic Constraints and the New 'Normalcy' in German Foreign Policy: the Eurozone Crisis, Libya and Beyond', German Politics, Vol. 21, No. 4, pp. 502-519; 2012 ; Maull, Hanns W. 'Deutsche Aussenpolitik: Orientierungslos', Zeitschrift für Politikwissenschaft, No. 1, 2011, pp. 95–119; 'Merkel's Caution: Berlin Reverts to Old Timidity on Military Missions', Spiegel Online, 26.3.2013. Available at: (http://www.spiegel.de/international/germany/germany-becoming-more-cautious-on-military-missions-a-890931-2.html).

[450] Deutscher Bundestag, Plenarprotokoll 17/95, pp. 10814-8.

However, many members of the Bundestag remained skeptical towards the Arab League across party divisions. The Social Democrats argued that there was a discrepancy between the idea of Arabic ownership of the management of the conflict and the fact that three countries of the Arab League voted against the implementation of the no-fly zone, because it would be interpreted as interference in the domestic affairs of sovereign states. The CDU/CSU reminded the Bundestag that Saudi Arabia had sent troops to Bahrain to protect its fragile royal house but had done nothing to help the Libyan liberty movement. In this context one could not expect that Germany would be part of a NATO or EU coalition just because this had been anticipated based on the declaration of the Arab League. Moreover, Gaddafi's disillusionment over the German position was seen not only to show how paranoid the Libyan dictator had become. Gaddafi had claimed in an interview with German media that he thought German position on Libya was, in contrast to many other Western countries, 'very good' and that he could therefore think to provide Germans with oil contracts in the future. It was therefore vital for the UNSC to check every possible and responsible avenue of action in Libya, even the probability of sending weapons to the freedom fighters, to end the violence as soon as possible. It was clear, however, that a no-fly zone would not stop the Gaddafi regime from murdering civilians and that is why the question of sending ground troops would also be imminent.[451] Despite of the criticism towards the Arab League, there was a strong consensus within the Bundestag that the Arab world had to take ownership of the Libyan crisis. The FDP argued that it was no longer possible for the West to act as the sole problem-solver only to be accused of having done something wrong afterwards.[452]

Both the CDU/CSU and the SPD drew attention to the wider strategic outlook of German foreign and security policy in the Mediterranean and the Middle East in the context of the Libyan crisis. The argument was that the former EU colonial powers had often had too much say in the issues involving the future of the Arab world. Moreover, these colonial powers had raised political claims that were not implementable or even desirable according to the German standards. A particular reference was made to France, which had lost a lot of credibility in the past few weeks in the region even though the French had previously exercised some sort of 'householder's rights'. Germany was standing before a new era in its policy towards North Africa and the whole of the Arabic region. This policy was bound to entail the classical tensions between an interest- and value –driven foreign policy. This meant that Germany had to exercise self-criticism in the fact that it had done a bit too much realpolitik with some of the Arab leaders and in the process perhaps forgotten the needs of the people in those countries.[453]

---

[451] Ibid., pp. 10818-21.

[452] Ibid., pp. 10823-4.

[453] Ibid., pp. 10826-9.

The CDU/CSU also argued that the interests Germany had in the region should be clearly spelt out – co-operation in the energy-sector and market participation. Germany also had a strategic interest in Israel's security and in preventing a mass wave of refugees to Europe and therefore also an interest in the modernization, reforms and good governance in the area. Finally, Germany also had an interest with the countries in the region to fight terrorism.[454] The position of Die Linke[455], in contrast, was to reject German military participation from the start and to disconnect the link between German interests and military conflict management. The only way forward would be to negotiate further and that wars should not be fought over oil as had been the case in Iraq.[456]

Hence, as the first debate indicated, Germany remained skeptical not only towards the countries in the region and their capability to take ownership of the Libyan conflict (even though this was principally seen as positive), but towards Germany's own allies and partners and the capacity of the West to solve the crisis by military means. Given that these sentiments were shared across the Bundestag and the sense of danger about getting dragged into a civil war in one of the most volatile regions on earth, an argument could be made that the German abstention from the vote on UN Resolution 1973 was perhaps not as surprising as the reactions among the scholars and media indicated.[457]

In the second debate on 18 March after the UNSC vote on Resolution 1973, Foreign Minister Westerwelle tried hard to explain the German position. Germany stood vehemently against Gaddafi and had proposed an even tougher line towards the Libyan regime in terms of economic sanctions by the UN in order to curtail the money flow for weapons supply. Germany stood at the side of those aspiring for liberty and those who were being persecuted and murdered because of their democratic beliefs. However, Westerwelle drew a clear line between this and the question of military intervention – a factor which was criticized by the opposition. According to Westerwelle, the answer was the tightening of sanctions, not military action. Moreover, the Libyan crisis ultimately had to be solved through domestic dialogue between the conflicting parties, not Western intervention. Westerwelle referred to the latest experiences in Iraq and Afghanistan and argued that military deployments always meant civilian casualties, which Germans should keep in mind given the experiences from German history and the latest out-of-area deployments. Moreover, every potential German military deployment should be evaluated on its own terms. Westerwelle also tried to stress

---

[454] Ibid., pp. 10831-2.

[455] Die Linke was formed in 2007 as the merger of the PDS (Party of Democratic Socialism) and the Electoral Alternative for Labour and Social Justice (WASG), commonly referred to as 'The Left' in Germany.

[456] Ibid., pp. 10821-3.

[457] See footnote 449.

that Germany's abstention did not mean that Germany would not be ready to take international responsibility - over 7,000 Bundeswehr soldiers were deployed in out-of-area missions at the time.[458]

A few members of the SPD and the Greens remained skeptical regarding the German abstention and claimed that abstaining in the UNSC vote was not decisive in the issue of national sovereignty but the explanation of why Germany did not stand by its allies was. They required measures from Westerwelle to prevent an impression of Germany not willing to do enough for the human rights of the people of Libya. A reference was also made to the experience and lessons of Rwanda and the principle of R2P and that it was "a disgrace that Germany had abstained from the UNSC vote".[459] Moreover, vocal criticism was raised by former German MPs concerning Germany's abstention. The most prominent criticism came from former Green Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer, who claimed in an interview with *der Spiegel* that Germany's decision to abstain from the vote represented "one the biggest debacles since the formation of the Federal Republic" and that "Germany is simply too big to play the role of Switzerland".[460] Even the former Chancellor Helmut Kohl later criticized the German government for endangering transatlantic relations with its decision to abstain and lamented that Merkel's foreign policy "was missing a compass".[461]

A number of scholarly accounts have made an attempt to explain German abstention from the UNSC vote. As Berenskoetter has observed in more general terms regarding German abstention, the critics, accompanied by an air of moral superiority and/ or a sense of embarrassment, explained the German decision "with a misplaced pacifist reflex, poor strategic thinking, and an incompetent Foreign Minister and, of course, with a short-sighted and an inward-looking government concerned mainly about public opinion."[462] Indeed, the parties of the governing conservative-liberal coalition had been trailing in polls for the state elections in Baden-Württemberg and Rheinland-Pfalz which took place a week after the UN vote and an argument could have been made that this played a role in the German abstention (as out-of-area operations have never been particularly popular in Germany). Some observers have even argued that German abstention was 'a professional mistake'

---

[458] Deutscher Bundestag, Plenarprotokoll 17/97, pp. 11138-9.

[459] Ibid., p. 11139; p.11145; p.11149; p.11151.

[460] 'Shame for the Failure of Our Government: Fischer Joins Criticism of German Security Council Abstention', Spiegel Online, 22.3.2011. Available at: (http://www.spiegel.de/international/germany/shame-for-the-failure-of-our-government-fischer-joins-criticism-of-german-security-council-abstention-a-752542.html).

[461] ,Merkels Außenpolitik ist ohne Kompass', Süddeutsche Zeitung 25.8.2011. Available at: (http://www.sueddeutsche.de/politik/helmut-kohl-kritisiert-bundesregierung-merkels-aussenpolitik-ist-ohne-kompass-1.1134682).

[462] Bereskoetter, Felix 2011, 'Caught between Kosovo and Iraq: Understanding Germany's Abstention on Libya', SOAS. Available at: (http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/ideas/).

made allegedly under time pressure as nobody had the time to explain to Mr. Westerwelle how the voting works in the UN.[463] Others have claimed that German abstention can be explained by the bad timing of the events – Germans were not aware of the shift in the US position in favour of military intervention in Libya while debating the issue on 16 March in the Bundestag. The argument here is that the shift in the US position was a major 'game changer' in that it enabled a UN resolution authorizing all necessary measures, supported by both Washington and all Arab countries. Indeed, as Brockmeier has claimed, had Obama or Clinton informed the Germans of their changed positions, "they would have provided the Bundestag with the opportunity to discuss Libya in a new light. Such a debate would have allowed the German government to change course, possibly leading to a 'yes' vote in the Security Council and even minimal German military participation."[464]

However, all of the above explanations for German behaviour disregard the argument which would have more than likely ensured German military participation of some kind, namely the prevention of possible genocide or mass murder, a case which was admittedly much harder to make in the context of Libya (even though it could not be disregarded completely) as was the case with Bosnia or Rwanda, for instance. There simply was not enough evidence to make it a clear-cut case for German military participation, not to mention that even if proven to be true, the Germans would have been at pains to deploy the Bundeswehr under 'never again Auschwitz' once again, especially as Libya was not exactly in Germany's backyard. In essence, Gaddafi's utterances regarding upcoming bloodbaths in Benghazi did not convince the German government of the necessity to deploy military means – at least German ones. Hence, the R2P norm did not play a major role in the German decision-making process over Libya. What is more, there was no Libyan 'Srebrenica' upon which a case of intervention could have been made. Hence, R2P was not a sufficient cause on its own to move German government to act militarily.

Moreover, as Katsioulis has noted, NATO's operational strategy of bombing strategic locations throughout Libyan territory corresponded much better with the objective of toppling a regime/dictatorship than the objective of protecting the people and establishing safe-zones or conditions for ceasefire negotiations – indeed the things mentioned in the UNSC Resolution 1973.[465] Hence, the actual fashion in which the crisis management was carried out resembled more a policy of regime change than that of a responsibility to

[463] Rühl, Lothar 2011, 'Deutschland und der Libyenkrieg', Zeitschrift für Aussen- und Sicherheitspolitik, Vol. 4, No. 4, November 2011, pp. 561-571.

[464] Brockmeier, Sarah 2013, 'Germany and the Intervention in Libya, Survival, Vol. 55, No. 6, pp. 64-65.

[465] Katsioulis, Christos 2011, 'Die Deutsche Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik nach der Intervention in Libyen', Internationale Politik und Gesellschaft, Vol. 4, pp. 36-37 (27-44).

protect. This was clearly an aspect that did not sit well with the powers-at-be in Berlin, because even though Germany wanted to see Gaddafi go, it wasn't convinced of toppling the Gaddafi regime through military action. Indeed, Germany's position at the brink of the Libyan conflict in 2011 was similar to its stance towards Iraq several years earlier, even though there were notable differences. While it was clear that the Germans did not believe that Gaddafi and his actions posed an immediate threat to world peace and Western security (as was the case also with German view on Saddam and Iraq), one of the most important differences was that Libya did not have any major repercussions in terms of transatlantic relations nor did it create a considerable rift in US-German relations, even though German reliability as partner was heavily questioned.

How should we evaluate the case of Libya in terms of German strategic culture? From the outset, it would seem that Libya did not prove to be a case in which we could clearly argue in favour of strategic cultural change but then again, it is not a clear-cut case of strategic cultural continuity, either. First of all, Libya did not shake the normative or ideational foundations of German strategic culture to the degree that was feared by the alarmist observers at the time. Perhaps more than in any other case of potential German military deployment, Libya stands out as a case in which German strategic behaviour was based on very careful strategic deliberation about potential risks and threats vs. potential gains of military intervention.[466] This was much discussed during the debates on Libya which were not driven primarily by higher principles or moral imperatives but rather by objective assessments of the conflict situation. The wider context included the international actors and above all, the strongly conveyed notion of German interests (or the lack thereof) in terms of Libya. Miskimmon argues similarly claiming that German abstention was a result of a combination of factors involving German national interests, which did not directly involve Libya: German responsibility and pressure in the handling of the euro crisis as well as its fallout in the German electorate.[467]

Indeed, if one does not accept as unequivocal that the German Bundestag had not been informed about the US policy shift before the first debate on Libya, Germany would have most likely voted in favour of UN Resolution 1973. Taking the wider context into consideration seems to offer the best explanation for German policy in the Libyan case. However, perhaps an even more convincing explanation for German abstention can be found when we assess German policy towards the Arab Spring as a whole. Ever since the Iraq War, Germany had sought to establish not only a stronger profile for the EU

---

[466] Which is not to say that this would not have been the case earlier. However, German government officials reportedly exercised different scenarios of military action and non-action. On the repercussions for German position, see e.g. Brockmeier, 2013.

[467] Miskimmon, Alister 2012, 'German Foreign Policy and the Libya Crisis', German Politics, Vol. 21, No. 4, pp. 392-410.

in the Middle Eastern peace process, but had attempted to carve out a stronger and more independent profile for Germany as well. This could be detected for instance in the active 'post-Iraq shuttle-diplomacy' that German foreign ministers have conducted over the years in the region during peace talks between Israelis, Arabs and the Palestinians. However, despite their qualitatively different approach to the Middle East compared to the major players France, the UK and the US which is detectable in their increased efforts to engage in a dialogue with Islam[468], the Germans were equally taken by surprise by the spiral of violence that followed the Arab Spring, in particular with regard to Libya and Syria. Hence, as one observer put it, the Germans had committed the 'Faustian bargain' along with the rest of the West, meaning that they had mistaken stagnation for stability in that they had either 'bought' dictators off or offered concessions and turned a blind eye to human-rights issues, societal transparency and aspirations for political and societal modernization in exchange for stability in the region and 'a little bit of hope' for peace for Israel (e.g. in the case of German policy towards Egypt and President Hosni Mubarak).[469] However, German policy differed considerably from the rest of the major Western actors in the conclusions it drew from the violent popular upheaval brought about by the Arab Spring. Germany remained skeptical of a military solution in Libya and later in Syria and focused its efforts on strengthening the national dialogue in the countries in the Middle East and North Africa region (MENA) as part of its peace mediation efforts.[470] Hence, German abstention in the UNSC vote in the Libyan case was caused primarily by these sentiments – i.e. in the German strategic view, that the spiralling violence and the unpredictable domino-effect of spreading civil unrest was far more threatening to Germany's security and its interests as Gaddafi and his regime and the fact that Germany was not willing to risk becoming a party to this spiral of violence by committing troops to Operation Unified Protector.

To sum up, firstly, the crisis in Libya reaffirmed Germany that military force can only be a part of a larger political solution in the effort to end a conflict, which seemed to fit rather well with what the Germans basically already knew based on the experiences of Iraq and especially Afghanistan. Second, however, German behaviour in the crisis was nothing but predictable and regardless of the utterances of Merkel and Westerwelle that German abstention did not mean that Germany was principally opposed to the Western pol-

---

[468] See e.g. Jünemann 2005.

[469] Ratka, Edmund 2012, 'Germany and the Arab Spring - Foreign Policy Between New Activism and Old Habits', German Politics and Society, Issue 102, Vol. 30, No. 2, Summer 2012, pp. 59-74.

[470] See e.g. 'Germany as Mediator. Peace Mediation and Mediation Support in German Foreign Policy, Conference Report 25.11.2014, Federal Foreign Office, Directorate-General for Crisis Prevention, Stabilisation and Post Conflict Peacebuilding. Available at: (http://www.friedensmediation-deutschland.de/fileadmin/uploads/friedensmeditation/dokumente/Report_on_Peace_Mediation_Conference_2014.pdf).

icy on Libya, only to the part relating to the use of military force, was certainly not seen as such by France, the UK and the US and many Arab states (even though many EU member states were equally in favour of the more cautious approach represented by Germany). Indeed, it can be argued that for the skeptics, the German behaviour was a testament of a cherry-pick strategy that seemed to amount to a *sine qua non* for German foreign and security policy in the Middle East.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, in the Bundestag debates over Libya, few references were to be found to German historical responsibility which had hitherto been the decisive factor for both those who advocated a German military deployment and for those who were against it, especially in the case of Lebanon. At the very least, this can be taken as a sign of 'German normalization' in terms of security and defence policy in the very particular sense that not every decision on the use of military force would have to be subordinated to the dichotomy of German guilt and responsibility. And yet, as will be argued in the next chapter, continuity can be detected in how this dichotomy structures the strategic debate in Germany while the ways the past continues to affect the present have changed. This can be detected for instance in the current strategic cultural context when the question is not so much *whether* Germany needs to bear international responsibility but rather *how*, to what extent and in what ways it should do so. However, as will be argued in the next chapter, German 'normalization' has very little to do with a specific pattern of security and defence policy behaviour. It also does not function very well as a conception of German international responsibility via some 'objective' argument of what is or should be considered 'normal' behaviour. An example of this can be found in the traditional realist view on states as 'normal' when they aim to maximize their military power. 'Normality' rather, is what Germany and Germans make of it.

In terms of the analytical framework of strategic cultural change, there are several observations to draw from Libya. Firstly, Germany's abstention from the UNSC Libya vote can not only be attributed to the meagre effects that peer pressure had on the German government at the time. It can just as well be argued to stem from Germany's deep skepticism towards the use of force in general and in the context of the Middle East, in particular. However, it was not as if Germany's abstention was an established political practice in the Federal Republic, and German behaviour in the crisis was rather peculiar. However, it cannot be argued that German strategic culture did not function seamlessly in the Libyan case. It provided the necessary clarity in terms of what the implications for German military participation in the Operation Unified Protector would be, and provided the basis for Germany's abstention from the UNSC vote. Moreover, while the crisis in Libya did not trigger any fundamental change in German strategic culture, it caused a shift in the German policy preferences in the sense that the German government attempted to carve out an independent role for Germany in the crisis, with the attempt to not to clearly break with the 'never again alone' principle. Howev-

er, this did not arise out of specifically articulated foreign or security policy ambitions but was rather reflected in the Bundestag debates when a clear delineation was made between the former colonial powers and Germany.

From stagnation and weak strategic culture to 'new activism'?

"Germany is not an island"[471] *(Joachim Gauck)*

As argued, the aftermath of the Libya crisis did not lead to a renewed crisis in transatlantic relations nor did it really isolate Germany in terms of international politics. However, the decision to abstain from the UNSC vote on Resolution 1973 was increasingly conceived as a regression of German foreign and security policy and a sign of a 'weak strategic culture'. As Hyde-Price has argued, this 'regression' was crystallized not only in Germany's abstention over Libya or its refusal to help eliminate Syria's stock of chemical weapons or to participate in NATO's 2013 military exercise Steadfast Jazz in the Baltic region, but in the very persona of the then Foreign Minister Guido Westerwelle, who "was out of his depth in the more complex world of international politics, which has its own logic and dynamics. During his tenure as Foreign Minister, Germany not only failed to live up to its responsibilities as a major European power, it also failed to nurture and sustain its relationships with key allies and partners."[472] This was especially reflected in the worsening Franco-German relations. France was increasingly worried about German lack of enthusiasm to invest further in CSDP and the French media and diplomats summoned the doom for CSDP after EU's disunity in Libya.[473]

However, while Hyde-Price's account of the Foreign Minister's merits and demerits might be accurate, it hardly accounts for an explanation of the 'stasis' within German strategic culture at the time. Moreover, part of the reason for the argued 'weak strategic culture' can be found in the German predicament with the euro crisis, which raised the issue of economic security to the forefront. And yet, even the financial crisis alone cannot explain the stagnation in German strategic culture because, while it had a direct effect on the aggregate defence spending at the EU level, Germany's defence budgets remained approximately the same during 2010-2015 (between €34.93 billion and €35.52 billion).[474] Moreover, while the argument of overstretch has quite often been used against further out-of-area deployments of the Bundeswehr,

---

[471] 'Germany's role in the world: Reflections on responsibility, norms and alliances', speech by Federal President Joachim Gauck at the opening of the Munich Security Conference, 31.1.2014. Available at: (http://www.bundespraesident.de/).

[472] Hyde-Price, Adrian 2015, 'The "sleep-walking giant" awakes: resetting German foreign and security policy', European Security, Vol. 24, No. 4, p. 605.

[473] Menon, Anand 2011, 'European Defence Policy from Lisbon to Libya', Survival, Vo. 53, No. 3, p.76.

[474] Militärausgaben von Deutschland von 2000 bis 2015 (in Milliarden Euro). Available at: (http://de.statista.com/statistik/daten/studie/183064/umfrage/militaerausgaben-von-deutschland/).

this has hardly amounted to the described weakness in German strategic culture. Hence, it is rather the political ramifications of the economic crisis that play a more important role here. In addition, it can be argued that one of the more pertinent reasons was the lack of major successes on behalf of the Bundeswehr as part of the ISAF, which further decreased the German belief in military solutions as part of crisis management. As argued above, even though the Kunduz airstrike in 2009 functioned as sort of an external shock and brought home the operational reality of 'warlike circumstances', and even though it ultimately led to a considerable increase in German participation in NATO counterinsurgency operations, in the eyes of the German politicians, Kunduz was clearly a military failure.[475] Indeed, even the Bundeswehr military operations in Afghanistan that were first and foremost military successes, were mostly downplayed by the federal government.[476] As Sangar has argued in detail, even though the Bundeswehr participated in fully-fledged counterinsurgency (COIN) operations in Afghanistan, ever since the 'wake-up' call of Kunduz, the general reluctant reaction to the spreading violence "can partly be understood by a missing doctrinal debate on the nuts and bolts of expeditionary and counterinsurgency experience".[477] This had the effect of German ground commanders not knowing the intentions of their superiors which led "many soldiers on the tactical level to the intuitively correct impression that they are 'aimlessly' wandering around".[478] Indeed, it is not difficult to conclude that a lack of strategic debate does not reinvigorate strategic culture. This was well highlighted in the response of a German Lt. Colonel in an interview with Sangar as he claimed that "What I wish is that the impact of our own experience would move away from the tactical towards the operational, strategic levels – towards thinking about the war. In that aspect, we are still light years away from other nations."[479]

Hence, we could argue that the weakness of German strategic culture at the time was due to not only a 'pacifist reflex' of the German government but also due to existing structural deficiencies in Bundeswehr strategic capabilities, the lack of strategic debate as well as lack of military success – or rather the lack of perceived or officially acknowledged military success in Afghani-

---

[475] However, German soldiers and officers serving in Afghanistan usually treated Kunduz rather as a success, because it in effect drew attention to the material deficits of the Bundeswehr and had a dissuasive effect on the Taliban insurgency in the Kunduz region. See e.g. Sangar, Eric 2015, 'The Weight of the Past(s): The Impact of the Use of Bundeswehr's Use of Historical Experience on Strategy-Making in Afghanistan', Journal of Strategic Studies, Vol. 38, No. 4, p. 439.

[476] Consider i.e. Bundeswehr's first counterinsurgency operation in Afghanistan in 2007,'Harekate Yolo II', see e.g. ‚Bundeswehr in Afghanistan: Der weichgespülte Kampfeinsatz', Spiegel Online, 10.1.2008. Available at: (http://www.spiegel.de/politik/deutschland/bundeswehr-in-afghanistan-der-weich gespuelte-kampfeinsatz-a-527869.html).

[477] Sangar 2015, p. 440.

[478] Ibid.

[479] Ibid, p. 441.

stan. To put it another way, we could argue that the lack of experience (in expeditionary and counterinsurgency warfare) prohibited the normal functioning of German strategic culture. This led to the impression of strategic inertia that was reflected at the level of Bundeswehr operational reality as aimlessness and at the political level as inertia or even as disillusionment.

Nonetheless, however one wishes to describe this period of stagnation or weakness in German strategic culture, it came to an end rather abruptly due to the intervention of German Federal President Joachim Gauck in his Day of German Unity Speech on 3 October 2013. Gauck argued strongly in favour of a broader political and societal debate on the question of whether Germany lives up to its international responsibility. He argued that as "(o)ur country is not an island, we should not cherish the illusion that we will be spared from political and economic, environmental and military conflicts if we do not contribute to solving them."[480] Even though not outspoken, a reference to German behaviour during the Libya crisis was evident. Indeed, Gauck's speech seemed to reinvigorate the security and defence political debate in Germany. This was partly made possible by the Bundestag elections in 2013, which resulted in Angela Merkel's third term as Chancellor. Frank-Walter Steinmeier (SPD) took the Foreign Ministry from Westerwelle and Ursula von der Leyen (CDU/CSU) was appointed as the new Defence Minister. As Hyde-Price has argued, "(b)oth von der Leyen and Steinmeier have indicated a desire to break with the foreign policy legacy of Westerwelle, and to pursue a more active foreign policy. This includes the use of military force, and a more proactive and engaged approach to multilateral military operations."[481]

Signs of this new activism in German foreign and security policy were clearly detectable during the 50th Munich Security Conference in January 2014. The appearances of key German politicians did not go unnoticed. One observer even called the behaviour of Gauck, Steinmeier and von der Leyen at the conference as "the revenge of the German elite" as the German "foreign policy establishment struck back against a public they say has become increasingly insular, self-satisfied and pacifist".[482] Indeed, especially Gauck seemed to continue where he left off in October 2013 in terms of the debate regarding German responsibility:

I have to admit that while there are genuine pacifists in Germany, there are also people who use Germany's guilt for its past as a shield for laziness or a desire to disengage from the world. In the words of

---

[480] Speech by Federal President Joachim Gauck to mark the Day of German Unity Stuttgart, 3 October 2013. Available at: (http://www.bundespraesident.de/SharedDocs/Downloads/DE/Reden/2013/10/).

[481] Hyde-Price 2015, p. 603.

[482] Leonard, Mark 2014, 'The revenge of the German elite', European Council on Foreign Relations, 5.2.2014. Available at: (http://www.ecfr.eu/article/commentary_the_revenge_of_the_german_elite).

the German historian Heinrich August Winkler, this is an attitude that grants Germany a questionable "right to look the other way, which other Western democracies" cannot claim for themselves. Restraint can thus be taken too far if people start making special rules for themselves. Whenever that happens, I will criticize it.[483]

However, while the above passage was undoubtedly the most cited one in the media and among the critics, the key message Gauck attempted to deliver was that Germans should begin to trust themselves and their country in international issues, because Germany had proven to be trustworthy. By doing so, Germany would also make an even better friend and a partner to its allies.[484]

Foreign Minister Steinmeier especially seemed to take up on the 'new activism' as he often talked about reactivating the foreign ministry at the time. Steinmeier also announced a revival of Franco-German relations (which had arguably sunk to an all-time low during Westerwelle's tenure) by conducting joint trips with the French in Moldova, Georgia, Libya and Tunesia and offering to destroy Syrian chemical weapons in Germany.[485] Von der Leyen, in turn, argued in a similar vein that "indifference is not an option". She pledged an increase in the German deployment to Mali and her support for the establishment of a European army.[486] However, and as Leonard has argued, "history is 'dialectical', as Germans like to say. It rarely advances in straight lines. It usually takes jagged swings between opposites. One senior diplomat explained to me that if Westerwelle had not embraced the 'culture of restraint' so proudly, it would be impossible for the current players to throw it overboard so comprehensively".[487] In any case, Steinmeier's shuttle diplomacy in mediating the crisis in Ukraine that will be discussed below, has received a lot of appreciation – and as the chief political correspondent of *Deutsche Welle* argued, it moved Germany "from the comfort zone into the middle of things".[488]

---

[483] Speech by Federal President Joachim Gauck at the opening of the Munich Security Conference on 31 January 2014 in Munich. Available at: (http://www.bundespraesident.de/SharedDocs/Downloads/DE/Reden/2014/01/).

[484] Ibid.

[485] 'Georgien, Moldau, Tunesien: Steinmeier und Fabius auf gemeinsamer Krisen-Mission', Spiegel Online, 23.4.2014. Available at: (http://www.spiegel.de/politik/deutschland/steinmeier-und-fabius-besuchen-georgien-moldau-und-tunesien-a-965601.html); ,Deutschland beteiligt an Chemiewaffen-Vernichtung', Die Welt, 9.1.2014. Available at: (http://www.welt.de/politik/deutschland/article123690949/Deutschland-beteiligt-an-Chemiewaffen-Vernichtung.html).

[486] Hyde-Price 2015.

[487] Leonard 2014.

[488] Crane, Melinda 2014, 'New Diplomacy: Germany in the middle of things', Deutsche Welle, 25.5.2014. Available at: (http://www.dw.com/en/new-diplomacy-germany-in-the-middle-of-things/a-17647834).

Ukraine

It can be argued that the political crisis which erupted in Ukraine in early 2014 has effectively ended the rather co-operative phase in Russian-Western relations, which began with the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989. In retrospect, it seemed that the brief Russo-Georgian war in 2008 delivered the foretaste of what was to become a period of heightened rivalry and even confrontation between the old Cold War adversaries, because it ended the prospects of NATO membership for both Georgia and Ukraine and cemented the Western view of Russia as a resurgent power that will seek to implement its interests with the use of military force and the dismissal of international law if need be.

The crisis in Ukraine started in late 2013 when unrest and riots spread as a result of Ukrainian President Viktor Yanukovych's refusal to accept the association agreement with the EU that had been offered. The suppression of 'Euromaidan' – a name given to a wave of protests and civil unrest that began in the Maidan square demanding closer integration into Europe – turned violent and bloody and Yanukovych had little choice but to make concessions to the opposition to end the bloodshed and crisis in Kiev. Agreement on the settlement of political crisis in Ukraine was signed by Yanukovych and the representatives of the Ukrainian parliamentary opposition, including German-based ex-boxer Vitali Klitschko on 21 February under the mediation of German and Polish Foreign Ministers Steinmeier and Sikorski. Russia did not endorse the agreement. Ultimately, Yanukovych was ousted from office in the 'February 2014 revolution' and was forced to flee the country to Russia.

After Yanukovych had fled the country, the Ukrainian government made a decision that proved to be fatal in terms of the aftermath of the Maidan revolution. It voted to make Ukrainian the sole state language at all levels. As Freedman has argued, this caused a strong adverse reaction in Crimea and southern and eastern Ukraine, all of which backed Yanukovych and prompted street protests. Acting President Oleksandr Turchynov vetoed the bill on 1 March.[489] As Forsberg has argued, German policy in Ukraine during these initial phases had three strings: "Germany was ready to assume a role as a mediator, or at least to serve as a contact partner to Russia. Yet Germany was also willing to advocate tougher action in terms of sanctions if Russia escalated the crisis. A third strand in Germany's policy was to support Ukraine. In formulating this response to Russia's action, it was also pushing for unity in the West and the EU in particular." In terms of strategic culture, "Germany ruled out the use of military force as a solution to the crisis, believing in-

---

[489] Freedman, Lawrence 2014, 'Ukraine and the Art of Conflict Management', Survival, Vol. 56, No.3, p. 20 (7-42).

stead in the power of long-term diplomatic efforts to end the crisis."[490] Indeed, German strategic behaviour did not seem to deviate drastically from any established strategic patterns during this phase and seemed to correspond to the views of 'new activism' in German foreign and security policy, but as Forsberg has argued, the continued escalation of the crisis signaled an "erosion of [German] *Ostpolitik*".[491]

However, Germany's policy toward Russia shifted considerably as the crisis escalated in the course of Russian military intervention, annexation of the Crimean peninsula and the subsequent armed conflict which erupted between the post-revolutionary Ukrainian government and the pro-Russian insurgents and militia in the Donetsk and Luhansk oblasts of Ukraine. This was particularly detectable in Chancellor Merkel's tough stance as she condemned Russian annexation of the Crimean peninsula by arguing that Russia had violated international law. As Russia did not call off the referendum in Crimea[492], which Merkel had pleaded to Putin, she "opted for targeted sanctions and advocated more if Russia took further military action in Ukraine".[493] However, even though the principal argument of the German political elite was that co-operation with Russia would continue in the mid- to long term, Germany's tough stance toward Russia in the Ukraine crisis had "obliterated the core principle of Germany's traditional *Ostpolitik,* according to which the country sees itself as Russia's chief interlocutor in Europe".[494]

This view is confirmed in the recent German White Paper (*Weissbuch*) which clearly signalled that the former strategic co-operation with Russia has turned into strategic rivalry:

> *Russia is openly calling the European peace order into question with its willingness to use force to advance its own interests and to unilaterally redraw borders guaranteed under international law, as it has done in Crimea and eastern Ukraine. This has far-reaching implications for security in Europe and thus for the security of Germany. The crisis in and surrounding Ukraine is the concrete manifestation of long-term internal and external developments. Russia is rejecting a*

---

[490] Forsberg, Tuomas 2016, 'From *Ostpolitik* to 'frostpolitik'? Merkel, Putin and German policy towards Russia', International Affairs, Vol. 92, No.1, pp. 28-9.

[491] Ibid.

[492] The referendum was held by the legislature of the Autonomous Republic of Crimean Peninsula and the local government of Sevastopol (both are subdivisions of Ukraine) on 16 March 2014, following Russian military takeover of the Crimean Peninsula. The referendum asked the local population whether they wanted to join Russian Federation or if they wanted to restore the 1992 Crimean constitution and Crimea as part of the Ukraine. An overwhelming majority (over 80%) voted in favour of joining Russian Federation. The referendum was declared illegitimate by the UN General Assembly on 28 March 2014. For more detail, see the press release on UN General Assembly 80th Plenary Meeting, available at: (https://www.un.org/press/en/2014/ga11493.doc.htm).

[493] Ibid., p. 29.

[494] Ibid., p. 36.

close partnership with the West and placing emphasis on strategic rivalry. Internationally, Russia is presenting itself as an independent power centre with global ambitions. This is reflected, for example, by an increase in Russia's military activities along its borders with the European Union (EU) and the North Atlantic Alliance (NATO). In the course of extensively modernising its armed forces, Russia appears to be prepared to test the limits of existing international agreements. By increasingly using hybrid instruments to purposefully blur the borders between war and peace, Russia is creating uncertainty about the nature of its intentions. This calls for responses from the affected states, but also from the EU and NATO [495]

Moreover, the White Paper clearly describes Russia as a security challenge (short of a military threat) even though it acknowledges the fact that security in Europe cannot be established and maintained without co-operation with Russia:

Without a fundamental change in policy, Russia will constitute a challenge to the security of our continent in the foreseeable future. At the same time, however, Europe and Russia remain linked by a broad range of common interests and relations. As the EU's largest neighbour and a permanent member of the UN Security Council, Russia has a special regional and global responsibility when it comes to meeting common challenges and managing international crises. Sustainable security and prosperity in and for Europe cannot therefore be ensured without strong cooperation with Russia. It is therefore all the more important that, in our relations with Russia, we find the right balance between collective defence and increased resilience on the one hand, and approaches to cooperative security and sectoral cooperation on the other. What is important for the common security space of our continent is thus not the development of a new security architecture, but rather respect for and consistent adherence to existing and proven common rules and principles. [496]

Some observers of German foreign and security policy, such as Hans Kundnani, have offered a rather different view. Kundnani makes an argument that Germany's response to the Ukraine crisis can be understood against the backdrop of "a long term weakening of the so-called Westbindung" which despite Germany's contributions to Afghanistan and its pledge to NATO, is to be detected in the change in Germany's attitude toward the rest of the West: "Germany has hardened its opposition to the use of military force. After its experience in Afghanistan, Germany appears to have decided that the right lesson from its Nazi past is not 'never again Auschwitz' the principle it in-

---

[495] White Paper on German Security Policy and the Future of Bundeswehr (2016), p. 31-32. Available at: (https://www.bmvg.de/).

[496] Ibid., p. 32.

voked to justify its participation in the 1999 NATO military intervention in Kosovo, but 'never again war.' German politicians across the spectrum now define their country as a *Friedensmacht*, a 'force for peace.'"[497]

Firstly, it needs to be noted that there are no *absolute* right lessons, or rather that the prevailing lessons 'never again war' and 'never again Auschwitz' are both equally absolute in terms of their impact on German strategic culture. This is clearly detectable if one considers the track record of German strategic culture after the end of the Cold War discussed in this chapter. Moreover, in terms of strategic culture, 'a long-term weakening of Westbindung' seems hardly compatible with a simultaneous 'obliteration of Germany's traditional Ostpolitik', because increased economic co-operation with China or other rising international powers can hardly supplant either in terms of security for Germany. Moreover, the 2016 White Paper does not seem to reflect Kundnani's predictions as it clearly states that NATO remains the ultimate guarantee for peace and security in Europe for Germany:

> *Alliance solidarity is a fundamental principle of German governance. Strengthening the cohesion and capacity to act of NATO and the EU is of paramount importance for Germany. We actively strive to strike a balance between conflicting interests and are prepared to assume responsibility and lead in order to make joint action possible. Priority is given to the continuous adaptation to the changing security environment, the close interlinking and progressive integration of European armed forces, the strengthening of NATO's European pillar, and coherent interaction between NATO and the EU. In addition, Germany is committed to the goal of a security order that includes all the states of the European continent.[498]*

In terms of German strategic culture, it can be argued that the crisis in Ukraine highlights both the aspects of continuity and change. This is well exemplified in the notion of a 'double strategy' (*Doppelstrategie*) adopted within NATO which is a mix of both restraint and engagement, reflected in the shift of the image of Russia from strategic partner to a strategic rival in Germany or as the 2016 White Paper puts it: "the right balance between collective defence and increased resilience on the one hand, and approaches to cooperative security and sectoral cooperation on the other".[499]

During the NATO Wales Summit in 2014, Merkel reaffirmed the German double strategy in that it was ready to 'act strongly' if required but that the avenue for co-operation was open, if Russia showed signs that it respected the agreements signed between NATO and Russia, i.e. the Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security between NATO and the Russian Federation signed in May 1997 in Paris. According to this document, it was

---

[497] Kundnani, Hans 2015, 'Leaving the West behind', Foreign Affairs, Vol. 93, No.1, pp. 108–16.

[498] White Paper 2016, p. 49.

[499] Ibid.

agreed that NATO would not station military troops permanently on Russia's borders. However, Merkel criticized Russia for violating the principles of the 1997 agreement. Germany also supported the establishment of a rapid reaction force (as part of NATO's Response Force) and Merkel pledged to bolster the multinational brigade of Poland, Denmark and Germany stationed in Stettin.[500]

Some observers have labelled German strategic behaviour in the crisis as 'strategic wait and see' (*Strategisches Abwarten*).[501] This highlights continuity in German policy towards Russia, despite the shift in the image of Russia in Germany. However, in the context of Russian aggression, this behaviour has triggered serious questions in the German capacity to deliver real political solutions to the Ukraine crisis. This can be seen in Steinmeier's and Merkel's political mission to stabilize the volatile security situation that has mostly resulted in helplessness and frustration in Germany.[502] The political left, in particular, has been critical of NATO's re-armament plans and criticism has been voiced regarding NATO's pledge not to station permanent troops adjacent to Russia's borders.[503]

Before the NATO Summit in Warsaw in July 2016, Chancellor Merkel argued in a government declaration that the deployment of the rapid reaction force was not enough and promised more support for NATO's eastern member states – Poland, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. She also reacted to Foreign Minister Steinmeier's criticism of NATO's 'martial behaviour' in Eastern Europe by arguing that the elements of the double-strategy belong together and that security and peace in Europe cannot be established without Russia.[504] In the Warsaw Summit, NATO decided to deploy four battalions, each of 1,000 troops, in Poland, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. These troops would circulate in order for NATO to keep intact its pledge to the 1997 agreement with Russia. Germany takes the lead in the Lithuanian battalion

---

[500] See e.g. ‚Nato beschließt schnelle Eingreiftruppe', Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, 5.9.2014. Available at: (http://www.faz.net/aktuell/politik/ausland/gipfeltreffen-in-wales-nato beschliesst-schnelle-eingreiftruppe-13137102.html); Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security between NATO and the Russian Federation, 27.5.1997. Available at: (http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/offici al_texts_25468.htm).

[501] Kwiatkowska-Drożdż, Anna and Frymark, Kamil 2015, 'Analyse: Deutschland im Russland-Konflikt: eine politische oder eine humanitäre Aufgabe?', Ukraine-Analysen Nr. 148, Bundeszentrale für Politische Bildung. Available at: (http:www.bpb.de).

[502] See e.g. Kwiatkowska-Drożdż and Frymark 2015; Haukkala, Hiski 2016, 'A Perfect Storm; Or What Went Wrong and What Went Right for the EU in Ukraine', Europe-Asia Studies, Vol. 68, No. 4, p. 661.

[503] Pflüger Tobias, ‚NATO-Gipfel: Aufrüstung für den Kalten Krieg 2.0', 8.7.2016. Available at: (https://www.die-linke.de/nc/die-linke/nachrichten/detail/artikel/nato-gipfel-aufruestung-fuer-den-kalten-krieg-20/).

[504] ‚Regierungserklärung: Merkel verspricht Nato-Truppen für Polen und das Baltikum', Spiegel Online, 7.7.2016. Available at: (http://www.spiegel.de/politik/deutschland/angela-merkel-nato-wird-feste-kontingente-im-baltikum-und-polen-stationieren-a-1101756.html).

with several hundred Bundeswehr soldiers. NATO also agreed to step up its fight against the terrorist organization 'Islamic State' by deploying 16 AWACS surveillance aircraft in the airspace over Syria and Iraq. According to Bundeswehr's own estimates, it would deploy around one-third of the crews required. The US also requested the EU to cover more of the costs and US President Obama appealed to Chancellor Merkel especially in this regard.[505] Merkel had already signalled a considerable increase in German defence spending before the NATO Summit. At the economic conference of the CDU/CSU in June, Merkel had argued that the EU of today was not in a position to defend itself and that therefore it was essential that German defence spending (1.2% of the GDP) would come closer to that of the US (3.4 % of the GDP). As a member of NATO, Germany is pledged to the common Alliance goal of 2% defence spending of the GDP.[506]

German Foreign Minister Steinmeier remained more skeptical than Chancellor Merkel towards NATO's rearmament, having warned against 'symbolic tank parades at the eastern border of the Alliance' and 'sabre-rattling'. However, Steinmeier was quick to defend NATO's position after Russia had condemned the Warsaw Summit. The Russian Foreign Ministry issued a statement which declared that "NATO concentrates its effort in curtailing a non-existent danger from the east", calling NATO's actions as 'Russia's demonization'. Similarly, former Russian President Mikhail Gorbachev accused NATO of 'warmongering'. Steinmeier defended the deployments and argued that the upcoming NATO-Russia Council "would be a chance to elucidate NATO's decisions and aim for a serious and continuous dialogue with Russia".[507]

Reflecting on the recent developments in global security policy and change and continuity in German foreign and security policy, Steinmeier elaborated at length on Germany's 'new global role' in a recent article by asserting that, today, "Germany is a major European power that attracts praise and criticism in equal measure". He argued that the actions Germany had undertaken in the international stage in recent years "are forcing Germany to reinterpret the principles that have guided its foreign policy over half a century. But Germany is a reflective power: even as it adapts, a belief in the importance of restraint, deliberation, and peaceful negotiation will continue to guide its interactions with the rest of the world."[508] Steinmeier also highlighted Germany's increased role as a leader, especially regarding the crisis in

---

[505] ,Die Nato rüstet auf', Zeit Online, 9.7.2016. Available at: (http://www.zeit.de/politik/ausland/2016-07/nato-gipfel-aufruesten-russland-osteuropa).

[506] ,Merkel will Militärausgaben erhöhen', Wirtschaftswoche, 22.6.2016. Available at: (http://www.wiwo.de/politik/deutschland/bundeswehr-merkel-will-militaerausgaben-erhoehen/13769148.html).

[507] ,Russland wirft NATO Dämonisierung vor', tagesschau 10.7.2016. Available at: (https://www.tagesschau.de/ausland/nato-gipfel-125.html).

[508] Steinmeier, Frank-Walter 2016, 'Germany's New Global Role. Berlin Steps Up', Foreign Affairs, pp. 106-7.

Ukraine: "Germany did not elbow its way into that position, nor did anyone else appoint it to that role. Its long-standing economic and political ties to both Russia and Ukraine made it a natural go-between for both sides, despite Berlin's obvious support for the victims of Moscow's aggression."[509] He also pointed out that "(t)he Minsk agreement that Germany and France brokered in February 2015 to halt hostilities is far from perfect, but one thing is certain: without it, the conflict would have long ago spun out of control and extended beyond the Donbas region of Ukraine. Going forward, Germany will continue to do what it can to prevent the tensions from escalating into a new Cold War."[510]

In summary, the crisis in Ukraine has confirmed recent trends in both strategic cultural continuity and change. However, the changes have not been as fundamental at the normative/ideational level as they might appear at the level of policy. Nonetheless, the fact that Russia's image has shifted from being a strategic partner to being a strategic rival will have long-term repercussions on German strategic culture. This pertains in particular to the image of peace and war in Europe, because in the long-term, the unresolved situation in Ukraine is a destabilizing factor, which, as we have witnessed, has already shifted the focus in NATO's defence posture from out-of-area operations to collective defence and effectively brought about a spiral of rearmament and a considerable increase in German defence spending.

How should we apply the framework of strategic cultural change in the case of Ukraine if there is no major detectable effect on either the ideational/normative structure or the strategic practices of German strategic culture? As argued, the conflict has already caused a fine-tuning of German policy preferences towards Russia (from strategic 'partner' to strategic 'rival') and contributed to a notable increase in German defence spending. It can also be argued that these are both significant outcomes in their own right, given that the Russo-Georgian war in 2008, as an external shock, was not forceful enough to facilitate the shift in German strategic stance towards Russia and that the year 2015 marked the first year since the end of the Cold War, when Germany considerably increased its defence spending (the Bundeswehr's budget, for instance, had steadily dropped from 3.2% of the GDP in 1983 to 1.2% of the GDP in 2014).[511] However, perhaps the value of the analytical framework of strategic cultural change is best expressed when we elaborate on the possible repercussions of the Ukraine crisis in terms of future developments. First, in general, the Ukraine crisis has unsettling effects in light of the ongoing Bundeswehr reform[512], because it highlights the role and im-

---

[509] Ibid., p.112.

[510] Ibid.

[511] See e.g. 'The Bundeswehr Backs Away From the Brink. Germany Patches Up its Military', Foreign Affairs, Snapshot, 19.1.2016. Available at: (https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/europe/2016-01-19/bundeswehr-backs-away-brink).

[512] See Chapter 5.3.3. for more detail.

portance of traditional territorial defence in German (and NATO) military doctrine, which puts pressure on the Bundeswehr and the German government economically and politically. This might facilitate a further fine-tuning of German security policy preferences that go beyond an increase in defence spending. Second, while NATO and the rest of 'the West' have presented a rather united front in the Ukraine crisis (as opposed e.g. to the Russo-Georgian War), the policy of introducing tougher sanctions on Russia has neither borne much fruit politically nor contributed to the increase of the security situation in the volatile Ukraine. The sanctions are tied to the Minsk peace accords, which have been breached multiple times as clashes have continued between the Ukrainian government forces and pro-Russian forces in East Ukraine. Given these developments, it is reasonable to assume that Germany, which is widely considered to have the closest relationship to Russia of all the key NATO and EU member states, will be the target of increasing peer pressure from its allies. While Chancellor Merkel has not backed away from engaging Putin in the question of Ukraine and his commitment to the Minsk peace process, not much has hitherto come out of these talks. However, all this points to an increase in the probability that the 'double strategy' will be scrutinized and possibly even replaced with a more effective strategic practice at some point. This is so because Germany is well aware of the geopolitical implications for its economy and security with regard to potential 'freezing' of the conflict and even more so given the possibility, however small, that Russia will continue with its policy of aggression. More specifically, however, an argument can also be made that the Ukraine crisis has consolidated the shift in the German image of war and peace in Europe and it echoes the images during the Cold War, even though Germans are united in the idea that lasting peace in Europe cannot be achieved without the cooperation with Russia. Hence, a particular challenge for German strategic culture remains how Germany is able to re-engage with Russia and prevent the development of *Frostpolitik* from turning the crisis in Ukraine into a 'frozen conflict'.

4.4. POST-COLD WAR GERMANY – STILL A CIVILIAN POWER?

Conflicts in and beyond Europe have reshaped the security policy context for all EU member states since the end of the Cold War. For Germany, this has meant a process of reassessing and redefining the German post-Cold War identity in the sense of attempting to find an international profile which could be reconciled with interpretations of German historical responsibility. And as we have seen during the course of the 1990s and beyond, this process has been immensely difficult, not only because the different interpretations offer different suggestions as to what kind of role Germany should actually play in international affairs but also because the expectations towards a more

active German international military presence have often exceeded either the capabilities or the willingness of the German polity. Ever since war again became political reality for the Germans during the first Gulf War in 1990, the inherent discrepancy built within the normative structure of German strategic culture (the tension between the different never again principles) has been in the spotlight. This discrepancy has been exacerbated on one hand by the growing external demands towards an increased German military presence in crises throughout the world and on the other hand by the domestic public opinion that at present remains largely negative towards the issue of growing German military presence in global crises.[513]

In the wake of the human catastrophes beginning with the Balkans and Srebrenica, this inconsistency has been reflected in the domestic German criticism towards 'unconditional pacifism' and in the argument that the perfectly conceivable individual stance of 'ideological-ethical pacifism' cannot be so easily converted into a fundament for German state identity, as Michael Glos noted during the debate on Iraq. The humanitarian interventions since the Balkan conflict have been coined by critics as 'liberal interventionism' and by advocates as the deployment of military means in defence of human rights and the norm of responsibility to protect.[514] Political and financial support for these interventions is important for their success and it is something that Germany more often than not has been ready to provide. However, despite the fact that the taboos concerning German military participation were largely removed in the period from mid-to-late 1990s (*Enttabuisierung des Militärischen*), the major Bundeswehr reforms and the abolition of conscription as well as the German debates on the Bundeswehr's role in military conflict management still raise more questions than they provide answers. In that sense, there is continuity in the German strategic culture as Germany remains a rather reluctant military actor. Yet the global war on terror since 9/11 has shown that the political price for restraint has risen exponentially. This can be highlighted for instance in the repercussions of the Iraq war on Germany as well as in the rift within the transatlantic alliance regarding German abstention from the UNSC vote in the issue of NATO operation in Libya, which raised concerns about Germany's commitment to the Western alliance and led some to interpret German behaviour as 'isolationist' or even 'self-destructive' whereas others

---

[513] See e.g. ,Deutsche gegen mehr Militäreinsätze', Süddeutsche Zeitung, 31.1.2014. Available at: (http://www.sueddeutsche.de/politik/umfrage-zu-auslandseinsaetzen-deutsche-gegen-mehr-militaereinsaetze-1.1876426); ,Umfrage: Deutsche lehnen stärkeres Engagement in der Welt ab', Spiegel Online, 20.5.2014. Available at: (http://www.spiegel.de/politik/deutschland/umfrage-deutsche-lehnen-auslandseinsaetze-der-bundeswehr-ab-a-970463.html).

[514] See Duffield, Mark 2013, 'Liberal Interventionism and the Fragile State: Linked by Design?', Duffield, Mark & Hewitt, Vernon (eds.) 2013, *Empire, Development and Colonialism: The Past in the Present*, Boydell & Brewer Ltd, 2013., pp. 116-129; Cooper, Richard H. & Kohler, Juliette (eds.) 2010, *Responsibility to Protect. The Global Moral Compact for the 21st Century. Palgrave Macmillan*, 2010; Bellamy 2015, *Responsibility to Protect: A Defense*. Oxford University Press, 2015.

have argued that Germany's decision to abstain was due to an 'interest-based' calculation in the context of the looming euro-crisis.[515]

Overall, the persistence of the normative inconsistency within German strategic culture has had the effect that Germany's support of these 'liberal interventionist policies' has been modest at best regarding Germany's preference of civilian conflict management over pre-emptive or even preventive military policies, despite the fact that Germany has been a steadfast supporter of the R2P norm. Indeed, the more recent cases of Lebanon and Libya testify to the fact that the normative shift from 'never again war' to 'never again Auschwitz' has neither been permanent nor has it created a more assertive behavioural pattern or practice in terms of defence and security and that Germany continues to debate the direction of its strategic culture. Yet as will be discussed in detail in Chapter 5, these cases do not amount to an argument in favour of a static strategic culture based on continuous patterns of strategic thinking and practice.

Indeed, given the aforementioned development throughout the 1990s and beyond, it seems that German strategic culture continues to suffer from a double dilemma. The first concerns the fact that the Cold War consensus between the never again principles is politically difficult to achieve, firstly, because Germany has become an international, global actor with diverse interests in its own right and secondly, because the nature of the threats and conflicts has changed. The consensus was not contested during the Cold War mostly because these principles reinforced each other and created consistency and stability in German policies towards both of the superpowers. In addition, Germany's international actorness was limited in the area of international security and defence policy. Since the end of the Cold War, Germany has often faced a situation in which it has to go against one of the 'never again' principles in order to endorse the other. The second dilemma follows from the first: as these principles are rarely mutually reinforcing in terms of what kind of strategic behaviour they suggest, they have increasingly become a locus of conflict rather than a source of inspiration or guidance. The problem lies in that this conflict is a structural one; there is no easy way to simply ignore it, because even historical reinterpretations have their limits and that in terms of agency within strategic culture, thinking 'outside the box' is hardly possible. This will be shown in Chapter 5.

Hence, German strategic culture appears to be less 'strategic' and more 'cultural', since this fundamental normative discrepancy is historically con-structed in the German self-understanding. Since this has basically always had concrete political consequences for German policy making, the debates

---

[515] See Maull, Hanns 2011, 'Deutsche Aussenpolitik: Orientierungslos', Zeitschrift für Politikwissen-schaft, no. 1, 2011, pp. 95–119; Müller, Harald 2011, 'Ein Desaster. Deutschland und der Fall Libyen', HSFK Standpunkte, no. 2, 2011; Miskimmon, Alister 2012, 'German Foreign Policy and the Libya Cri-sis', German Politics, Vol. 21, Issue 4, 2012, pp, 392-410.

on the lessons of the German past and their viability as political guidelines have remained rather lively and non-consensual. These debates also testify to the fact that even though the foreign and security political taboos have been removed, the discrepancy remains unresolved because many interpretations of German historical responsibility remain politically legitimate and offer viable options from the German perspective. Sometimes the different 'never again' lessons can be reconciled, but as argued, more often than not they amount to political conflict despite the Constitutional Court ruling in favour of the legality of Bundeswehr out-of-area deployments in 1994. Yet the Court's decision only established the legal and formal prerequisites for military deployments; the scope and depth were left for the politicians to decide. This continues to be the case as Bundeswehr deployments remain firmly under parliament control.

German concerns over the political legitimacy of the use of military force are also reflected in the question of a European army, which, according to many German politicians, should preferably be organized according to the German model. This would mean that the European Parliament would have similar rights to make caveats as the German Bundestag, something that was confirmed by the final report of the 'Rühe-Commission' (2015). The purpose of the report was to contemplate the appropriateness of the so-called *Bundestagsvorbehalt*[516], but in the context of out-of-area operations in contemporary politics, it did not suggest any major revisions to the existing system in Germany. However, the report suggested that the German government should present a report on the multilateral military alliance capabilities to the Bundestag annually.[517] In addition, Germany's new White Paper underlines the hybrid nature of the emerging security threats which requires increased co-operation between the armed forces of the EU member states.[518] What is more, both CDU/CDU and SPD aim to maintain the long term-goal of a European army, as stated in their coalition agreement.[519]

However, the important point is that Germany is not willing to act beyond the normative boundaries of its strategic culture – yet these boundaries have become more contested than ever, and this was also highlighted in the new

---

[516] This means that the Bundestag retains the final veto on the deployment of the Bundeswehr in out-of-area operations with a simple majority of votes.

[517] Unterrichtung durch die Kommission zur Überprüfung und Sicherung der Parlamentsrechte bei der Mandatierung von Auslandseinsätzen der Bundeswehr. Abschlussbericht der Kommission, Deutscher Bundestag, Drucksache 18/5000. Available at the website of German Defence Ministry (http://www.bmvg.de); ‚Wie von der Leyen die europäische Armee vorantreibt', Die Welt, 4.2.2016. Available at: (http://www.welt.de/politik/deutschland/article151860389/Wie-von-der-Leyen-die-europaeische-Armee-vorantreibt.html).

[518] White Paper 2016, pp. 48-9; See also ‚Enorme Herausforderungen für alle klassischen Instrumente der Sicherheitspolitik': Ein Gespräch zum Weißbuch 2016. Available at (http://www.bmvg.de).

[519] Shaping Germany's Future. Coalition contract between CDU, CSU and SPD for 2013-2017, p. 177. Available at: (https://www.bundesregierung.de/).

White Paper. In the next chapter, I will elaborate on this question through an examination of how some of the core elements of German strategic culture have been historically constructed, contested and partly redefined as part of the process of the ongoing *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*[520] and, importantly, discuss some aspects of this process which the current strategic culture scholarship on Germany has largely chosen to ignore.

To conclude this chapter, I will briefly discuss how the aforementioned development in the framework of German strategic culture since the end of the Cold War has been analysed in the scholarship on German foreign, security and defence policy. The most important scholarly debate in this respect is undoubtedly the one that concerns Germany's role as a civilian power. It also directly concerns the issue of continuity and change and is therefore also most relevant in terms of our discussion on German strategic culture. The concept of civilian power was initially used by Francis Duchêne in the 1970s to attribute to the EC a distinct international profile that was different from traditional military powers stressing instead low politics, politics of interdependence and the role of ideas in shaping foreign and security policy.[521] In the German context, the idea of Germany as a civilian power is based on the German foreign policy consensus that developed during the Cold War, culminating in the politics of *Westbindung* and multilateralism. In terms of Cold War German strategic culture, this consensus was highlighted in the rather unproblematic coexistence of 'never again war' and 'never again alone', as discussed above.

Hanns Maull, whose work is perhaps most widely recognized among the theorists on German foreign and security policy, has often been claimed as the strongest advocate of the continuity thesis, because of his argument about Germany persisting as a civilian power even after the Kosovo crisis and the NATO bombing campaign in which German Luftwaffe participated. He has also argued that Kosovo was not a watershed in terms of German foreign and security policy because Berlin's decision to join in the NATO campaign was "not the fundamental rupture with the past but a further step in the evo-

---

[520] 'Coming to terms with the past'; in a broad sense to be understood as an ongoing process at the centre of which is the idea of learning from the injustices committed in the past and legitimating one's own existence at present, highlighted in public debates, commemorations and in the politics and practices of remembrance. In a narrow sense, it can be understood also as a legally binding regulatory framework concerning the issue of admission of guilt, monetary compensation, reconciliation as well as ex post facto conviction and punishment of those responsible for past atrocities. In Post-WW II Germany, the debates concerning Vergangenheitsbewältigung have traditionally been rather controversial concerning the substance and purpose of the whole undertaking. In recent times, the discussion has concentrated more on the reappraisal of the role of perpetrators and followers in Nazi Germany.

[521] F. Duchêne 1973, 'The European Community and the Uncertainties of Interdependence', Kohnstamm, M. and Hager, W. (eds.), *A Nation Writ Large? Foreign-Policy Problems Before the European Community*, London: Macmillan, 1973, pp. 1-21.

lution of German attitudes towards the use of force".[522] Maull has also posited that "this evolution had begun with the debate in Germany about the Gulf War in 1991, and reached its culmination in 1995, towards the end of the Bosnian war. What happened in 1998/99 represented a consummation of changes which had been under way for several years. This was true for the political parties and for the electorate as a whole."[523]

Hence, we could elaborate that the question for Maull was not so much whether German strategic culture has fundamentally changed or not, but rather whether these incremental changes in attitudes have caused any notable ruptures with the German past and could thus be seen as the natural flow of events that constitute a given strategic culture and its evolution. The decision during the Kosovo conflict to send in the German Tornados could then be interpreted as a culmination point of all of these internal developments without representing any real change in terms of the civilian nature of Germany's foreign and security policy, because in Maull's terms, this would have necessitated a considerable rupture with the German past. Hence for Maull, this decision was well within the framework of German strategic culture.

Yet Maull's account, with all of its merits, is unsatisfactory for a number of reasons. Firstly, it presumes – without further clarification – that changes of strategic cultures (or in his terms, civilian powers) have first and foremost internal origins. Second, Maull stretches the argument in favour of civilian power Germany even though it acknowledges the German predicament of dealing with all things military. Moreover, Maull does not clearly delineate the behavioural scope for civilian powers as he does not tell us where and when civilian power ceases to be a civilian power. This is partly understandable since we are dealing with an ideal-type construct. According to Maull, the political objectives of a civilian power relate to the 'civilizing of international relations' striving for a civilized political order which can be determined by the so-called civilizational hexagon of interrelated principles that include i.e. a culture of non-violent resolution of political disputes.[524] By Maull's definition, civilian power represents a "foreign policy role concept – a complex bundle of norms, beliefs, attitudes and perceptions – which tell a state (or more precisely, its decision makers) how to behave" and that therefore, "foreign policies may thus correspond to the actual role concept, rather than to the policy behaviour expected from an ideal-type civilian power."[525] Yet although his ideal-typical conception of civilian power Germany allows for a dissonance between norms and beliefs that may not be fully reconcilable and for an actual role conception that will not fully correspond to the ideal type but contain specifics and variations, Maull's definition still implies that civil-

---

[522] Maull 2000, p. 5.

[523] Ibid.

[524] Ibid., p. 15.

[525] Ibid.

ian powers have specific behavioural consequences. This is also why it is difficult to fully agree with Maull's argument about Germany and Kosovo.

If we attempt to translate Maull's take on civilian power into the language of strategic culture, being a civilian power would then equate to defining and practising some sort of a 'civil grand strategy'. Indeed, from the standpoint of strategic cultures which are more often than not deemed as static, enduring as a civilian power appears like a self-fulfilling prophecy, because the evolution of attitudes is only a natural phenomenon and can be explained away by the grand scheme of a culture of restraint that is based on the promotion of civilian norms and values. Hence, it is clear why for Maull, Kosovo did not signify a break with the past but rather an evolution of attitudes. Yet from a methodological standpoint, constructing ideal types that might have implications for actual foreign policy behaviour is vague enough to dodge the hard questions that concern the issues of strategic cultural change and more importantly, the conditions under which such changes might take place. Another implication of Maull's argument is that these could only be equated with a complete reversal of the principles Maull mentions in his civilizational hexagon. Yet as the concept of civilian power as an ideal type implies, a complete reversal of these principles would, in reality, be as far-fetched as to argue for eternal continuity of the civilian power role. Indeed, as Harnisch has argued, there has been both change and continuity in the domestic preferences as well as external expectations towards what Germany as a civilian power should stand for and that therefore, it is better to talk about 'modified continuity' concerning the role concept itself.[526]

What we can conclude from Maull's account is that the classification of a civilian power Germany as an ideal type should not be mixed up with the concept of German strategic culture because civilian power is an ideal-typical construct. Of course, we could argue that strategic culture also is, but then we would have to allow for a more rigorous methodological framework to differentiate the concept of evolution from the concept of change. It seems that for Maull, this never was the intention of his civilian power approach in the first place. To be fair, Maull has since become more skeptical himself given the state of affairs among the German political elite concerning the issue of coming to terms with the growing international responsibility, hence labelling Germany as an 'uncertain power' given the lack of direction and purpose in its foreign and security policy.[527]

Maull's concept of Germany as a civilian power has been both widely acclaimed and criticized. This has involved a wide spectrum of theoretical and methodological standpoints which do not necessarily form a coherent cluster of arguments that could be directly posed against one another. Yet, even

---

[526] Harnisch, Sebastian 2001, 'Change and Continuity in Post-Cold War German Foreign Policy', German Politics, vol. 10, issue 1, 2001, pp. 35-60.

[527] Maull, Hanns 2006, *Germany's uncertain power: the foreign policy of the Berlin Republic*, Palgrave Macmillan 2006.

though the coherence might be lacking, the question of continuity and change has always been at the centre of the debates on German foreign and security policy since the end of the Cold War.[528] The case of Kosovo and the German participation in the Operation Allied Force (OAF) mission has received a lot of attention which is no surprise given the fact that it was the first time the Bundeswehr was dispatched to participate in a combat mission since the end of World War II and hence made a good case for the study of continuity and change. The bulk of the literature seems to back Maull's early claims on the persistence of Germany as a civilian power in the sense of continuity/change dichotomy. Miskimmon, for instance, has argued that "while German involvement in OAF was significant it resulted in relatively modest long-term change."[529] Hyde-Price, in turn, has posited that "the German public's response to the Kosovo war suggests that Germany remains at heart, a Civilian Power" even though he also added that "the Kosovo war demonstrated that the concept of civilian power needs further elaboration if it is to be analytically useful in exploring the political and moral dilemmas of military intervention for humanitarian purposes."[530] This seems to be the main conclusion drawn from Kosovo by the observers of German foreign and security policy. The reason is that at the time, German foreign, security and defence policy was still widely considered to express itself through a 'culture of restraint' regardless of the growing German international presence and external expectations towards a more proactive German foreign and security policy.

Germany met with these expectations by showing solidarity towards the US after the 9/11 terrorist strikes, as Germany participated in Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan and the Horn of Africa. Also, Germany's stance towards NATO had shifted considerably in the sense that it was, firstly, ready to invoke Article V of the North Atlantic Treaty with its allies and secondly, that it allowed for a global role for NATO military action. These changes were significant compared to the hitherto rather skeptical German attitude towards any other role than territorial defence for NATO. Indeed, in the words of the then German defence minister Peter Struck, "Germany's security is not only, but also, defended at Hindukusch".[531] The term 'Hindukusch' underlined not only the German commitment to NATO but also to the principle of multilateralism and the value that Germany saw in preserv-

---

[528] A good example of the prevalence of continuity/change dichotomy in this debate is illustrated in a series of articles in German Politics in 2001, vol. 10, Issue 1.

[529] Miskimmon, Alister 2009, 'Falling into Line? Kosovo and the course of German foreign policy', International Affairs, vol. 85, no. 3 (2009), p. 562.

[530] Hyde-Price, Adrian 2001, 'Germany and the Kosovo War: Still a Civilian Power?', Webber (ed.), *New Europe, New Germany, Old Foreign Policy? German Foreign Policy Since Unification,* Routledge 2001, pp. 31-32.

[531] Declaration of the German Federal Government, issued by Defense Minister Peter Struck, 11.3.2004. Available at (http://www.bmvg.de).

ing NATO as the fundamental pillar in European (and in an increasing sense international) security. However, this also meant for Germany that US security policy had to be more closely tied to multilateral decision-making structures. Yet in the run-up to the NATO Prague Summit in November 2002, Schröder explicitly denied that Germany had concrete plans to increase the German defence budget which NATO Secretary General Robertson had been calling for in order to preserve NATO's military capability in the future. Also, during the Summit, tensions were at boiling point regarding US policy towards Iraq among the Europeans – at stake was no less than the future behaviour of NATO regarding international crises and conflicts.[532] In addition, von Oppen has argued that the term 'Hindukusch' reflected both the German inability to acknowledge a combat role in the NATO mission but also a desire to evoke a colonial fantasy in which Germans could play the role of benevolent onlookers. Hence in that sense, the term was used to modify the German position on civilian power and imagine a role as a civilizing power.[533]

The transatlantic rift that occurred as a result of Germany's reluctance to abide by US unilateralism (or US reluctance to abide by institutional multilateralism) seemed to present a more drastic break with the past and the tenets of German strategic culture even though it seemed to highlight the continuity of the restraint in German strategic culture. Since the war in Iraq, many came to regard the concept of civilian power Germany as outdated, not because Germany would have adopted a more offensive posture regarding military deployments but because of the changes in German attitudes towards multilateralism. These changes were already visible during the run-up to the Iraq war, which highlighted Germany's early unilateral stance regardless of how the UNSC would decide on the issue. Indeed, the war in Iraq is the second "big" case in sense of the evolution of German strategic culture because it forcefully testifies to the power of the 'never again' principles in shaping German security and defence policy. Anja Dalgaard-Nielsen has convincingly argued that "neither the timing nor the outcome of Germany's policy transformation can be properly understood without taking these two schools of thought into account", and that their "co-existence and the cross-pressures they placed on German policy-makers help explain apparently contradictory and puzzling aspects of Germany's stance on Iraq."[534] One plausible explanation for these puzzling aspects (continuity in form of restraint but change in form of contingent multilateralism) is that the prevalence of the normative inconsistency discourages or even in some instances prohibits any long term strategic planning. As Forsberg has argued, "(t)he German position on the war on Iraq emerged in an ad hoc fashion, rather than as a result of con-

---

[532] ‚Bundeswehr – Schnelles Dreirad', Der Spiegel, 18.11.2002, 47/2002; ‚NATO: Feuer in den Kulissen', Der Spiegel, 25.11.2001, 48/2002.

[533] Von Oppen, Ulf 2013, 'From "civilian power" to "civilizing power": The German mission to the Hindu Kush 2001-2011', Journal of War and Culture Studies 2013, (6)3, p. 215-225.

[534] Dalgaard-Nielsen 2005, p. 340-341.

scious strategic rethinking" and that "(i)n the Post-Cold War era, Germany had not become more anti-American as such, nor more pacifist, but more self-conscious about its role in international politics in general [...] In questions of war and peace, it means neither a consolidation of pacifism nor a new militarization, but rather the ability to pick and choose those wars that it regards as necessary and justified in a manner that is compatible with the notion of a 'civilian power'."[535] Karp, in a similar vein, has argued that the transatlantic rift was due to Germany's different stance towards collective conflict resolution which had the effect that "Germany did not find an approach that allowed it to harmonize alliance relations and multilateral preferences".[536]

Others have been vocal in their criticism of the notion of Germany as a civilian power. Overhaus, for instance, points to the decline of the transatlantic order that has also eroded the basis upon which the post-WW II German civilian power has been built. He enumerates three main factors: 1) declining security interdependence between the US and Europe after the end of the Cold War; 2) decline in the common basic principles of the international and European order, specifically concerning the differences attributed to the use of military force and the rule of law and 3) the process of de-coupling between America and Europe which has been exacerbated through demographic and sociological changes, for instance the emergence of a new political elite that is less bound with the legacy of World War II.[537] His argument is that these structural changes have also made Germany's role in the development of ESDP problematic because "the creating of ESDP caused ambivalences in German foreign and security policy as old principles became less compatible with new circumstances" and that "it became increasingly difficult for Berlin to keep its traditional equidistance towards United States and France."[538] This is indeed the case if one considers the fact that unlike for France, the creation of ESDP was never a non-transatlantic project for Germany or an attempt to project European military power as such.

Further examples considering the change in German stance towards multilateralism include for instance the decision of the German Constitutional Court in 2009 to approve of the Lisbon Treaty yet the decision also further imposed limits on transferring sovereignty to Brussels. Moreover, the Court's decision also explicitly states that should the European Council unanimously decide over common European defence, the German constitution would guarantee the parliamentary caveat (*Parlamentsvorbehalt*) in issues con-

---

[535] Forsberg, Tuomas 2005, 'German Foreign Policy and the War on Iraq: Anti-Americanism, Pacifism or Emancipation?' Security Dialogue 2005, vol. 36, no.2 (June 2005), p. 226; p.214.

[536] Karp, Regina 2005, 'The new German foreign policy consensus', Washington Quarterly, vol.29, no.1 (Winter 2005-2006), p. 65.

[537] Overhaus, Marco 2004, 'In search of a post-hegemonic order: Germany, Nato and the European security and defence policy', German politics, Vol. 13, Issue 4, 2004, p. 554.

[538] Ibid., p. 556.

cerning military deployments. In addition, Germany would not accept any changes to EU Treaties which would render the principle of unanimity into qualitative majority voting in the area of CSFP because the unanimity principle guarantees that no EU member state can be forced to participate in EU military operations without its consent.[539] Also, in 2010, the then German Foreign Minister Guido Westerwelle publicly demanded the withdrawal of US nuclear weapons from German soil hence bypassing the relevant multilateral forum, the North Atlantic Council.[540] These sentiments have enjoyed a lot of political support across the party political spectrum in Germany. Since then, however, and particularly in light of the recent events in Ukraine, Germany has backed down from its demands concerning the withdrawal of the last remaining warheads and instead more or less agreed to the US plans to upgrade the ageing missiles instead of withdrawing them.[541] In any case, German behaviour during the Libya crisis can be seen as having been a rather unsuccessful attempt to reassert its civilian power profile. Indeed, as Kundnani has asserted, "while Germany is seeking more power through institutions, it has become less willing to transfer sovereignty to them."[542] Germany still favours multilateral avenues as opposed to unilateral policies but its 'all-in' approach has been reversed to something which is contingent on the political conditions and the re-emergence of the debate on German national interests, which is undoubtedly part of the 'new activism' in German foreign and security policy. Crucially, given the post-Cold War developments in international security politics and the challenges that they continue to pose, it seems that Germany's civilian power profile stands in contradiction with Germany's commitment to effective multilateralism (which seems to increasingly require military deployments that are robust in nature) and hence to the principle 'never again alone'. Even so, as will be assessed in the next chapter, it would be far-fetched to label Germany as a 'Normal Power' or argue that Germany has once again embraced another 'Sonderweg'.

Overall, it seems that, in terms of Germany's civilian power stance, there are factors that both speak for its continuity and for its change. In general, Germany continues to uphold the culture of restraint despite the fact that Germany's military commitments around the world have risen exponentially

---

[539] Constitutional Court's decision on the Lisbon Treaty, 30.6.2009. Available at: (http://www.bundes verfassungsgericht.de/SharedDocs/Entscheidungen/DE/2009/06/es20090630_ 2bve000208.html).

[540] See ‚Atomwaffen Abzug: Wie Westerwelle abrüsten will', Spiegel Online, 13.4.2010. Available at: (http://www.spiegel.de/politik/ausland/atomwaffen-abzug-wie-westerwelle-abruesten-will-a-686646.html).

[541] See ‚Nuklearwaffen werden nicht abgezogen sondern modernisiert', der Tagesspiegel, 27.3.2014. Available at: (http://www.tagesspiegel.de/politik/us-atombomben-in-deutschland-nuklearwaffen-werden-nicht-abgezogen-sondern-modernisiert/10236788.html).

[542] Kundnani, Hans 2001, 'Germany as a Geo-economic Power', The Washington Quarterly, vol.32, no.3, p. 35.

since the end of the Cold War. In addition, besides the shift from 'never again war' to 'never again Auschwitz' no drastic change in the constitution of the normative structure of German strategic culture has taken place since the end of the Cold War either. Nonetheless, the fact that Germany continues to send 'boots on the ground' has led to the elaboration of the more important question *what for*, both among the political elite and the German population. Significantly, this question cannot simply be answered in terms of 'never again alone', as was the case during the early 1990s. The key word here is 'responsibility' (*Verantwortung*), which can have several dimensions in terms of German strategic culture. It can be understood both as Germany's international responsibility to contribute to the peaceful resolution of global conflicts and Germany's responsibility towards its allies and multilateral commitments, which also include military deployments. Yet it can also be understood as being Germany's responsibility towards its own history, which, as will be shown in the next chapter, is still significantly shaping the evolution of German strategic culture – despite all the talk about the alleged German 'normalization'.

4.5. SUMMARY: STRATEGIC CULTURAL CHANGE FROM AFGHANISTAN TO LIBYA AND BEYOND

The fundamental changes in German strategic culture that took place in the period from Bosnia to Kosovo (from 'never again war 'to 'never again Auschwitz', expansion in the remit of Bundeswehr deployments) have had a lasting impact on German foreign, security and defence policy making mainly in the form of bringing 'war' back into German politics. While the post-Kosovo developments have perhaps not entailed such fundamental change (either on the level of norms and ideas or strategic practices), they still represent a number of significant changes that have altered the strategic reality in Germany.

Afghanistan and Iraq

In the run-up to the war in Iraq, Germany deviated from its 'never again alone' principle by drawing a clear line between solidarity and support for US 'adventurism'. Indeed, Germany seemed to reverse its strategic tenet as a close ally to the US. However, the rift in the German-US relations had a more considerable impact on the bilateral relations between the two than it eventually had on German strategic culture. While Iraq could be taken as proof that the changes in the mid-to-late 1990s in German strategic culture were not as fundamental as argued, Germany quite quickly 'returned to the fold' in Afghanistan. Firstly, with the German participation in Enduring Freedom/ISAF operations, Germany 'crossed the Rubicon' by participating in ground combat, a long time taboo in German strategic culture. Secondly, Af-

ghanistan not only solidified the image of Bundeswehr as an army *im Einsatz* ('in deployment') but also affected the process of Bundeswehr reform as perhaps no other conflict management operation to date. Thirdly, Afghanistan not only expanded the realm of German strategic action, but it also clearly showed the inconsistencies between the operational reality on the ground and the discursive reality of German political elite, which has undoubtedly hampered the functioning of German strategic practice at times (e.g. the Kunduz affair). Most importantly, Afghanistan has been key in bringing to the fore the complexities of long-time engagement in conflict management that put considerable economic and political pressure on the political decision makers. This constant pressure has functioned as a source of continuous incremental change to German strategic practices (e.g. procurement policies, counterinsurgency tactics) in order to adapt to the emerging challenges in the external strategic environment.

These developments from Afghanistan to Iraq provide mixed arguments regarding Wendt's account. Terrorism was clearly acknowledged to be a threat to German security yet there was the caveat in Schröder's policy regarding Germany's unlimited solidarity towards the US: Germany would not partake in any 'military adventures'. Nonetheless, it can be argued to be the 'common fate' of the rest of the world to take up arms against terrorism which threatened the existence of commonly shared values and way of life. In this sense Germany indeed shared in that fate. The existence of terrorism as a common threat also increased interdependence within the states system because the units mostly agreed that terrorists should be treated as enemies. However, as became clear during the run-up to the Iraq war, Germany did not agree with the Bush administrations' policy of putting rogue states in the same basket as terrorists (i.e. Bush's definition of the axis of evil). This same phenomenon also occurred in many other European states and led to the famous argument regarding 'old' vs. 'new Europe' – hence it seems that the issue at the system level was not about whether or not terrorism was identified as the common enemy, but rather who would count it as such and what the proper actions to be taken were.

To apply Wendt's terminology, whereas the US policy after 9/11 and its conception of Self vis-à-vis Others increasingly created images of enemies, this was not the case in Germany. Hence, it could be argued that Germany did not agree with how the US was defining its identity, because it did not correspond with Germany's experience of 'Othering'. Indeed, as Zehfuss has noted, articulations regarding German identity often rely on "contextualizing what is considered German now with respect to historical experience of the Third Reich."[543] Her research also shows that the principles of 'never again' take into account the need of others and that "(t)hey do not represent a competition between a more egoistic and a more collective identity but rather

---

[543] Zehfuss 2001, p. 327.

focus on the question 'who the Self should be?'"[544] In that sense we can argue that German strategic culture was not willing to abide by the rules of unilateralism that would increasingly divide the international system between 'us' and 'them', 'friends' and 'enemies'. Indeed, concrete iterations on enemy images are largely absent from German post-Cold War strategic thought. Regarding the above notion about the articulations on German identity, while we could argue that for Germany, the Self in the image of the Third Reich has been the worst and most threatening enemy of all time, it is not as simple as Wendt's discussion on the pre-existing state of 'Ego' and 'Alter' would suggest.[545] In this sense and following Zehfuss, we could argue that the existence of a strategic culture – as long as we agreed that culture is an ultimately heterogenous social and political entity – would suggest that the question whether Germany is more alike or different from the Third Reich cannot be determined a priori, but would depend on concrete articulations.[546] Indeed, this can be presented as a critique of Wendt's model, since, as argued, it largely suggests that identity is something that can be 'negotiated' between states.

And yet, there is more to the Wendtian angle than just pitting internal logics and forms of international interaction against one another in terms of their explanatory power. This is unravelled if we consider that unilateralism – as a specific form of international interaction – is at odds with the modus operandi of a Lockean system (and Kantian even more so). From this point of view, then, it would seem that Germany's 'no' to Iraq could be explained by factors other than its particular strategic cultural tenets. As was argued, even though the continuity of 'culture of restraint' was reaffirmed by German policy regarding Iraq, it did not explain German resistance to the US and the 'coalition of the willing'. Rather, US unilateralist policies were at odds with German conceptions and aspirations about international order and hence, the preferred logic of international interaction. In Wendt's terms, we could argue that Germany aspired to move towards a Kantian system whereas the US preferred the Lockean one. From a systemic view, the significance of the Iraq war lies particularly in the unravelling of this difference. Indeed, the form of international interaction (unilateralism) was pivotal in bolstering German resistance to the war in Iraq.

A critic could argue that this makes little sense given Germany's participation in Enduring Freedom/ISAF operations that were arguably initiated on the same grounds – as 'war against terrorism' (in particular the former). However, the difference here is that German strategic culture was far more receptive to the idea of war against terrorism in general than it was towards toppling regimes or dictators in the name of the war against terrorism. Hence, both the ends and the means mattered. In fact, German participation

---

[544] Ibid., p. 332.

[545] See Chapter 2.4.

[546] Zehfuss 2001, p. 336.

in Afghanistan can be explained by the combination of solidarity towards the US, agreement on the means and ends in the fight against terrorism and a strong sense of displaying reliability as a partner, which culminated in the strong support for the 'never again alone' principle. All of these factors were largely missing in the case of Iraq.

Lebanon, Libya and beyond

The more recent developments testify to the continuity of change within German strategic culture. German participation in UNIFIL showed that Germany was ready to part with the last military taboo still remaining, since the possibility of German soldiers standing against their Israeli counterparts could not entirely be ruled out *a priori*. This also testifies to the fact that while the special German-Israeli relationship brings its own dynamic to German strategic decision-making (Israel's security as German *raison d'être*), German strategic culture is able to adapt within the boundaries set by it. While the historical experience of warfare remains the key mechanism within these boundaries, there are a number of other factors that influence German strategic behaviour. This was clearly to be detected in the case of Libya where historical contemplation did not play a major role. Indeed, one of the more significant changes in recent years refers exactly to the role played by historical experience. Even though new experiences continue to be filtered through the prism of the German past, it seems that the past itself has less often been used as a direct legitimation of concrete strategic decisions on the use of military force. This can be explained by the established nature of the 'never again' normative framework – the major contestation between the different interpretations of the past seems to have settled down. However, Libya also confirmed that whenever there is reason to doubt that Germany breaches or is about to breach one of these principles, it also evokes a debate on continuity/change of German strategic culture. This is a part of the continuing relevance of the past on German strategic culture, which continues to evolve in the debate regarding German international responsibility, as will be argued in the next chapter.

The recent developments, once again, paint a rather mixed picture in terms of Wendt's model and strategic cultural change. Firstly, it can be argued that the transatlantic rift that ensued based on the differences mainly regarding the war in Iraq, was the culmination point of German distrust with a system in which relations between units would increasingly be played out in terms of enmity – in particular between the Christian West and the Islamic East. This is not to suggest a change in the systemic logic of interaction as a whole, but Iraq in particular showed how far the system was from the principle of military self-restraint, which, as argued, has remained one of the cornerstones of German strategic culture after the end of the Cold War. This constellation was clearly reflected in German policy in Libya (and to a lesser extent in Lebanon). Secondly, however, if we think about the recent crisis in

Ukraine, Germany has firmly realigned its strategic thought with the prevailing external conditions in mind, in which the resurgence of a powerful unit (Russia) represents a common threat to the very foundation of the Lockean system (state sovereignty). This, in turn, has prompted the shift in German strategic thought regarding Russia – from 'friend' to 'rival', as is clearly delineated in the new White Paper. Whether or not this shift will have more permanent repercussions regarding German strategic culture remains to be seen, but it nonetheless provides clear evidence of how the interaction at the system level can affect strategic culture.

Overall, on the surface, the track record of German strategic culture from Afghanistan to the present highlights incremental adaptation instead of fundamental, comprehensive change. However, the argument can also be made that the period of Afghanistan and beyond represents a period of a more tangible change because 1) the discrepancy within the 'never again' framework has lost much of its incendiary potential, even though the differences remain real and meaningful and the possibility of political conflict remains; 2) German participation in ISAF at latest solidified the Bundeswehr out-of-area operations as institutionalized and continuous strategic practice and as a result 3) German strategic culture has lost much of its reactive and static nature compared to the 1990s and seems rather to unfold under the professed 'new activism' for the foreseeable future.

Indeed, the 'experience of warfare' has remained the most crucial mechanism in bringing about change also during this period, and is reflected in the shift from reactive to proactive strategic culture. The fundamental changes that took place in German strategic culture in the mid-to-late 1990s (shifts in 'never again', Bundeswehr out-of-area operations) have been institutionalized in the form of recurring and new strategic practices based on Bundeswehr reforms and new concepts on security (discussed in detail in the next chapter). Importantly, however, Germany has not faced external shocks of similar proportions to the massacre of Srebrenica in this latter period that would have fundamentally altered the tenets of German strategic culture. While the 9/11 terrorist strikes certainly functioned as an external shock that affected German strategic policy making and practices in the form of war against terrorism and by accelerating the process of Bundeswehr reform, they did not trigger fundamental change regarding the principled orientation of German strategic culture based on the idea of military restraint. The 'Kunduz affair' stands out as one of the more powerful external shocks that initiated a shift in the elite discourse regarding the status of the Bundeswehr soldiers, but it did not lead to a tangible change on the level of strategic practices. One of the reasons for this is that neither 9/11 nor Kunduz represented instances that would have required a re-interpretation of the German past which is part and parcel of the evolving experience of warfare – a factor that was at the forefront in Bosnia and Kosovo.

Finally, the fact that Germany participated in ground combat for the first time since the end of World War II in Afghanistan without going through a

similar period of moral contemplation surrounding Srebrenica is proof that the normative changes within German strategic culture have been permanent. The novelty, however, is that the purpose for which military force can be used is subject to more intense debate, despite the credo of the use of military force as a last resort, *ultima ratio*. Hence, the debate has partly but not entirely shifted from the more fundamental question regarding the use of force *per se* to the question of whether, how and when and under what conditions Germany should use military force. This is also reflected in the debate concerning the evolving relationship between German guilt and its international responsibility – the focal point of the next chapter of this thesis.

5 RE-INTERPRETATION OF THE PAST AND GERMAN STRATEGIC CULTURE

"Being conscious about German history is part of the process of renewal. The nation state of the Germans is broken. The German nation has remained, and will continue to do so." (Helmut Kohl, 1982)

At the end of the Cold War, Francis Fukuyama famously posited that the victory of liberalism over other systemic alternatives also meant the "end of history as such: that is, the endpoint of mankind's ideological evolution and the universalization of Western liberal democracy as the final form of human government."[547] In one sense, Fukuyama was right: an interpretation of the reunification of Germany as a victory of the Western way of life, emancipatory ideas and liberal thinking in general seems plausible. Yet as critics have noted, 'the end of history' did not only mean the shattering of a socialist utopia but that of a liberalist utopia as well, since the democracy that evolved after the democratic revolution in Eastern Europe did not, in essence, resemble the model of a Western liberal democracy.[548] Similarly, in Russia, a form of democracy emerged that was not based on liberalism or individual freedoms but rather on state sovereignty and centralized political authority.[549] Moreover, a cursory glimpse at post-Cold War developments around the globe is enough to show that political and economic liberalism is not the only 'ism' competing for the hearts and minds of the people: religious fundamentalism, nationalism and various forms of totalitarianism have not vanished but rather made a strong re-appearance both within and beyond Europe's borders. In Germany, however, the propagated 'end of history' was indeed first and foremost historic: it was the first time the political and economic systems of former Cold War adversaries had been merged into a democratic political system and social market economy based on the political and economic model of the former BRD[550]. But perhaps more importantly, the German reunification, for its part, was a prerequisite for a sober discussion about the meaning of a common German past that could be conducted with-

---

[547] Fukuyama 1989, 'The End of History', *The National Interest*, Summer 1989, p. 3.

[548] See Tamás 1992, 'Socialism, Capitalism, and Modernity', Journal of Democracy, Volume 3, Number 3, July 1992, The Johns Hopkins University Press, pp. 72-74.

[549] See Morozov, Viacheslav 2008, 'Sovereignty and Democracy in contemporary Russia: a modern subject faces the post- modern world', Journal of International Relations and Development, vol. 11, June 2008, pp. 152-180.

[550] Social market economy relies on the principle of free market economy and highlights the same opportunities for all citizens. The state is expected to lead a stabilizing economic policy and a modest income distribution policy.

out the tainted glasses of the Cold War 'isms'. In contrast, polarized debates concerning the legacy of Nazism a few years before the end of the Cold War were certainly not indicative of an emancipatory atmosphere - especially the famous Historians' Controversy: one would either find apologetic or nihilistic arguments; critical historical reflection was lost somewhere in between. Hence, the reunification was a reason for Germans to venture into history again, not abandon it. In that sense, the triumph of liberalism and the end of the Cold War did not silence history but rather gave it a new voice, contrary to what Fukuyama had predicted.

Colin Gray has argued that if we want to truly understand what strategic culture is all about, then we have to go back in history. For Gray, history plays the role of the plot, the master narrative, because "a security community is likely to think and behave in ways that are influenced by what it has taught itself about itself and its relevant contexts. And that education [...] rests primarily upon the interpretation of history and history's geography."[551] This is a plausible argument since every strategic culture has its historical origins, which are rooted in specific ideational, material and political conditions and contexts. Indeed, as discussed in the previous chapter, these conditions set the pace for the evolution of German strategic culture both during and after the Cold War. This is also significant in terms of the continuity/change dichotomy: if strategic culture is based on patterns of strategic thinking and practice, it is evident that the national past plays a key role in shaping these patterns, because the existence of any kind of strategic cultural continuity would be impossible in a historical vacuum. Similarly, as will be discussed throughout this chapter, reinterpretations of the past wield the power to change the tenets of strategic culture.

As discussed at the beginning of Chapter 1, constructivist studies in IR have emphasized the importance of cultural and institutional frameworks in which policy is generated. Interpretations of the past are an important part of these frameworks because beliefs, ideas and norms prevalent in international politics often originate in specific understandings of the past. Studies on collective memory have traditionally underlined the importance that interpretations of the past have in terms of setting the limits of the possible within the political sphere by both constraining and enabling policy behaviour.[552] Specific interpretations of the past involve value judgments, which necessarily result in either promoting or delegitimizing certain policies. Hence, these interpretations function as constitutive elements for policy behaviour. Therefore, collective memory "plays a key role in the symbolic discourse of politics,

---

[551] Gray, Colin 2007, 'Out of the Wilderness: Prime Time for Strategic Culture', Comparative Strategy, Vol. 26, Issue 1, p.5.

[552] This understanding is prevalent in the seminal writings of sociologist Maurice Halbwacs. See e.g. Halbwachs, Maurice 1992, *On Collective Memory*, Coser, Lewis A. (ed.), Chicago University Press, 1992.

in the legitimation of political structures and action, and in the justification of collective behaviour."[553]

Since the focus of this study lies in the question concerning the continuities and changes in German strategic culture, the important thing is to tackle the questionof how historical interpretations concerning the ideational tenets of strategic culture evolve, and how all this affects the functioning of the strategic culture under investigation. In the previous chapters, this was illustrated by the shift in the normative structure of German strategic culture: from 'never again war' to 'never again Auschwitz'. This ideational shift among the German Left reflected the difficulty of the whole process of historical re-interpretation in Germany. This was so because it involved the deeply rooted strategic principles and understandings that had become part of Germany's *raison d'état* during the Cold War. In that sense, Colin Gray is right in arguing that strategic culture touches upon the very core understandings of what it means to be: "Germans cannot help but be Germans, whether they are waging war as they would prefer or as they must [...] those responsible for the [strategic] behaviour necessarily are encultured as Germans, Britons, and so forth."[554]

Indeed, the re-evaluation and re-interpretation of the national past is and, at least tacitly always has been, a simultaneous effort to (re)define German post-World War II national identity since the defeat of the Third Reich. The expression 'national identity' was, to say the least, politically ambiguous during the Cold War decades, given the *de facto* existence of two German states under an arguably single German nation. Nationhood, not statehood, was the locus of a pan-German identity during the Cold War. The concept of a common German nationhood was the most important culturally uniting factor for all Germans during the long Cold War years, yet there were many open questions concerning the substance of national identity for a reunified German nation. Internationally, it was important to reassure Germany's allies that a reunified Germany was a Western nation, firmly committed to European and Western values. Hence, Germany's European and transatlantic orientations were important components of post-Cold War German national identity. One could posit that after reunification, the task was to provide assurance that the new German 'Being' was consolidated and directed towards Europe, the US and multilateral co-operation, in other words, to solidify the foundations of Cold War German strategic continuity. Yet, as was discussed in the previous chapters, further into the 1990s and especially ever since the Balkan Wars, the question of 'Becoming' became the more dominant one in

---

[553] Markovits, Andrei S. & Reich, Simon 1999, 'The Contemporary Power of Memory: The Dilemmas for German Foreign Policy', Brady, John S, Crawford, Beverly & Williarty, Sarah Elise (eds.), *The Postwar Transformation of Germany: Democracy, Prosperity, and Nationhood,* Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1999, pp.439–72, quoted here p.445.

[554] Gray, Colin 1999, 'Strategic culture as context: the first generation of theory strikes back', Review of International Studies, Vol. 25, Issue 1 (January 1999), p.55.

the sense of an attempt to redefine German historical responsibility in the context of emerging wars, conflicts and the use of military force. In this sense, there is certainly some overlap between the evolution of German strategic culture and German national identity. However, as discussed in Chapter 1, it is imperative to maintain the conceptual and analytical distinction between strategic culture and national identity especially since strategic cultural changes (in terms of strategic thinking and strategic action) do not necessarily result in easily/readily observable changes in foreign policy identity. For example, as discussed earlier, the long prevalence of the concept of Germany as a civilian power rested on the deeply rooted consensus on foreign policy and strategy during the Cold War. This view persisted even though changes in the German stance towards the use of force in the 1990s clearly indicated that civilian power approach's explanatory power had reached its limits.

Importantly, the redefinition of the historical responsibility of a Germany whose duty was to never to forget and to engage in reparations and reconciliatory politics into a Germany where this responsibility has been transformed into an almost absolute moral imperative to prevent genocide even with military means if needs be. This has substantially changed the way the past affects the present in contemporary German politics, but whereas the past used to dictate the limits of the politically possible, the present asymmetrical global political developments and phenomena such as terrorism, climate change and failing states challenge these limits and create a sense of urgency in terms of security that often needs quick and also at times, creative responses. Political actors and decision makers do not always have the luxury of having the time to engage in deep normative deliberations or ethical soul-searching in case the normative framework of the strategic culture in question is unable to offer a viable policy alternative or legitimize the preferred policy option. However, despite the evident need for a degree of pragmatism in contemporary security and defence policy in the face of rapid change in the international environment, long term strategic planning is needed to tackle these challenges successfully. The legitimacy of a particular strategy often relies on a shared interpretation of historically significant events and issues, even though these would not be clearly articulated in the strategy.

For instance, as Hilpert has illustrated at length in her case study on German policy in Afghanistan, the lack of clear strategic objectives and long term strategic planning on the political level created a certain kind of capability-expectations gap over the period of Germany's Afghanistan mission. This gap, in turn, distorted the way Germany's participation in Afghanistan was assessed, both at the political level as in the theatre of operations. The German soldiers seemed to be fighting in a war while the German politicians were still struggling to come to terms with the fact that, indeed, 'war' was the proper term to describe the conditions under which German participation

took place.[555] This 'assessment lag' between the political level and the theatre of action can be explained not only by a lack of strategic planning or even an unclear conception of how 'terrorism' is understood and how it should be countered, but specifically also by a shared view among the German political elite that German military participation would never involve being party to war. This view was strengthened further especially after the transatlantic rift between Germany and the US in the wake of the Iraq war. Indeed, the strong re-appearance of 'never again war' in German strategic discourse in the context of the war in Iraq, and the prevailing understanding of German historical responsibility did not offer much that would have altered the German politicians' view on the situation in Afghanistan. The last yearly status report on the progress made in Afghanistan (issued by the German government) reflects this understanding as well. While acknowledging the necessity of military deployment in the early stages of the ISAF/Enduring Freedom mission, the report clearly questions the feasibility of the deployment of the military for the purpose of transforming the Afghan society (*Transformations-Einsatz*).[556] Indeed, the report testifies to Hilpert's argument of lacking strategic goals – it states that the "objective of the NATO mission in Afghanistan *actually turned out to be* the Afghan ownership of their own affairs"[557], which indicates a sincere lack of a clear strategic objective in different stages of the conflict. The EU post-ISAF strategy for Afghanistan 2014-2016, which was drafted under strong German influence, also highlights the importance of civilian measures and co-ordination of development policies instead of robust military involvement.[558]

Overall, the experience of Afghanistan has shown that Germans continue to be at odds with the deployment of military force – this is reflected in the lack of a clearly defined strategy as well as the gap between political conceptualizations and experience and practice on the ground. Indeed, emerging global patterns of insecurity and new security threats such as failing states, natural disasters, climate change, global migration movements and terrorism challenge the German strategic culture in a way that can make historical reflection and traditional patterns of strategic thinking and practice seem redundant. However, as will be discussed in this chapter, the German Comprehensive/Networked Approach on security (*Vernetzte Sicherheit*) rests upon a broad concept of security. It was developed based on the strategic experience of the Balkan conflict in the 1990s and it has distilled many traditional traits

---

[555] Hilpert 2014.

[556] Deutscher Bundestag, 18. Wahlperiode 20.11.2014, Unterrichtung durch die Bundesregierung, Fortschrittsbericht zur Lage in Afghanistan 2014 einschließlich einer Zwischenbilanz des Afghanistan-Engagements, Drucksache 18/3270.

[557] Ibid.

[558] 'Council conclusions on Afghanistan', Council of the European Union, Foreign Affairs Council Meeting, 23.6.2014, Luxembourg. (Available at: http:// http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/EN/foraff/143322.pdf).

of German strategic culture: multilateralism, co-operation and co-ordination and incorporated new post-Cold War strategic practices such as the deployment of military means as *ultima ratio*.

The German past continues to be of utmost relevance to German strategic culture not only because we can pinpoint a certain change in the normative structure of German strategic culture as a result of reinterpretation of the past (e.g. never again war – never again Auschwitz), but even more so because the evolution of German strategic culture after the end of the Cold War is part of the process of 'coming to terms with the German past'. The contours of change within this process were already detectable in the intellectual climate towards the end of the 1980s in Germany due to the legacy of the events at the Bitburg military cemetery and the Historians' Controversy, discussed in detail in this chapter. This process attained a new facet through these events and the debates that ensued which, among other things, revealed the fact that if change in attitudes could be considered relevant in terms of coming to terms with the past, then surely this insight would have repercussions on German strategic culture, too.

Indeed, the last two decades have proven that Germany continues to be in a state of 'Becoming' in terms of strategic culture due to ideational shifts that have solidified the use of military force as a legitimate political tool. Even so, the German military action on the ground has not followed a clear-cut strategy as far as the use of force itself is concerned as can be showcased by the German participation in the conflict management in Afghanistan regarding the then prevailing Rules of Engagement (RoE). Indeed, the reason for using the military seems often unclear for Germans. A national security strategy would perhaps help make the purpose clearer (notwithstanding Germany's commitment to NATO and collective defence). However, the lack of a 'grand' strategy in terms of the use of force rests partly on the fact that the German past is clearly more limiting than it is enabling in this regard, despite the removal of the military taboos during the 1990s and German participation in ground combat. Also, there are limits to how the past can be harnessed for the purposes of the present and the future in the first place. This can be detected in one of the focal points of this chapter – the relationship between German guilt and German responsibility. Hence, what Harnisch & Wolf have labelled 'continuity in change' in German strategic culture is a fitting expression, since it also refers to the continuing relevance of the past on the present in German politics.[559]

In Chapters 3 and 4, I laid out the track record of German strategic culture after the end of World War II. The purpose of this chapter is to concentrate on the evolution of the ideational side of German strategic culture, which is best achieved by looking at how (re)interpretations of the past have

---

[559] Harnisch, Sebastian & Wolf, Raimund 2010, 'Germany; The Continuity of Change', Kirchner, Emil & Sperling, James (eds.) *National Security Cultures: Patterns of Global Governance*, Routledge, London 2010, pp. 43-65.

shaped and continue to shape the essence and substance of German strategic culture. The following discussion will hence cover key elements such as ideas and beliefs concerning the legacy of Nazism, the related issue of German guilt and responsibility as well as the debate on German 'Sonderweg' and Germany's 'normalization'. The first three elements combined have constituted the cornerstones of the ideational fabric of German strategic culture since the end of World War II – the setting out of which the norms of 'never again' emerged, as discussed in the previous chapters. The normalization of German foreign and security policy, in turn, is sometimes interpreted in scholarly writing as the outcome of the end of the Cold War and/or German reunification and also as evidence of the evolution of German strategic culture. It refers particularly to a group of historians labelled as 'Normalization-Nationalists', whose primary goal is to call upon Germans to 'abandon their self-hatred' and replace it with a 'love for their own land'.[560] Oftentimes, German normalization is also linked to the coming-of power of the Red-Green government in 1998, and especially to Chancellor Gerhard Schröder in order to pinpoint a major political and moral break from Chancellor Kohl's era. However, as will be discussed, it is not as new a phenomenon as is often claimed – Chancellor Schmidt was already supporting a normalization of German politics in the early 1980s and vehemently resisted any efforts, domestic or international, to convey a collective guilt on the German people.[561] Hence, the debate on German normalization can be depicted as either a critique of the German tendency to 'dwell on the past' or as a form of apologetics, depending where one stands on the issue (coming to terms with the past vs. 'overcoming' the past) but also as a counter-narrative to the theory of German Sonderweg (special vs. normal path).

A further objective of this chapter is to dig deeper into the interconnected and historically constructed nature of these terms, because this makes the ideational structure of German strategic culture more intelligible and accessible. It goes without saying that evaluating the impact of the past on contemporary policy is never an easy task, but as Hoffmann and Longhurst have argued, "an understanding of German strategic culture projects a picture of what 'history qualifies Germany to do'".[562]

Therefore, in order to establish this understanding, a simple look at the defence and security policies Germany pursues will not do. Rather, we need

---

[560] Hellmann, Gunther 1996, 'Goodbye Bismarck? The Foreign Policy of Contemporary Germany', Mershon International Studies Review, Vol.40, No.1 (April 1996), pp. 16-17.

[561] Schmidt's opposition to accepting collective guilt was especially detectable in his Israel-policy: Contrary to the Israel's official stance, Schmidt declined to accept collective guilt as a basis for the development of German-Israeli relations. See e.g. ‚Die Deutschen in ihrer Gesamtheit waren nicht mitschuldig', Zeit Online, 28.4.2015. Available at: (http://www.zeit.de/gesellschaft/zeitgeschehen/2015-04/hel mut-schmidt-zweiter-weltkrieg-kriegsende).

[562] Hoffmann, Arthur & Longhurst, Kerry 1999, 'German strategic culture in action', Contemporary Security Policy, Vol. 20, No.2, p.31.

to pay attention to things which are not necessarily as easily empirically detectable or verifiable – such as the issue of German guilt for the Nazi past, unlike the manifestations of defence and security policies. This is important because the ideational-normative structure of German strategic culture did not spawn in a vacuum – it was the feeling of guilt transformed into a sense of responsibility which informed the formulation of the 'never again' framework after the end of World War II. During the Cold War, this transformation could for instance be detected in the Kohl Doctrine according to which Germany had the responsibility not to send ground troops to countries where the German Wehrmacht had wrought havoc during World War II. After the German reunification and the subsequent crisis in the Middle East and the Balkans, the transformation from guilt into responsibility was clearly detectable. Indeed, being responsible for the past was conceived as a responsibility to hinder any possible genocide from emerging again on European soil at present and in the future – from 'never again war' to 'never again Auschwitz' – with military means if necessary. However, before we turn to the linkages between guilt, responsibility and strategic culture in more detail it is necessary to locate and discuss the historical and discursive context within which the issues of German guilt and responsibility have evolved.

5.1. COMING TO TERMS WITH THE GERMAN PAST – FROM INDIVIDUAL GUILT TO COLLECTIVE RESPONSIBILITY

The process of coming to terms with the German past has been as much a fencing contest among the German intelligentsia as an earnest debate on the repercussions of the legacy of Nazism for the reconstruction of German post-World War II national identity. What is more, strong feelings of guilt and responsibility have always accompanied the process of German *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* (coming to terms with the German past). The immediate conceptual discrepancy concerns the validity of the term *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* itself, since the German verb *bewältigen* can be translated in many ways – 'coming to terms with the past', 'coping with the past', 'managing the past', 'dealing with the past' etc. Indeed, many authoritative voices in Germany have argued that the German past cannot simply be dealt with and that the best Germans can do is to learn from it and never forget. Perhaps the term *Aufarbeitung der Vergangenheit* (reappraisal of the past) is more to the point here since this process has indeed involved novel responses to the questions that the past has posed on the Germans. The purpose of this sub-chapter is to show that the issue of German guilt and responsibility and especially their evolving relationship, is key in assessing ideational and normative change within German strategic culture. I will first discuss German guilt and responsibility in more general terms before turning to strategic culture in

5.1.1.   KARL JASPERS AND THE FOUR CATEGORIES OF GUILT

Unsurprisingly, the issue of German guilt was raised immediately after the end of World War II. The so-called Stuttgart Declaration of Guilt in 1945 was the first public statement of guilt by influential German clergy and laymen. However, the Declaration was regarded by most Germans as an unnecessary concession to the Allies, who were seen by the majority of Germans as having been as ruthless as the Nazis were in the eyes of the world.[563] Indeed, collective guilt theories flourished in the aftermath of the war. Swiss psychoanalyst Carl Jung wrote an influential essay in 1946 about the issue of guilt as a psychological phenomenon, in which he asserted that the German people felt a collective guilt (*Kollektivschuld*) for the atrocities committed by their fellow countrymen. According to Jung, it was an essential task for the psychoanalysts to bring the Germans to recognize this collective aspect of guilt.[564] Also, the occupying Allied forces promoted shame and guilt with a publicity campaign, which included posters depicting concentration camps with headlines such as 'These Atrocities: Your Fault!' (*Diese Schandtaten: Eure Schuld!*) with the text 'You just calmly watched and silently approved' (*Ihr habt ruhig zugesehen und stillschweigend geduldet)* underneath.[565]

However, despite the societal, political and psychological nausea brought by the end of the war the writings of prominent German scholars such as Hannah Arendt and Karl Jaspers took a more nuanced view on the issue of German guilt. In 1945, Arendt famously pointed to the ambiguous relationship between guilt and responsibility: "(t)here are many who share responsibility without any visible proof of guilt. There are many who have become guilty without being in the least responsible. Among the responsible in a broader sense must be included all those who continued to be sympathetic to Hitler as long as it was possible, who aided his rise to power, and who applauded him in Germany and in other European countries."[566] Yet for Arendt, the most pressing issue was that ordinary German 'jobholders and family men' had been organized by Himmler's 'Satanic genius' to commit mass murder in the face of the threat of losing social benefits, thereby losing their

---

[563] See. Conway, John S. 1987, 'How Shall the Nations Repent? The Stuttgart Declaration of Guilt, October 1945', The Journal of Ecclesiastical History, Vol.38, Issue 4, October 1987, pp. 596-622.

[564] Jung, CG. 1946, ‚Nach der Katastrophe', Neue Schweizer Rundschau, XIII (1945), pp. 67-88.

[565] Picture available at the website of Imperial War Museums, (http://www.iwm.org.uk/collections/item/object/29110).

[566] Arendt, Hannah 1994, 'Organized Guilt and Political Responsibility', Kohn, Jerome (ed.), Essays in Understanding 1930-1954: Formation, Exile, and Totalitarianism, Hannah Arendt Literary Trust Bluecher 1994, pp. 149-150.

human dignity and honour.[567] Arendt did not, however, describe this solely as a German phenomenon, but argued that it was international and 'bourgeoisie' in character.[568]

In 1947, Jaspers published a book called *Die Schuldenfrage* (The Question of German Guilt) based on his earlier lectures. In this book, Jaspers – an anti-Nazi who had remained in Germany during the war – sought to draw distinctions between different kinds of guilt and corresponding degrees of responsibility. From the outset, this seemed like an insurmountable task given the clear implications of guilt for Germany and Germans as a whole. For Jaspers, it was important to distinguish between different kinds of guilt because every German experienced guilt differently and yet there was something which was common to all Germans in this respect, which reflected Arendt's views on the issue. Hence, in order to be able to cope with their guilty conscience and make amends with and reparations to those who had been wronged, Germans had to know what they were actually guilty of. This was especially crucial in the context of German political life after 1945: "(w)e [Germans] only have shadows of a truly common political ground on which we might stand and retain our solidarity through the most violent controversies. We are sorely deficient in talking with each other and listening to each other. We lack mobility, criticism and self-criticism. We incline to doctrinism. What makes it worse is that so many people do not really want to think."[569]

Hence, Jaspers sought to differentiate between different aspects of guilt. His fourfold categorization can be summed up as follows: 1) criminal guilt; 2) political guilt; 3) moral guilt and 4) metaphysical guilt. Criminal guilt pertains to crimes that are "capable of objective proof and violate unequivocal laws". Jurisdiction rests upon courts, which "in formal proceedings can be counted to apply the law".[570] Political guilt involves "the deeds of statesmen and of the citizenry of a state, results in my having to bear the consequences of the deeds of the state whose power governs me and under whose order I live. Everybody is co-responsible for the way he is governed."[571] Jaspers also mentioned that the jurisdiction depends on success and the will of the victor in both domestic and foreign politics. Political prudence as well as the existence of norms applied as natural and international law both serve to mitigate the arbitrary use of power. Moral guilt, in turn, does not rest with the community or groups of people: "I, who cannot act otherwise than as an individual, am morally responsible for all my deeds, including the execution of political and military orders. It is never simply true that 'orders are orders'. Ra-

---

[567] Ibid., p. 152.

[568] Ibid., pp.152-153.

[569] Jaspers, Karl 2000, *The Question of German Guilt*, Fordham University Press, New York 2000, p. 16. Originally published as *Die Schuldenfrage* in 1947, Piper Verlag München, Germany.

[570] Ibid., p. 25.

[571] Ibid.

ther, as crimes even though ordered, so every deed remains subject to moral judgment. Jurisdiction rests with my conscience and in communication with my friends and inmates who are lovingly concerned about my soul."[572] The fourth category, metaphysical guilt, revolves around the wrongs committed either in or without a person's presence but in his knowledge, without doing anything to prevent them: "If I fail to do whatever I can to prevent them, I too am guilty. If I was present at the murder of others without risking my life to prevent it, I feel guilty in a way not adequately conceivable either legally, politically or morally."[573]

Jaspers argued that this distinction was important because it clarified the meaning of charges towards Germans: "(p)olitical guilt, for example, does mean the liability of all citizens for the consequences of deeds done by their state, but not the criminal and the moral guilt of every single citizen for crimes committed in the name of the state. The judge may decide about crimes and the victor about political liability, but moral guilt can truthfully be discussed only in a loving struggle between men who maintain solidarity among themselves. As for metaphysical guilt [...] (t)here remains shame for something that is always present, that may be discussed in general terms, if at all, but can never be concretely revealed."[574]

It can be gathered from what Jaspers wrote at the time that moral and metaphysical guilt in particular were difficult to assess. The reasons for this can be argued to be at least threefold. Firstly, after the end of the war, solidarity was difficult to bring about since the war had profoundly transformed the way German society had learned to communicate and exercise self-critique. Secondly, the hardships brought by the aftermath of the war had taken their toll on the German populace – there was simply not enough energy for critical reflection considering what every individual could or should have done in order to prevent the atrocities that took place during the war.[575] Third, German people had been indoctrinated into the racial and political ideologies of National Socialists, either willingly or against their conscience. For those that were willing the question of guilt seemed hence more pertinent. However, the issue here was that moral and metaphysical guilt did not differentiate between Germans with a guilty or a clean conscience – they touched upon each and every individual regardless of how they felt, what they had done or left undone.

It was crucial that these aspects of guilt would be discussed, according to Jaspers, since they entailed the possibility of redemption for Germans: "[c]rime is met with punishment, political guilt with liability; moral guilt

---

[572] Ibid., 26.

[573] Ibid.

[574] Ibid., 27.

[575] On this point, Fulbrook has argued that it was the process of denazification that prevented any honest soul-searching both in West and East Germany. See Fulbrook, Mary 1998, *German National Identity After the Holocaust*, Polity Press 1998, p. 54.

ends up in penance and renewal and metaphysical guilt will lead to a transformation of human self-consciousness before God."[576] Jaspers also made the important distinction between internal and external aspects of guilt: "(t)he accused either hears himself charged from without, by the world, or from within, by his own soul. From without, the charges are meaningful only in regard to crimes and political guilt. They are raised with the intention of effecting punishment and holding liable. Their validity is legal and political, neither moral nor metaphysical. From within, the guilty hears himself charged with moral failure and metaphysical weakness – and, if these led to political and criminal acts or omissions, with those as well."[577] In addition, Jaspers was very articulate about individual vs. collective guilt: "(i)t is non-sensical [...] to charge a whole people with a crime. The criminal is always only an individual. It is nonsensical, too, to lay moral guilt to a people as a whole. There is no such thing as a national character extending to every single member of a nation."[578] Similarly, Arendt had argued that "(w)ere all [Germans] guilty, nobody in the last analysis can be judged".[579] The point that Jaspers tried to make was that it was not up to outside powers to blame Germans as a people for the moral failures of individual Germans.

5.1.2. GERMANS, GUILT AND THE COLD WAR

Despite the popularity of collective guilt theories in the early postwar years, thorough deliberations on the issue of guilt were quickly set aside by the dawn of the Cold War. Superpower relations, ideological differences and the threat of an all-out nuclear war took precedence over the issue of German guilt as West Germany was needed as an ally in the fight against the USSR and communism, which was regarded as the new threat to European and world security by the West. It is also worth noting that the Denazification program put in place by the Allied powers had not worked as efficiently as was hoped because German courts could not handle the sheer volume of cases – unless the crimes committed were indisputable, all members of the Nazi party born after 1919 were automatically exempted of any guilt related to war and were instead treated as 'brainwashed' by the Nazi regime. The program was officially terminated due to lack of resources and progress made in 1951.[580]

In 1949, Germany lost almost a quarter of its pre-war (1937) territory, around 115,000 square kilometres of land consisting mostly of East Prussian, Silesian and Pomeranian territories under the German Reich to Poland and

---

[576] Jaspers 2000., p.30.

[577] Ibid., p.33.

[578] Ibid., 34.

[579] Arendt 1994, p.150.

[580] See Art, David 2005, *The Politics of the Nazi Past in Germany and Austria*, Cambridge University Press 2005, pp. 53-55.

the USSR. West Germans did neither accept the annexation of these territories nor the legitimacy of the new East German state. The West German-Soviet relationship remained strained and complicated because West Germany's *Ostpolitik* was largely a function of its policy towards the German question. Therefore, there were no improvements in the FRG-Soviet relations until the FRG officially gave up the Hallstein-Doctrine in 1969, which signalled to Moscow that West Germany had accepted the status quo in Europe, hence acknowledging its guilt for the war. In terms of guilt, GDR officially renounced all responsibility for Nazi crimes – instead it officially attempted to convey a picture of GDR citizenry consisting solely of those who actively opposed the Nazis during the war. The blame for Nazi crimes was allotted to the capitalist FRG, which was portrayed as carrying on with the fascist traditions of the Third Reich.[581] The FRG, in turn, regarded the official policy of GDR on the guilt question as pure socialist propaganda – hence, the ideological differences and the political reality of the Cold War prevented any kind of a pan-German understanding on the issue of guilt from emerging. The GDR did not change its stance on the issue after détente and the CSCE in 1975. Paradoxically, the GDR recognized the state of Israel only in 1989, the year the GDR ceased to exist.[582]

In a nutshell, the first Cold War decades were a period of 'losing history' in the sense that German history prior to 1945 was considered 'banned history'. It was as if all the things that had taken place before the reign of the National Socialists had lost their historical meaning. The culmination point of the Nazi era as a historical disaster was considered inevitable in the sense that German pre-1945 history was taken to be nothing else than a series of fatal path-dependent incidents and processes that had led to the fall of the Weimar Republic and the rise of the Third Reich.[583]

This negative view on German pre-war history had immense implications not only for German historiography but also for politics and society in general. It was not until the emergence of the so-called younger generation of critical historians (born in the 1960s) who breached the taboo of German history as fatal and non-historical.[584] The critical historical science tried to develop a concept of rewriting history under the historical lens of the demo-

---

[581] Niven, Bill (ed.) 2006, 'Introduction: German Victimhood at the Turn of the Millennium', Germans as Victims, Palgrave Macmillan 2006, p.1

[582] See Fulbrook, 1998, p. 34; Timm, Angelika 1997, 'The Burdened Relationship between the GDR and the State of Israel', Israel Studies, Volume 2, Number 1, Spring 1997, pp. 22-49.; Timm, Angelika 2006, 'Ideology and Realpolitik: East German Attitudes towards Zionism and Israel', Journal of Israeli History, 25:1, pp. 204-222.

[583] This is well reflected in the literature on the negative/critical view on the German Sonderweg discussed in this chapter.

[584] It needs to be noted that many of these German 'critical historians' cited below have strong right wing sympathies. For instance, Karl-Heinz Weißmann is widely regarded in Germany as the central intellectual figure in the movement of 'New Right'.

cratically organized societies of the West, thereby positing that German history, too, was part of the bigger picture. During the 1960s and the 1970s, there were a lot of disputes among the German historians between the so-called traditionalists and the new generation of scholarship about the primacy of foreign and domestic policy in defining things such as the emergence of National Socialism and the world wars.[585]

As Weißmann has observed, "(a) further transition in German historiography became noticeable only at the beginning of the 1980s. Distinct developments such as the end of the social-liberal coalition of Helmut Schmidt and the government takeover by CDU/CSU and FDP, the emergence of the peace movement and the discussion about German identity all contributed to the transformation of political constellations, which affected the perspectives of historians respectively. The decisive impetus for this transition came from abroad in the form *The German Problem reconsidered* by David P. Calleo, in which he reaffirmed the [realist] thesis of the inevitability of inner-European battle over hegemony."[586] Also, two Marxist historians, David Blackbourn and Geoff Eley broke the myths of German historiography, namely, that the Western states would have fundamentally been more modern than Germany.[587] Therefore, the reason for Nazism was not to be found in German 'backwardness' compared to the rest of Europe but in the German polity itself. These works triggered an intensive discussion among the historical scholarship in Germany concerning the German Sonderweg and, for their part, paved the way to the famous Historians' Controversy. Indeed, (re)interpretations of the past began to shake the German polity from its Cold War slumber from before the fall of the Berlin Wall with the 'Bitburg history' discussed below. It significantly rattled the hitherto understandings of the Nazi past and German guilt and responsibility, which were critically assessed in light of the events that took place at the Bitburg military cemetery in 1985.

---

[585] See Weißmann, Karl-Heinz 1993, 'Der „Westen" in der Historiographie nach 1945', Zitelmann, Rainer, Weißmann, Karl-Heinz & Großheim, Michael (eds.), Westbindung. Chancen und Risiken für Deutschland. Propyläen, Frankfurt a.M, 1993, pp.352-355; See also Fulbrook 1998, pp.118-120.

[586] Weißmann 1993, p.355.

[587] Blackbourn, David & Eley, Geoff 1980, *Mythen deutscher Geschichtsschreibung. Die gescheiterte bürgerliche Revolution von 1848*, Frankfurt a.M/Berlin/Wien 1980.

5.1.3. FROM BITBURG TO HISTORIANS' CONTROVERSY AND BEYOND: REFRAMING THE ISSUE OF GUILT, RESPONSIBILITY AND VICTIMHOOD

Bitburg

Spring 1985 marked the 40th anniversary of the ending of World War II. US President Ronald Reagan had planned a visit to the concentration camp and funeral site of Bergen-Belsen to commemorate the ending of the war and attend the G7 economic summit in Bonn. With respect to Reagan's visit, Chancellor Kohl had made a suggestion to Reagan about a joint military cemetery visit as a sign of reconciliation between old enemies during Kohl's November 1984 visit to Washington. Kohl argued that the cemetery of Kolmeshöhe in Bitburg would serve nicely because NATO had an operational air base there as well as over 10,000 US troops living side by side with the local population. Many of Reagan's aides and staff advised against the visit because it was deemed to cause a public outrage among the Jew political groups in America and beyond. Reagan thought he owed a token of gratitude towards Chancellor Kohl, who had backed US policy during the double-track decision despite strong domestic criticism, and hence, agreed to Kohl's proposal.[588]

Public uproar and vehement criticism arose because Bitburg was not just another military cemetery. Among the 2,000 German soldiers buried in Bitburg were the graves of 45 troops from Hitler's elite guard – the notorious *Waffen Schutzstaffel* (Waffen-SS), the main culprits behind the mass deportations and murder of Jews in Germany and in the territories occupied by the Wehrmacht during World War II. One of the most vocal critics was the Chairman of US Holocaust Memorial Council, Elie Wiesel. In a meeting with Reagan he argued, referring to Bitburg: "May I, Mr. President, if it's possible at all, implore you to do something else, to find a way, to find another way, another site. That place, Mr. President, is not your place. Your place is with the victims of the SS [...] Oh, we know there are political and strategic reasons, but this issue, as all issues related to that event, transcends politics and diplomacy. The issue here is not politics but good and evil."[589] Yet Reagan argued similarly as he did in the several interviews he had given on the topic that he thought the visit was morally justified because the soldiers buried in those graves consisted mostly of young men who were also victims of Nazism. Reagan said in an answer to foreign journalists that the men who were buried in Bitburg had "long since met the supreme judge of right and wrong",

---

[588] Bitburg was widely covered in both US and German media at the time. See e.g. ‚Eine eigenartige geistige Gymnastik', Der Spiegel, 17/1985 (22.4.1985.); 'Kohl says Nazi crimes will never be forgotten', Los Angeles Times, 22.1985.

[589] Remarks on Presenting the Congressional Gold Medal to Elie Wiesel and on Signing the Jewish Heritage Week Proclamation, April 19, 1985. Available at: (http://www.pbs.org/eliewiesel/resources/reagan.html).

and that "whatever punishment or justice was needed, has been rendered by the One who is above us all."[590]

Before attending the joint wreath-laying in Bitburg with Kohl, Reagan gave a memorable speech at the KZ Bergen-Belsen – notably in the absence of German rabbis, who had declined to be present because they opposed Reagan's visit to Bitburg. The significance of this opposition lies in the underlying idea that Reagan's visit resulted in setting perpetrators and victims on an equal footing. Indeed, as historian Charles Maier has put it, "Bitburg history courts the danger that is reminiscent of Hegel's remarkable discussion of master and slave in The Phenomenology of the Spirit. It confuses the formal, logical dependence of victim and victimizer [...] with a shared responsibility for the wrong committed."[591] However, most public statements at the time reflected the sensitivity around the issue and agreed that the past should be respected and lines for clear moral responsibility drawn. In short, Germany should 'never forget'.[592] Yet there were arguments that were less conforming. The political right was especially outspoken in this regard. Alfred Dregger, for instance, the leader of the CDU/CSU parliamentary group and a member of the so-called *Stahlhelm-Fraktion* (steel helm wing) within the party, wrote to the US senators who had signed a letter calling on Reagan to cancel the visit. Dregger argued that the letter was an insult to his brother, who had died on the Eastern Front fighting communism.[593]

Also, the CDU representative of the Bitburg region, Alois Mertes, argued that the US Catholic clergy should openly support Reagan's visit. Mertes said to Reagan that "(w)e Germans have provided mankind with great and splendid accomplishments, but we have also committed terrible acts. However, it is not in keeping with Jewish and Christian ethics to apportion blame collectively. It is always the individual who bears responsibility."[594] This was the second major issue connected with Reagan's visit. Who was to blame for the atrocities and the Holocaust - Germans as a people or Germans as individuals? The issue of guilt was not brought up the first time with Reagan's visit but had been an underlying theme in the German political and societal consciousness ever since WW II had ended, beginning with the famous Nuremberg Trials in 1945-6, where individuals of Hitler's regime were accused and tried for committing crimes against humanity. Indeed, Reagan's remark of

---

[590] Jensen, Richard J. 2007, *Reagan at Bergen-Belsen and Bitburg*, Texas A&M University Press 2007, p. 69.

[591] Maier, Charles 1997, *The Unmasterable Past. History, Holocaust, and German National Identity*, Harvard University Press, 1997, p. 14.

[592] This was reflected e.g. in Chancellor Kohl's speech at Bergen-Belsen and in Federal President von Weizsäcker's famous speech in the Bundestag to the 40th commemoration of the end of World War II, 8.5.1985.

[593] See e.g. ‚Auf Kohls Rat hören wir nicht wieder', Der Spiegel 18/1985, (29.4.1985); ‚Haudegen und Überzeugungstäter', Die Zeit, Nr. 49, (29.11.1991).

[594] 'Another 40 years', The New York Times, 6.5.1985.

the 'SS boys buried in Bitburg' did not only mix the perpetrators and victims, it also seemed to relieve the Germans from a collective guilt. This was something which had been difficult to come to terms with ever since it was deemed early on after the end of World War II that the culprits were to be found in a clique of high level Nazis close to Hitler.[595] In addition, the question of victimhood was closely linked with the issue of guilt. This question was also raised by Reagan's visit and echoed in Mertes' claim that 'also we Germans are victims'.

Third, Bitburg raised the question whether the crimes committed by the Nazis were in a league of their own considering the history of mass murder and the belated question whether Holocaust was without historical comparison. As Maier has provocatively put it, "Auschwitz may have been horrendous, but consider the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki; the conventional bombings of Hamburg, Dresden and Tokyo; the Stalinist massacres of the so-called kulaks, Crimean Tatars, Ukrainian farmers, blind folksingers and old Bolsheviks. Recall the Turkish genocide of the Armenians, the Khmer Rouge's slaughter of fellow Cambodians. Are the Germans just getting worse remarks because they mechanized the process?"[596]

Hence, the significance of Bitburg for the evolution of the ideational structure of German strategic culture could be interpreted as threefold: first, it underlined the German commitment to multilateralism, transatlanticism and Western values by an unconventional method: it directly addressed the question of German suffering and victimhood instead of just highlighting German guilt. Second, it addressed the question of historical responsibility linked both to Germans as individuals and as a people, which finds its current strategic cultural expression in the specific code of conduct for the modern German soldier (*Innere Führung/Bürger in Uniform*) and in the more general debate concerning German international responsibility. Third, Bitburg raised the question about historical comparability: was it at all possible to treat the Holocaust as primarily historical in nature, interpreting it as something other than the sum of all German evils without any existing historical precedent or typology? Hence, as Maier has put it, "it [Bitburg] revealed a change in attitude – not a thinking about the unthinkable but a debate over the hitherto undebatable".[597] Hence, it can be argued that this change in the attitude functioned as a catalyst in the process of attempting to come to terms not only with the troubled past but with the challenges of the future as well. In that sense, it connects directly with the German debates in the 1990s concerning the use of military force. Indeed, the breaking of this 'historical deadlock' (of having only one legitimate interpretation of the Nazi past and the Holocaust) was a necessary precondition for the shift in the normative structure of Ger-

---

[595] See Niven 2006, p. 133.

[596] Maier 1997, p. 16.

[597] Ibid., p.12.

man strategic culture that took place in the mid-1990s – from 'never again war' to 'never again Auschwitz'.

What is more, the debate on the comparability between the past and present crimes seemed to have reached some sort of a conclusion in the wake of the Srebrenica massacre (discussed in Chapter 3), which is also highlighted well in this normative shift. This raises a couple of significant points in terms of German strategic behaviour. Firstly, it is difficult to see how the imperative for military action (or the shift in the normative structure of strategic culture) could have been justified in terms of Srebrenica if Auschwitz had not been considered *sui generis* in the political, historical and philosophical debates and controversies that took place in the mid-1980s before German unification. Because of this prevailing view on Auschwitz as *sui generis*, the comparisons made between Srebrenica and Auschwitz were considered particularly delicate and often misplaced.[598] However, the very fact that these two were directly compared with one another suggests that the *sui generis* nature refers first and foremost to the historical – not political – categorization of Auschwitz as a singular event. Therefore, there was more than just one conclusion to be drawn as to what the actual lessons and political ramifications could entail, even though Auschwitz was regarded as historically unique. This was so because just as Auschwitz was considered to be a crime above all else in human history, it should never be allowed to happen again.

Indeed, this became the prevalent interpretation of Auschwitz and its political consequence in Germany after the Srebrenica massacre in 1995. Hence, the comparability of Auschwitz in the political sense enabled to stretch the limits of the possible and broaden the scope of the imaginable in German strategic culture. That being said, any comparisons made with Auschwitz are still quite delicate in Germany and there are many Germans for whom Auschwitz is in a sense beyond the realm of politics because it symbolizes something the existence of which cannot ever be denied. In essence, the events and debates in and around Bitburg made the issue of German guilt, responsibility and suffering *political* again. This was psychologically 'ground-breaking' for Germans, whose guilt had long been suppressed both internally and externally, since Germany was considered a crucial ally in the fight against Communism and the USSR during the Cold War. In this sense, Bitburg was the beginning of the politicization of the German past. This continued in what came to be known as the famous Historians' Controversy in Germany in 1986.

---

[598] Yet there were influential voices to the contrary. Elie Wiesel himself was a strong supporter of military intervention in Bosnia, arguing that Clinton's decision to finally intervene was "an act of morality" in the face of genocide. See Chmiel, Mark 2001, *Elie Wiesel and the Politics of Moral Leadership*, Temple University Press, Philadelphia 2001, p. 145.

Historians' Controversy

These developments, that have been labelled as 'the Bitburg history' by Maier and other historians, paved the way to the so-called *Historikerstreit* (Historians' Controversy), which paradoxically, was not initiated by German historians but by one of the more prominent German philosophers of the post-1945 era, Jürgen Habermas. There are many views on what the Historians' Controversy was actually all about – whether it was about the singularity of Auschwitz and the Holocaust, the uniqueness of the Nazi crimes, German national identity, a substitute for a constitutional debate that did not take place in 1989/90, or rather just a political squabble between Habermas and the historians. However, while the debate took place at a highly politicized atmosphere, at its core was no less than the question of the role the remembrance of National Socialism should have in the reconstruction of German national identity. Importantly, especially since conservative German historians had long understood themselves as the custodians of German national identity, they also interpreted Habermas' accusations as targeted against the German nation state and identity. Hence, as the whole concept of German national identity had been politically ambiguous and quite fragile throughout the long Cold War decades, some of the historians thought the time had come to defend it.

The issues in the Controversy itself had been up in the air since Bitburg, but it was ignited through certain publications from two conservative German historians.[599] The first of these was Andreas Hillgruber's volume called *Zweierlei Untergang. Die Zerschlagung des Deutschen Reiches und das Ende des Europäischen Judentums (1986)* (Two sorts of demise: The shattering of the German Reich and the end of the European Jewry). Hillgruber, once a soldier at the Eastern front himself, sought to defend the German Wehrmacht's resistance in face of the advancing Soviet armies against claims that by so doing the Wehrmacht would have contributed to the Holocaust. Hillgruber insisted that one had to take a stand, and in case of the tragic events during the winter 1944-45 the historian must "identify himself with the concrete fate of the German population".[600] However, as critics noted, the title of his book indicated that Hillgruber would also elaborate at length or otherwise illustrate the deportation and murder of the Jews in parallel to the German retreat but these events were mostly lacking in his volume.[601] Ernst Nolte, another prominent conservative historian, wrote an essay called *Vergangenheit die nicht vergehen will (1986)* (The past that does not want to become history). Nolte claimed that it was time to put Auschwitz and the leg-

---

[599] In Germany, the study of history has traditionally been divided into right-wing and left-wing chairs depending on the university.

[600] Hillgruber, Andreas 1986*, Zweierlei Untergang. Die Zerschlagung des Deutschen Reiches und das Ende des Europäischen Judentums.* Siedler Verlag, Corso bei Siedler, Berlin 1986, p. 24.

[601] See Maier 1997, p. 23.

acy of Nazism into the same basket with normal history meaning that the continuing debate should not prevent Auschwitz and Nazism from becoming the past. Hence, one should put them into perspective and historical comparison should be allowed in order really to understand what was going on at the time. He lamented the existing literature on National Socialism for the lack of either recognizing or admitting that all the acts of cruelty committed by the Nazis (with the exception of the technical process related to the gas chambers) were already recorded in the vast literature of the 1920s. Finally, by drawing a parallel between the mass murder of the Armenians at the hands of the Turks, the Russian Gulaks and the mass murder of the Jews, he asked: "Did the National Socialists, did Hitler commit an 'Asiatic deed' perhaps only because they saw themselves and their sort as potential or actual victims of such an 'Asiatic deed'? Was the Gulag Archipelago not more original than Auschwitz? Was the 'class murder' of the Bolsheviks not the logical and factual precondition for the 'race murder' of the National Socialists?"[602] Nolte's argument was pointed at establishing a historical context for Nazism and the crimes committed so that the assessment of that period would be less obsessive for Germans themselves.

Habermas replied to the claims of Hillgruber and Nolte in a long essay *Eine Art Schadensabwicklung. Die apologetischen Tendenzen in der Deutschen Zeitgeschichtsschreibung (1986) (*A form of claims settlement. The apologetic tendencies in the writings of German contemporary history). Habermas targeted what he called the nationalist revisionism of Hillgruber and Nolte and linked their arguments to the German neo-conservative agenda. First, Habermas lamented that the conservatives' attempt to historicize Auschwitz and the Third Reich in the spirit of *Verstehen* would prohibit any critical perspective from emerging; a perspective which could not be avoided since historians were also assessing history subjectively and therefore the hermeneutic production of knowledge, even if valid, was alone unsatisfactory because it lacked the critical component of self-reflection and was used in a 'revisionist' fashion. Second, Habermas criticized Michael Stürmer's intervention in the debate.[603] Historian Stürmer, political advisor to Chancellor Kohl at the time, had argued in an article *Geschichte im geschichtslosen Land (1986)* (History in a country without history) that Germans did not have a readily available historical identity, which could be witnessed for instance in the growing interest among the German population towards historical museums and televised broadcasting of *Holocaust*. Stürmer claimed that "(t)he loss of orientation and the search for identity are brothers. But anyone who believes that this has no effect on politics and the future ignores the fact that in a land without history whoever supplies memory, shapes concepts,

---

[602] ‚Vergangenheit, die nicht vergehen will', Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, 9.6.1986.

[603] Habermas, Jürgen 1986, ‚Eine Art Schadensabwicklung. Die apologetischen Tendenzen in der Deutschen Zeitgeschichtsschreibung', Die Zeit, 11.7.1986.

and interprets the past will win the future."[604] Habermas criticized the quest for historical identity among the conservative historians because he claimed it mixed the endowment of spiritual meaning to historical events (*innerwelt-liche Sinnstiftung*) with mythmaking and that this quest would lead to Germany's alienation from the West and to a new German *Mitteleuropa*, an age-old longing among the German conservatives. For Habermas, the Western connection, which for Stürmer was primarily exemplified in the German membership in NATO and resulted in the accountability of German foreign policy, went far beyond the immediate political implications. For Habermas, the German Westernization was the most important achievement of post-World War II Germany in the sense of finally embracing the values of European Enlightenment, which, as Habermas lamented, had only been possible as a result of Auschwitz. Therefore, according to the idea presented in his seminal work *Theorie des kommunikativen Handelns* (The Theory of Communicative Action) 1981, Habermas argued that Germans did not owe loyalty to the nation but to the principles of *Verfassungspatriotismus* (constitutional patriotism) and that therefore "whoever wants to summon Germans back to a conventional form of national identity, destroys the only reliable basis of our Western loyalty."[605]

However, as we have witnessed, Habermas' prediction has not come to pass, even though there have been times when Germany's strategic behaviour has been interpreted as isolationist (as was the case with the unilateral recognition of Slovenia and Croatia in 1991 and Germany's abstention from the UNSC vote on Libya in 2008 for instance). Yet these deviations from the multilateral foreign policy orientation can hardly be explained by the aspects of German national identity, or a turn away from the alleged Habermasian *Verfassungspatriotismus*. As illustrated at length in the previous chapters they are better understood in the context of an evolving German strategic culture. In terms of strategic culture, the Historians' Controversy, for its part, paved the way for the discussions concerning the legitimacy of military action in terms of collective historical responsibility after the end of the Cold War. The Controversy quite astutely revealed what was not only intellectually and politically at stake, but also what was societally at stake if and when Germans decided to debate these issues. It was also the most important German post-World War II intellectual debate taking a stance on Auschwitz and the legacy of Nazism, therefore setting the initial ideational parameters for what could be considered 'appropriate' German strategic behaviour from the viewpoint of historical (re)interpretation.

---

[604] Stürmer, Michael 1986, ,Geschichte in geschichtslosem Land', Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, 25.4.1986.

[605] Habermas 1986.

5.1.4. THE MIXED LEGACY OF NAZISM: GERMANS AS PERPETRATORS AND VICTIMS

Firstly, it needs to be stressed that the take on Nazism illustrating Germans as victims is not new – it has persisted throughout the German post-World War II history, and it was particularly strong in the early days of the Federal Republic.[606] However, as discussed above, the Bitburg history politicized the issue to an unprecedented scale by portraying SS men – the primary perpetrators of mass murder and atrocities of the Hitler regime – also as victims of the war and Hitler, ascribing to the perpetrators a victim status. Essentially, the argument here is that Hitler causes suffering not only to Jews, Sinti and Roma and the disabled as well as millions of people in the USSR and the rest of Europe, but also to his own people. This victimization is highlighted well, for instance in Hannah Arendt's famous discussion on guilt and responsibility, concerning especially the tragedy of ordinary Germans made part of the Nazi murder machine.[607] It is also reflected in the rather uncritical acceptance of Goebbels' total war declaration in early 1943 after the German 6th Army had surrendered in Stalingrad at the end of 1942. In this sense, the German people victimized themselves, either knowingly and willingly or not. Besides the illustration of Germans as victims of Hitler, the roots of the contemporary discussion on German victimization lie in the wartime bombings of German cities, most notably Dresden, where more than 20,000 Germans vanished in the firestorm that swept through the city after the allied bombings in early 1945. Also, portrayals of the exodus and suffering of the Sudeten Germans from the Eastern territories of the Third Reich served the same purpose of German victimization.

As Niven has argued, the brief period of depoliticization at the end of the Cold War when German suffering could be grasped as an existential German experience ended as Chancellor Kohl set out to re-politicize the issue: Kohl was determined to bring East and West Germans together by establishing an inner unity based on a common understanding of German history according to which Germans had suffered under two different but comparable forms of totalitarianism, National Socialism (1933-1945) and the Soviet-imported socialism (1945-1990).[608] However, as Niven writes, "(f)or all Kohl's universalizing approach to victimhood [...] the 1992-98 period was characterized by widespread historiographical, media and public interest in the issue of German perpetration and guilt, and Jewish victimhood – as shown by the popularity of the critical Crimes of the Wehrmacht exhibition."[609] Indeed, the Wehrmacht exhibition that took place between 1995 and 1999 (War of Anni-

---

[606] See Wittlinger, Ruth 2006, 'Taboo or Tradition? The 'Germans as Victims' Theme in the Federal Republic until the mid-1990s', Niven, Bill (ed.) *Germans as Victims,* Palgrave Macmillan, 2006, p. 63.

[607] See Arendt 1994, pp. 121-132.

[608] Niven, Bill 2006, 'Introduction: The German Victimhood at the Turn of the Millennium', (ed.) Niven, *Germans as Victims*, Palgrave Macmillan, 2006, p.5.

[609] Ibid., 7.

hilation. Crimes of the Wehrmacht 1941-1943) was visited by more than 1.2 million people in Germany and Austria.[610]

Yet importantly, Niven also posits that "(t)here is a noticeable correlation in the contemporary preoccupation with German suffering between constructions of victimhood in the past".[611] This involves two strategies of transforming Germans into absolute victims: "The first strategy is to exculpate Germans living at the time of the Third Reich. The first strategy relies on depicting the Allied bombing of German cities as innocent collectives untouched by Nazism."[612] Needless to say, this strategy completely ignores the link between the Allied bombings and the fight against Nazism, ascribing Germans an equal victim status with the Jews. In contrast, "the second [strategy] emphasizes rather a commonality of perpetrator status linking Nazis and the Allies – while at the same time implying a corollary of this that the fate of Germans at the hands of the Allies was every bit as terrible as that of the Jews at the hands of the Nazis."[613] Niven's conclusion is that establishing a corollary between the victim and perpetrator status of Germans and Jews amounts to nothing less than "a complete reinterpretation of the Second World War".[614] Hence, the problem with these victimizing strategies is not that they portray German suffering as such but that it is done in a fashion which does not do justice to historical facts.

One peculiar trait of the discourse on the Nazi past in Germany is the common lack of identification for active perpetration, even though the collective guilt theory has long been rejected. Phrases such as 'crimes committed in the name of the German people' are very common in the speeches of German politicians across the whole party spectrum, almost as if it had become an idiomatic expression. This is an interesting phenomenon, because it draws a clear distinction between Germans as active perpetrators (the Nazis) and Germans as victims (the rest) and deviates completely from Arendt's view on ordinary Germans as perpetrators. Yet this 'passive perpetrator status' or to put it provocatively, 'proxy perpetration' is understandable from the viewpoint of the younger and millennial generations of Germans who, by and large, do not consider themselves guilty whatsoever. Hence, it highlights the contemporary view in Germany that unlike responsibility, guilt should not pass over from the perpetrator generation to the next.

Despite the fact that the theme of German suffering has not featured prominently in post-1998 German memory politics, echoes of German victimization by the Allied bombings can be observed for instance in the extensive media coverage of the bombing of Iraq (and in the mid-1990s during the

---

[610] The exhibition was controversial and politically contested from the start. The CDU/CSU was vehemently opposed to the exhibition while the SPD and the Greens endorsed it.

[611] Niven, 2006, p. 8.

[612] Ibid., p. 13.

[613] Ibid.

[614] Ibid., p. 15.

NATO air strikes against Serbia). Indeed, as Hyussen has observed, "media reports of events in the former Yugoslavia in particular tapped into a collective memory of what Germans had endured. Often, the parallels drawn were sentimental in the extreme. At the same time, however, German suffering was deployed in a more thoughtful manner during the heated debates surrounding Germany's participation in multilateral interventions in these conflicts."[615] This 'thoughtful manner' is exemplified by the fact that German feelings towards the NATO bombings were mixed, some were in favour while others were against.[616] It is also well reflected in the 'soul-searching' period in the German Left during the mid-1990s highlighted in the shift from 'never again war' to 'never again Auschwitz'– both were legitimate interpretations of the German past yet the latter seemed to be the only politically viable choice for the newly elected Red-Green government even though accepting international responsibility in terms of military participation would also make one guilty in terms of 'never again war'.

Yet, as Hyussen has argued, only the prelude to the war in Iraq marked a significant shift in German memory politics: "(f)or the first time, the peace movement bolstered its positions by referring to the experience of strategic bombings of German cities in the Second World War. It seemed that the memories of Hamburg and Dresden's firestorms provided the unifying glue that brought Westerners and Easterners, old and young, Right and Left, out into the streets in larger numbers than ever before in protest against George W. Bush's war in Iraq."[617] Crucially, as he argues, "(i)n 2003, sentiment reverted back to a radical no war line, but this time – and this was new – with reference to German victimhood."[618]

This is a further example of the resilience of the normative structure of German strategic culture. Even though the genocide committed against the Bosnian Muslims at Srebrenica in 1995 had essentially led to the reinterpretation of the German past in favour of a military solution to the crisis in former Yugoslavia, the memory of Hamburg and Dresden served as a powerful reminder of the horrors of air war. The German government essentially considered US offensive military action against Iraq to be illegal in terms of international law beyond any notion of the purported US 'adventurism' and it

---

[615] Hyussen, Andreas 2006, 'Air War Legacies: From Dresden to Baghdad', Niven, Bill (ed.), *Germans as Victims*, Palgrave Macmillan 2006, p. 176.

[616] However, the support for the Bundeswehr's out-of-area operations has steadily declined among the German populace ever since the NATO air war against Serbia during the Kosovo conflict in 1999. In 2007 for instance, only about every third German thought that German participation in KFOR is a good thing. See. Biehl, Heiko 2010, 'Bürger und Sicherheitspolitik – Auf der Suche nach einem sicherheitspolitischen Konsens', Dörfler-Dierken, Angelika & Portugall, Gerd (eds.), *Friedensethik und Sicherheitspolitik. Weißbuch 2006 und EKD-Friedensdenkschrift 2007 in der Diskussion*, VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften , Wiesbaden 2010, pp.169-184.

[617] Hyussen 2006, p. 183.

[618] Ibid.

supported Schröder in his 'no war' line. Although it could be argued that Schröder's opposition to the war in Iraq was executed in a favourable domestic atmosphere as the memory of Hamburg and Dresden led to a formulation of 'never again Dresden' amongst the slogans that were used against the war besides 'no war for oil' etc., it is worth noting that not all Germans were opposed to the war in Iraq. For example, this was testified by Angela Merkel's article in the Washington Post, where she famously argued that "Schröder doesn't speak for all Germans".[619]

As shown above, the issue of Germans as perpetrators but also as victims can function as a powerful strategic cultural constraint in the deliberations over the issue of the use of military force. Even though the illustration of Germans as victims has been problematic in terms of historical reinterpretation (e.g. Niven's example of a complete reinterpretation of World War II) and its vulnerability to the critique of apologetics and/or historical revisionism, it is difficult to deny its impact on the German political elite because the Germans as a people share a deep sympathy for the victims of any war as is detectable in general not only in the German Bundestag debates, but in the wider public discussion. However, while the role images of the victim and the perpetrator are mutually constitutive – i.e. without a reference to Jewish 'victimhood', the role image of Germans as 'perpetrators' doesn't make much sense – the discursively interesting aspect is the fact that same actors can simultaneously wield opposite subject positions, i.e. that the worst kind of perpetrators can still be considered victims – as was evident in president Reagan's reference to 'the SS boys in Bitburg'. In terms of German strategic culture, however, the issue of Germans as victims has not featured very prominently for the same reason that accusing Jews of 'keeping Germans down' is considered revisionist and anti-Semitic – yet the effect of a construction (whether deliberate or not) of a 'double' identity of victim/perpetrator has linked guilt discursively not necessarily to a certain actor or group of actors but to 'those who are willing to commit violence' and that in war, everybody is a victim to a degree. In the following table I will sum up the discussion so far in this chapter by portraying the dimensions of the discourse on the Nazi past in Germany and their impact on German strategic culture:

---

[619] Merkel 2003, 'Schröder doesn't speak for all Germans', The Washington Post, 20.3.2003, p. A39.

Table 4. Discourse on the Nazi Past in German Strategic Culture

Dimensions of Discourse on the Nazi Past in German Strategic Culture

Role Images/Subject positions	Consequences	
	Guilt	Responsibility
Victim	Germans guilty of 'self-victimisation' → anyone resorting to violence can be regarded as guilty because violence produces victims	Germans responsible for ensuring an 'honest debate' without politicizing the past in favour of German victimhood → de-politizisation vs. re-politizisation of the role of the victim; responsibility for Auschwitz → 'never again Auschwitz'
Perpetrator	Nazis guilty for the Holocaust and WW II, Allies guilty of the bombing German cities, individual vs. collective guilt; active perpetration → 'never again war'	Germans responsible for maintaining 'never again war' → struggle for political legitimacy and appropriateness of reinterpretations of the past (never again war vs. never again Auschwitz); Allies responsible for their own 'perpetration of atrocities' →'never again Dresden'; passive perpetration

Taken as a whole, the view of Germans as victims has certainly a minority view. One of the more prominent post-Cold War examples testifying to the minority view is Daniel Jonah Goldhagen's famous book *Hitler's Willing Executioners* (1996). Goldhagen suggested that anti-Semitism had been a typical characteristic of ordinary Germans under Hitler, and that these ordinary

Germans had killed Jews quite willingly, without restraint.[620] It reflects Arendt's view on the issue – albeit with the crucial difference that there was nothing in the issue of ordinary men having turned into killers that made it a particularly German phenomenon for Arendt, who argued that it should be assessed in the international context.[621] Also, Goldhagen's thesis verges on the argument that Germans were ethnically predisposed to anti-Semitism – an argument for which Arendt would have had little sympathy. Moreover, whereas Jaspers had sought to distinguish between different dimensions of guilt, Goldhagen did not differentiate between singular and collective aspects of guilt. Therefore, Goldhagen's thesis seemed to reinvigorate the collective guilt theory of the 1950s. Many German historians were highly critical of Goldhagen's book, but the majority of Germans reacted to it with understanding.[622]

5.2. GERMAN STRATEGIC CULTURE, GUILT AND RESPONSIBILITY

5.2.1. CONSEQUENCES OF GERMAN GUILT

For Jaspers, categorization of guilt was not enough; the consequences had to be clearly delineated. Hence, accordingly, Jaspers theorized consequences for each category of guilt: "Crime is met with punishment, political guilt with liability; moral guilt ends up in penance and renewal and metaphysical guilt will lead to a transformation of human self-consciousness before God."[623] Nuremberg Trials were an example of the first consequence, as well as the 'Nazi hunts' during the Cold War and beyond. German people also took the consequence of liability for political guilt that resulted in reparation and reconciliation policies, especially towards Germany's eastern neighbours and culminated withthe division of Germany and the erection of the Berlin Wall in 1961, and later in the form of *Ostpolitik* and the so-called *Ostverträge,* that were primary examples of policies based on the premise of German political liability for WW II. Perhaps most importantly, West Germany pledged to pay reparations to Israel in the Luxembourg Agreement in 1952, even though diplomatic ties between the two were not set up until 1965. In the early 1950s, Israel did not want to convey a picture that German reparations equalled reconciliation, which became topical only after Germany's significance in NATO had considerably increased in the 1960s. Also, the high sym-

---

[620] Goldhagen, Daniel Jonah 1996, *Hitler's Willing Executioners*, Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1996, pp. 375-416.

[621] Arendt 1994.

[622] Niven 2006, p. 8.

[623] Jaspers 2000, p. 30.

bolic value of the trial of Adolf Eichmann in 1962 helped towards the normalization of relations.[624]

As for the consequences of moral guilt, the 'never again' principles, which established the normative baseline for German strategic culture after the end of WW II, are the prime example of the repercussions of moral guilt in strategic terms. We also have the actions of individuals such as Willy Brandt, who was the first German politician to kneel before the victims of Nazism at the memorial in the Warsaw Ghetto in December 1970, which can be assessed in terms of consequence of moral guilt (even though the 'kneeling act' could just as well be interpreted as a consequence of political liability because the purpose of Brandt's visit to Poland was to sign the Warsaw Treaty, which acknowledged the Oder-Neisse river line as the final border between Germany and Poland). The aspect of moral guilt has also been prevalent in the strategic cultural context when Germany discussed the preconditions for its out-of-area operations. For instance, during the Balkan crisis, it was not uncommon to compare Milosevic to Hitler or later, during the Iraq War, make similar comparisons between Saddam Hussein and Hitler.[625] This attribution of moral guilt to individuals goes hand in hand with the idea that the German people were morally not guilty of the crimes committed by the Nazis in the name of the German state and this has pertained to how contemporary Germany views dictators on one hand, and those dictated by them, on the other.

The consequence of metaphysical guilt – transcendence before God – can indeed only be detected at the level of individuals, if at all. However, it may also have other consequences that transcend the level of the individual, which can for instance be understood in terms of charity and solidarity: Germany's asylum policy has been often deemed as the most liberal in the whole of Europe.[626] This could also be interpreted in more strategic terms as the German populace is one of the fastest ageing peoples in Europe, which, in turn, can be regarded as a security threat. However, metaphysical guilt is the type of guilt the impact of which is omnipresent, and this pertains of course not only to Germans, but to humanity as a whole. Moreover, since formulating analytical arguments based on metaphysical conditions is not far from constructing tautologies, I will not attempt them here. Suffice it to mention a few instances when this type of guilt might be manifest. For Germans and their strategic culture, metaphysical guilt is perhaps best crystallized in the consequence of present day wars and conflicts – death, human suffering and misery, which were widely illustrated in the German media during the Bal-

[624] See Olick, Jeffrey K. & Levy, Daniel 1997, 'Collective Memory and Cultural Constraint: Holocaust Myth and Rationality in German Poltitics', American Sociological Review, Vol. 62, No. 6 (Dec., 1997), p.926.

[625] See Schwab-Trapp, Michael 2002, *Kriegsdiskurse. Die politische Kultur des Krieges im Wandel 1991-1999*, Springer Verlag, Wiesbaden 2002, pp. 87-111; Hyussen 2006, p.188.

[626] See Klusmeyer, Douglas & Papademetriou, Demetrious 2009, *Immigration Policy in the Federal Republic of Germany. Negotiating membership and Remaking the Nation*, Berghahn Books, 2009.

kan conflict. This is why the public awareness of these issues plays a special role in the contemporary German strategic culture. The pure consequence of metaphysical guilt according to Jaspers, "a transformation of human self-consciousness before God" that culminates in a life with an "indelible sense of guilt in that humility which grows modest before God and submerges all its doings in an atmosphere where arrogance becomes impossible".[627] In other words, that transformation implies a sense of impeccable altruism, a true form of selflessness. In terms of German strategic culture, the consequence of metaphysical guilt could also be detected in Germany's continued general preference for a broker- and mediator-role in international conflicts. However, it can hardly be argued that Germans would not consider their own interests in implementing the role of an 'honest broker'.

In terms of strategy, the so-called Kohl Doctrine was still significantly shaped by the issue of German guilt. This was reflected in the debates that took place when the Bundestag contemplated the possible German military presence in the Balkans in 1993. Defence Minister Volker Rühe outlined German position as follows: "One thing must be clear ... especially in view of the deployments in the former Yugoslavia: There must not under any circumstances be any deployment of German troops in the area of the former Yugoslavia – neither on the water, nor on the ground nor in the air. This is imperative if only for historical reasons. In any case, the FDP is fully convinced of that. We know that we share this conviction with the Chancellor."[628] Maja Zehfuss has noted that the reasoning behind the persistence of the Kohl Doctrine was "a fear of escalation and a concern for the well-being of German soldiers".[629] Yet it can be argued that after the 1994 Constitutional Court's decision in favour of the German out-of-area operations, German politicians harboured as many if not more concerns for the well-being of their soldiers as before the Court's ruling. A better explanation takes into account the fact that the German foreign and security policy consensus, which was one of the hallmarks of Cold War German strategic culture, backed the strategic thinking behind the Kohl Doctrine.

The 1992 Defence Policy Guidelines (VPR) had already stressed the need for the Bundeswehr to be transformed into a force, which could be used in the prevention and containment of crises and small-scale conflicts.[630] The 1994 White Paper, which was released after the Court's decision, reflected the need for Germany to bring to bear its international responsibility. Even though military risks for German security were not considered to be high and despite the fact that the 1994 White Paper called upon a plethora of measures

---

[627] Jaspers 2000, p. 30.

[628] Defense Minister Volker Rühe in Deutscher Bundestag, Plenarprotokoll 12/151, 21.4.1993.

[629] Zehfuss, Maja 2002, *Constructivism in International Relations. The Politics of Reality*, Cambridge University Press 2002, p.129.

[630] Verteidigungspolitische Richtlinien, Der Bundesministerium der Verteidigung, Bonn, 26.November 1992. Available at: (http://www.asfrab.de/fileadmin/user_upload/media/pdf/VPR1992.pdf).

to tackle the crises of the post-Cold War world, it acknowledged the possibility of military action: "In a political framework that aims at solving crises and conflicts by tackling their roots and causes, it may also be necessary to employ military means to prevent, confine or terminate violence or war".[631] The 1994 White Paper was still cautious in its overall strategic assessment, highlighting the traditional aspects of German strategic culture – conscription, territorial defence and NATO-led strategic command of German troops above all else but it also clearly acknowledged the need for a potential military prevention (instead of intervention) which was clearly a novelty to an assessment on German responsibility and implied an international role for the Bundeswehr. The conservative-liberal Kohl government used so-called 'Salami-tactics' in order to prepare Germany and the Bundeswehr incrementally for international conflict management. The key idea was to initiate gradual change without jeopardizing the German consensus on territorial defence and conscription. Defence Minister Rühe, in particular, was a key agent of change in developing a crisis intervention role for the Bundeswehr by successfully legitimating his reform with reference to the maintenance of NATO's credibility in the context of the new challenges in the security environment, particularly referring to the crisis in the former Yugoslavia and German participation in the IFOR/SFOR.[632]

As a side note, a fair assessment of the development of German strategy or military doctrine after the end of the Cold War acknowledges the fact that, overall, German politicians had not been keen to evaluate defence and security. This was mainly because German voters are usually not that interested in the topic and this pertains especially to the current post-Afghanistan situation in which the majority of the Germans are against new out-of-area operations.[633] Also, it is worth noting that Germany has never produced a concise national security strategy like the UK, France and the US. The next White Paper took 12 years to see the light of day; the publication of the 2006 White Paper occurred approximately five years after the 2001 terrorist attacks in the US. Like its predecessor, the 2006 White Paper stressed German international responsibility instead of German guilt. However, compared to the 1994 paper, the 2006 one was much more detailed as to what the Germans were actually responsible for or the kind of responsibility they should prepare for in the future. The 2006 White Paper mentions German responsibility 'for

---

[631] Weißbuch 1994 zur Sicherheit der Bundesrepublik Deutschland und zur Lage und Zukunft der Bundeswehr. Presse- und Informationsamt der Bundesregierung, Bonn 1994, p. 39.

[632] See Dyson 2007, pp. 59-60.

[633] According to a poll in the German newspaper *Die Zeit*, at the end of 2014 when German participation in ISAF ended, only every third German considered it important for the Bundeswehr to be more actively present in international crisis management. ‚Mehrheit der Deutschen lehnt Auslandseinsätze ab', ZEIT ONLINE, 28.Dezember 2014. Available at: (http://www.zeit.de/politik/deutschland/2014-12/umfrage-deutsche-ablehnung-internationale-bundeswehr-einsaetze).

Europe and the world', 'for global security', 'for peace and freedom'.[634] The paper quite clearly acknowledges that the changes in global patterns of security also affect Germany. This creates challenges that Germany is willing to meet as well as "shape the global changes in terms of its responsibility and interests".[635] Hence, the 2006 document quite clearly states the kind of international actor Germany aspires to be in the future – an actor who has the desire to shape the process of global change based on its national interests and international responsibility. The 2016 White Paper takes a step further in that German leadership is now understood as part of German international responsibility. This is highlighted in the willingness to assume responsibility as a 'framework nation' in alliances and partnerships.[636]

5.2.2. FROM GUILT TO RESPONSIBILITY: GERMANY AND THE COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH ON SECURITY

Furthermore, the current German proactive stance towards global security issues in the context of 'new activism' is well exemplified by the German concept of Comprehensive Approach or Whole-of-Government Approach (*Vernetzte Sicherheit*). It was first officially introduced in the 2006 White Paper. *Vernetzte Sicherheit* underlines the importance of co-operation between security policy actors and a broad understanding of security threats, that concern not only military threats, but also issues such climate change, global economic patterns and mass migration. The aim of this approach is to handle international crises effectively by coordinating the efforts of a plethora of actors and institutions at local, national and international levels. According to the concept, this necessitates both civilian and military means and resources are being put to work towards a common goal. This is exemplified in the different phases of the conflict: escalation, open conflict, post-conflict, peace consolidation. For instance, the role of diplomacy in these different phases is to prevent conflict escalation, achieve a cease-fire, secure the status quo and finally, normalize the situation. Accordingly, the role of the military is to prevent conflict escalation and provide training, intervene in case of open conflict, stabilize the post-conflict situation and finally, provide transition as part of peace consolidation.[637]

However, according to an inter-departmental Working Group on Comprehensive Approach (*Die AG Vernetzte Sicherheit*) the concept is problematic because it is in effect neutral concerning the underlying aims of the secu-

---

[634] Weißbuch 2006 zur Sicherheitspolitik Deutschlands und zur Zukunft der Bundeswehr, Berlin 2006, p.2; p.10-11.

[635] Ibid., p. 9; p.18.

[636] White Paper 2016, p. 98.

[637] See Wittkowsky, Andreas & Meierjohann, Jens P. 2011,'Das Konzept der Vernetzten Sicherheit: Dimensionen, Herausforderungen, Grenzen', Zentrum für internationale Friedenseinsätze (Die AG Vernetzte Sicherheit), Policy Briefing April 2011, p.2.

rity policy. Hence it can refer both to a traditional concept of security, the aim of which is to stabilize fragile states or to an understanding of security as 'human security' which concentrates on human rights and highlights the equivalent responsibility of the state to protect these rights, exemplified for instance in the international norm Responsibility to Protect (R2P). Also, factors which impede the networking include cultural caveats of the participating actors as well as differing understanding about the use of military force and divergent interests.[638]

Hence, German strategic culture plays a major role in how the Comprehensive Approach, which is based on a relatively broad understanding of security, can be implemented in practice. The German government established a Bundestag subcommittee in 2003 to provide yearly progress reports on how the Comprehensive Approach has been developing. In 2011, for instance, the progress report applauded the fact that the co-operation between different government departments had considerably increased but that even here, differing organizational interests and jurisdictions still played a major impeding role. The report also noted that many German actors preferred a pragmatic approach rather than a strategic one but that these same actors paradoxically called for joint leadership and objectives in the target countries. Also, the German Action Plan for Civilian Crisis Management, that should be one of the central benchmarks for interdepartmental co-operation, is rarely mentioned or deemed operationally viable. According to the report, the Germans consider the British Conflict Prevention Pools to be a more successful tool in implementing the Comprehensive Approach.

In terms of policy instruments, the report noted that the German debate circles around the issue of strategy and common goals. For instance, strategic questions include what the role a strategy should have in concerted action: what is the added value of strategy at different levels of implementation, and which elements of the strategy are essential. Also, Germans consider it vitally important that German strategies coincide with international ones and that there is a clear link between a strategy and its implementation. However, in retrospect, this was precisely the factor that was often missing not only from German but from NATO strategy as a whole. It was also deemed important that the Bundestag mandate should be complemented with concrete guidelines for networked co-operation.[639] These status reports issued by the German government underline the need for pragmatism, at least at the interdepartmental level. However, pragmatism as such does not necessarily fit well with all the strategic aspects of the German deployment, because it signals the ability to change one's stance according to the circumstances. This per-

---

[638] Ibid., pp. 4-5.

[639] 'Fortschrittsbericht Afghanistan zur Unterrichtung des Deutschen Bundestags', Presse- und Informationsamt der Bundesregierung, Dezember 2011. Available at: (http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/cae/servlet/contentblob/604602/publicationFile/163001/111214-Fortschrittsbericht2011.pdf).

tains especially to the crucial issue of Rules of Engagement (RoE) for German soldiers (discussed in Chapter 5.3).

Theoretically, it can be argued that the German understanding of Comprehensive Approach deviates from Karl Deutsch's initial idea of a 'pluralistic security community'[640] in the sense that shared, common values are as important for the preservation of a security community as the issue of state sovereignty. To give a contemporary example, this understanding of security is clearly visible in Germany's policy towards Russia in the current Ukraine-crisis. Germany, along with the rest of the EU, clearly condemned Russian annexation of the Crimean Peninsula as a violation of international law and Ukrainian sovereignty. However, it still maintains that the only way to reach lasting security in post-Cold War European neighbourhood has to be based on an understanding and acceptance of common values, even though Chancellor Merkel argued in the context of the G7 meeting in Germany in Summer 2015 that "Russia's return to the G8 is not possible" and that in terms of values, "there is a barrier towards Russia which is very difficult to overcome quickly".[641]

Moreover, the Comprehensive Approach as a concept is also qualitatively different from Adler's and Barnett's conception of a security community.[642] While that concept acknowledges the importance of a common identity, it does not necessarily treat the construction of a common identity solely for the purpose of tackling a common security threat but to rather strengthen the foundations of the community itself. Hence, for Germany, a common security identity is something more than just a political tool to get troops to rally around the flag as seemed to be the case for the US during the run-up to the Iraq war, which ultimately led to the crisis of the transatlantic security community.[643] Indeed, for Germany, underlining the common aspect of the Western security identity is important because it links directly with how Germans grasp their international responsibility.

The issue of guilt is such a pervasive and complex topic in the German political, cultural and historical context that it is hardly something which can be declared as having been resolved. The most significant and concrete contemporary example of the interplay between the guilt of the past and contemporary international responsibility is Germany's stance towards Israel. In 2008, Chancellor Merkel was the first foreign premier ever to present a speech in the Israeli parliament, the Knesset. She famously argued that "Israel's securi-

---

[640] Deutsch, Karl W. et al. 1957, *Political Community and the North Atlantic Area: International Organization in the Light of Historical Experience,* Princeton: Princeton University Press 1957.

[641] Interview with Chancellor Merkel, Bericht aus Berlin, Tagesschau, 7.6.2015.

[642] Adler, Emanuel & Barnett, Michael 1998, *Security Communities*, Cambridge University Press, 1998.

[643] See Risse, Thomas 2004, 'Beyond Iraq: The Crisis of the Transatlantic Security Community', Held, David & Koenig-Archibugi, Mathias (eds.) *American Power in the 21st Century*, Cambridge: Polity Press, pp.214-240.

ty is our [Germany's] raison d'être".[644] Germany has also paid more than lip service to this special relationship by delivering modern submarines to Israel over the years and covering a major proportion of the costs. This particular case, however, is problematic because the Israeli navy has the capability to equip the submarines with a nuclear arsenal – a thing which has not gone unnoticed in Germany.[645] Moreover, vocal domestic criticism has been raised with reference to Germany's arms export policies as a whole, which do not seem to fit very well with either the picture of Germany as a civilian power, or with the objective of German international responsibility for global security in the framework of Comprehensive Approach.[646] Even though the German government considerably reduced the number of weapons export licenses in 2015, exports to developing countries remained approximately the same as in 2014. Also, Germany continues to export weapons to countries such as Saudi Arabia, which are continuously criticized for their human rights policies.[647]

A strong sense of proactive German responsibility is also reflected in the German support of the norm Responsibility to Protect (R2P).[648] This has been the case especially since the UN appointed a Special Advisor on R2P and the UN General Assembly discussed the norm for the first time, mostly due to the outbreak of crises in Myanmar and Georgia in 2008. The 2006 German White Paper on security policy referred to R2P as an "international law doctrine that would in the long term [...] affect the mandating of international peace missions".[649] Between 2005 and 2008, the German Government

---

[644] Speech by Chancellor Angela Merkel to the Knesset in Jerusalem on 18 March 2008. Available at: (http://www.knesset.gov.il/description/eng/doc/speech_merkel_2008_eng.pdf).

[645] 'Geheim-Operation Samson. Wie Deutschland die Atommacht Israel aufrüstet', Der Spiegel, 23/2012, 4.6.2012.

[646] See 'Deutsche Rüstungsgüter: Opposition kritisiert 'Hemmungslosigkeit' bei Waffenhandel', Spiegel Online, 19.11.2013. Available at: (http://www.spiegel.de/politik/deutschland/deutsche-ruestungsexporte-opposition-kritisiert-hemmungslosigkeit-a-934424.html); Friederichs, Hauke 2014, 'Die Sünden der deutschen Rüstungsexporte', Zeit Online, 3.6.2014. Available at: (http://www.zeit.de/politik/deutschland/2014-06/ruestung-waffen-export).

[647] See 'Waffengeschäfte: Gabriel reduziert Genehmigungen für Rüstungsexporte', Spiegel Online, 9.2.2015. Available at: (http://www.spiegel.de/politik/deutschland/sigmar-gabriel-genehmigt-weniger-ruestungsexporte-a-1017399.html).

[648] Responsibility to Protect (R2P) is based on the initiative of the former UN General Secretary Kofi Annan in 2000, who encouraged the international community to reconsider the norm of state sovereignty if that sovereignty was used to perpetrate mass murder, ethnic cleansing or genocide on the state's population. The initiative arose out of the need to prevent genocide from ever happening again, based on the experience of Rwanda, Bosnia and Darfur. R2P bears no legal obligations for states but it was designed to counter the trend of 'humanitarian interventions' and has gradually been institutionalized as part of the UN practices.

[649] Weißbuch 2006, p. 79.

and public had largely ignored the concept – it was viewed largely through the lens of multilateralism and international law.

However, after increased internal and public debates on Libya, German leaders and officials started to accept that there were also practical implications to the concept. They have since focused on the aspect of prevention and the establishment of a focal point for R2P in the German Foreign Ministry.[650] Germans were slow to adopt the principle, firstly because the political implications were rather unclear at the time of R2P's inception (it is not legally binding), and secondly, because of the similarities and differences of R2P to the notion of humanitarian intervention. At first, Germany approached R2P more as a 'norm in the making' in terms of international law and multilateralism and considered that discursive references to the norm are the best way to promote it. However, in the wake of the Libya crisis in 2011, and the UNSC Resolutions 1970 and 1973, which legitimized the NATO intervention in Libya with reference to R2P, the German government, as Brockmeier et al. have argued, began to "broaden its idea of the concept: it would now also interpret R2P as a moral principle that demanded practical concepts and policies."[651]

Indeed, it should be stressed that in the German discourse, R2P often refers to instruments other than the military in conflict resolution – the emphasis is on *prevention* and the use of force is still considered *ultima ratio* as far as the implementation of R2P is concerned.[652] German abstention in the UNSC vote on Libya in 2011 reflects this view. The overall narrative about Germany adopting the R2P framework needs to be put in the wider context of German strategic culture: a more forceful German endorsement of R2P followed only after external shocks (Myanmar, Georgia, Libya) were considered serious enough to warrant a more clearly defined governmental stance. And yet, even though Germans agreed with their allies on the principle, they differed on what action should be taken based on that. Hence, the question of state sovereignty vs. human rights as exemplified in R2P and specified in the UNSC Resolution 1973 on Libya, was initiated by the epistemic community of the international society, spearheaded by the UN and the then Secretary General Kofi Annan. Germans principally supported R2P but it did not change German behaviour in the question of the use of military force.

To summarize, the issue of guilt played a major role in how the lessons of history and the associated principles of 'never again' were forged as the future guide for German postwar politicians. Yet the shift in focus from guilt to responsibility can be detected not only in the shift from 'never again war' to

---

[650] See Brockmeier, Sarah, Kurtz, Gerrit & Junk, Julian. 2014, 'Emerging norm and rhetorical tool: Europe and the responsibility to protect', Conflict, Security & Development, Volume 14, Issue 4, 2014, p. 451.

[651] Brockmeier, Sarah, Kurtz, Gerrit & Junk, Julian. 2014, 'Emerging norm and rhetorical tool: Europe and the responsibility to protect', Conflict, Security & Development, Volume 14, Issue 4, 2014, p. 431.

[652] See Kiesewetter, Roderich 2015, 'Die Bundeswehr als Instrument (neuer) deutscher Außenpolitik', Zeitschrift zur Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik, Vol. 8, pp.355-364.

'never again Auschwitz' but also in a re-appropriation of the 'never again alone/Sonderweg' principle. In effect, it enforces the Comprehensive Approach: no one state can be solely responsible for the security of other states but that all states are collectively responsible for the security of each state in the system. The method to arrive at a point where the security of all states in the system is guaranteed is based on mutual responsibility embedded in the German understanding of effective multilateralism, which is based on common values. Importantly, the way these principles were formulated suggests that the issues of moral and metaphysical guilt were not only matters for individuals, but for the German nation as a whole – not in the sense of feeling guilty as a nation, but rather in the sense of bearing the collective responsibility and acknowledging the importance of the moral and political consequence of these individual aspects of German guilt. It can be argued that German society took seriously the moral lessons of the war and in this sense indeed went through a process of renewal, as Jaspers had hoped.

The shift from guilt to responsibility is echoed within the discourse of Germany's partners and allies – Germany is encouraged to play a greater role and to take more responsibility in world affairs, not only by its European partners but notably by actors worldwide. Israel has long been advocating a more visible role for the Germans in the Middle East. This particularly came to the fore when former Israeli Prime Minister Olmert compelled Germany to reconsider its stance on UNIFIL and deploy its naval contingent in the Mediterranean in 2006.[653] Former Polish President Lech Walesa caused public uproar in 2013 by arguing that Germany and Poland should abolish national borders and unite to expand economic and defence co-operation: "The Germans have done us a lot more evil, and the relationship we have now is much better than with Russia. Why?" he asked; "Because after the war, Germany fully confessed to all its dirty tricks. It's necessary to say once and for all who did something evil, full stop. Until we do, the wound won't heal".[654]

Despite the many pleas, on the whole, Germany has been rather reluctant to take on a leadership role in international security policy. As discussed earlier, the arguments that attest to this reluctance often refer to a conception of Germany as a civilian power and, as argued, they often fall short in their explanatory power simply because they rely almost exclusively on a normative conception of German foreign and security policy. A more compelling argument for German reluctance for leadership would begin with an understanding of the guilt-responsibility relationship as described in this chapter. It

---

[653] See Belkin, Paul 2007, CRS Report for Congress. Germany's Relations with Israel: Background and Implications for German Middle-East Policy, Congressional Research Service, 2007; ‚Olmert wünscht deutsche Soldaten', Zeit Online, 28.7.2006. Available at: (http://www.zeit.de/online/2006/32/lib anon-olmert-merkel).

[654] Day, Matthew 2013, 'Poland and Germany should unite, says Lech Walesa', The Telegraph, 24.9.2013. Available at: (http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/poland/10330826/Pol and-and-Germany-should-unite-says-Lech-Walesa.html).

would acknowledge the fact that as long as there are grounds to argue that moral and metaphysical guilt remain pervasive psycho-social features in German strategic culture, Germany does not want to highlight its capacity to lead simply because it feels guilty about having led the world into chaos and hence this makes Germans reluctant to seek a prominent leadership role in military affairs. Indeed, unlike the concept of civilian power, the argument based on the assessment of guilt transformed into responsibility is better in line with the changes that took place in German strategic culture in the 1990s in the form of removing the military taboos that have witnessed in the shift from 'never again war' to 'never again Auschwitz'. However, the 'new activism' in German foreign and security policy discussed in the previous chapter which is buttressed by the signs of willingness to lead (i.e. White Paper 2016) represent a novel thread in German strategic culture since the end of the Cold War.

In summary, penance and renewal have not concerned only German individuals but the German society as a whole, since the German political elite and civil society have always considered it their responsibility to address the issue of the German past in ethical terms. Even though the process might happen at the level of the individual, it has certainly been guided by political authority. The German polity has offered public ways to initiate this individual process as can be seen in the countless memorial sites and remembrance dates that all more or less refer to a collectively experienced 'German guilt' transformed into collective responsibility. In conclusion, Jaspers' existentialism and the idea of transformation all convey a picture of guilt which can never be totally overcome – the debts of the past cannot ever be paid in full in the metaphysical sense; yet for the progress of reason and the cause of humanity this can only be a good thing for as Jaspers has argued, "no man is ever complete or without blame".[655] In this particular sense, state actors are not that different from individuals.

5.3. 'SONDERWEG' AS THE DOMINANT HISTORICAL-STRATEGIC NARRATIVE FOR GERMANY

One of the more crucial features of post-World War II German historiography has been the debate on the so-called German 'Sonderweg' (special/separate path). It has also been widely reflected upon in the scholarly debates concerning German foreign and security policy and the alleged Ger-

---

[655] Jaspers 2000.

man 'normalization'.[656] This sub-chapter will briefly go over the history of the concept of 'Sonderweg' and then critically assess its meaning for the study of German strategic culture. At the same time, it is also necessary to discuss the 'normalization' thesis of German foreign and security policy, which can also be depicted as either the German post- or contra- 'Sonderweg' narrative. This will also be reflected in the discussion concerning different dimensions of strategic culture as well as the Bundeswehr reform in its domestic and European context.

5.3.1. POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE APPROACHES ON 'SONDERWEG'

Some historians place the origins of the 'Sonderweg' concept as early as in the ideas of the late 18th century German thinkers, who contemplated the German 'Geist' compared to the 'West' and hence contributed to the formulation of a German national identity.[657] Kondylis has argued that "(t)his positive view was backed by French and English protagonists of romantic-counterrevolutionary 'Geist'" and that "(t)he admiration for German accomplishments in the human but also natural sciences consorted later with such a German bias and the talk about Germans as 'people of thinkers and poets' became a phrase-like expression."[658] The shift towards the negative interpretation culminated during the Kaiserreich period as the locus of German national identity shifted from that of 'thinkers and poets' to 'poets and warriors', which was highlighted in the victories of the Prussian army and the political and economic strength of the German Reich.[659] Hence, this transformed German 'Geist' was not one to be admired but was one to be feared. Others have argued that in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, a number of German historians became convinced of a 'positive German way' which was rooted in "certain German specifics, consistent with the German geographical and historical pattern".[660] In any event, the 'special German way' was interpreted positively in contrast to the negative treatment of the

---

[656] See Berger, Stefan 1995, 'No More *Sonderweg*: Germany's Return to the 'Normality' of the Nation State', Journal of Area Studies, Number 7 (Autumn 1995), pp. 86-99; Hampton, Mary N. 2000, 'The Past, Present, and the Perhaps' is Germany a Normal Power?' Security Studies, 10 (2), pp. 179-202; Pulzer, Peter. 1994, 'Unified Germany: A normal state?' German Politics, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp.1-17; Takle, Marianne 2002,'Towards a Normalisation of German Security and Defence Policy: German Participation in International Military Operations'. ARENA Working Paper Series: 10/2002. Available at: (http://ideas.repec.org/p/erp/arenax/p0073.html).

[657] Kondylis, Pejoratis 1993, 'Der Deutsche „Sonderweg" und die Deutschen Perspektiven', Zitelmann, Rainer, Weißmann, Karlheinz & Großheim, Michael (eds.), *Westbindung. Chancen und Risiken für Deutschland,* Propyläen, Frankfurt a.M, 1993, p.22

[658] Ibid., pp. 22-23.

[659] Ibid., pp. 23-24.

[660] See e.g. Kocka, Jürgen 1988, 'German History before Hitler: The Debate about the German Sonderweg', Journal of Contemporary History, vol. 23, no.1 (Jan. 1988), p.3.

'West'. As Kocka has observed, this positive interpretation pertained to German 'constitutional monarchy', which was seen as an asset, not a liability. Moreover, this positive view admired the long statist tradition in contrast to the 'laissez-faire' and party governance. Importantly, "'German 'Kultur' was considered to be different from and superior to western 'civilization', a view which reached its zenith at the beginning of the First World War and in the 'ideas of 1914'."[661] According to Kocka, this positive view became relativized in the interwar-period and after World War II it no longer sounded convincing.[662]

The negative version of 'Sonderweg', in turn, was used to try to explain why Germany became fascist in contrast to other developed countries in the west and the north during the crisis of 1920s and 1930s. Importantly, as Kocka has argued, this meant that National Socialist experience became the focal point of historical understanding and reflection. This new negative interpretation of 'Sonderweg' culminated in the idea of both explaining and overcoming it, hence linking the German past to both the present and the future.[663] The reasons for this negative development were already located in the societal and political conditions, experiences and processes of the 18th and 19th century Germany compared to those of France, Britain, North-America – the 'West'. Hence, the term 'Sonderweg' became a common denominator of what went historically wrong or differently in Germany compared to other Western nations.

Consequently, the term 'Sonderweg' has been used in several ways but it always expresses the difference to some 'normal state of affairs'. In the historical accounts, the German 'Sonderweg' was seen in contrast to the 'normality' that was the way of liberal-democratic development of the Western states from which Germany deviated; a 'Sonderweg' that was seen as one of the main reasons why Germany succumbed to fascism. However, the end of World War II was not the end of German 'Sonderweg'. In terms of German attitudes towards war, the Bonn Republic preserved some extremist traits that seemed to run counter to the developments in other countries. As Baumann and Hellmann have observed, "(w)here Hitler and his associates pushed war to new extremes in theory and practice, post-war West Germans were, for the most part, willing recipients or even zealous proponents of the anti-militarist re-education favoured by the Western allies. Where Goebbels was declaring 'total war' to the world, West German 'Genscherists' were declaring 'total peace'."[664]

In many accounts that attempted to sketch a future German foreign and security policy in the early to mid-1990s, 'Sonderweg' often refers to those aspects of German culture and politics that have been vindicated by a reap-

---

[661] Ibid.

[662] Ibid., pp. 3-4.

[663] Ibid.

[664] Baumann, Rainer & Hellmann 2001, p. 61.

pearance of a 'German nation state' after German reunification, a nation state which was seen to mark the endpoint of the long German 'Sonderweg'. Hence, the dawn of an era of normalization in Germany's foreign and security policy was to be expected of the new Berlin Republic.[665] However, the process of coming to terms with the German past that received new impetus with Bitburg and the Historians' Controversy neither ended with the German reunification nor heralded a specific form of 'normality' – quite the contrary was the case if we think of the debates that ensued on the issue of the use of military force already on the eve of the first Gulf War. Moreover, as there was no concrete substance for the concept of German 'normality' besides the factor of a reunited nation, the persistence of the Sonderweg-thesis in the post-Cold War context can also be understood as its criticism.

Yet importantly, many contemporary accounts of German Sonderweg are not based on Germany's foundational cultural or social differences from the Western nations but rather on the deviations from the alleged 'normality' or 'normalization of German foreign policy'. For instance, the term Sonderweg has been often invoked to highlight Germany's neglect of its 'never again alone' principle; or even to attest to a German unilateralism, as was claimed to be the case for instance during the early stages of the Balkan conflict as Germany recognized the breakaway republics of Slovenia and Croatia without prior definitive agreement with its allies.[666] However, it can hardly be argued that these so-called unilateral moments formed a pattern of policy behaviour or even a meaningful deviation from the accepted policy of principal co-operation in the sense of presenting a truly viable strategic policy alternative for Germany during the Balkan crisis. Moreover, it is especially debatable whether any so meaningful normality existed in German foreign and security policy in the next few years following German reunification, which makes the claims regarding a new Sonderweg understood as isolationism being rather nonsensical.

In any case, the term 'normality' usually refers to the proclaimed end of Sonderweg - Germany becoming a 'normal' state after reunification and gaining full national sovereignty. In particular, 'becoming normal' means a preference for multilateralism, respect for international law and human rights as well as a general embeddedness of German society and politics in democratic and constitutional principles, often expressed in the notion of Germany as a

---

[665] See Berger 1995.

[666] The unilateralist argument was particularly popular among realists. Most observers, however, took a more moderate view on the issue. See Banchoff, Thomas 1999, *The German Problem Transformed: Institutions, Politics and Foreign Policy 1945-1995*, The University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, p.145; Le Gloannec, Ann-Marie, 'The Implications of German Unification for Western Europe', Stares, Paul B. (ed.) *The New Germany and the New Europe*, Brookings Institution Press, pp. 251-257; Coggins, Bridget 2014, *Power Politics and State Formation in the 20th Century. The Dynamics of Recognition*, Cambridge University Press, p.130.

civilian power.[667] Yet the term 'normalization' is often associated with an increased willingness to use military force to solve international conflicts or the other way around as a decreased threshold to participate militarily in the international conflict management.[668] In general, however, all but the most devoted realists agree that the view juxtaposing normalization with 'a remilitarization of German foreign policy' or declared as 'the end of antimilitarism' is either misleading or strictly false.

As discussed in the previous chapters, the end of World War II and the defeat of Nazi Germany were marked by Germany's turn towards the West. The narrative of the German 'Special Path' was contrasted with the cultural, political and military Westernization of German society and the political elite during the Cold War. However, for Germany, the Cold War 'Westernization' did not lead to 'normality' after the end of the Cold War understood in realist terms, but rather to a strategic culture which had yet to discover the meaning of 'normality' for itself. It can be argued in a realist fashion that the German reunification and the idea of German normality were the necessary preconditions for any imaginable leadership position for Germany in Europe but unlike the realists predicted, this did not manifest itself in Germany claiming a dominant military position in Europe.

Furthermore, the post-Cold War development in the 1990s highlighted just how far Germany had actually deviated from its proclaimed negative special path. It is important to note that the question of the *Enttabuisierung des Militärischen* (removal of military taboos), which effectively meant that Germany gradually began to take part in the military management of international conflicts with its allies, has to be seen as another important deviation from the negative Sonderweg theory and not against the backdrop of any objective 'normalization' or 'militarization' of German security and defence policy. In short, German security and defence policy and its strategic culture have become normal only in a way which makes sense to Germans themselves. This, in turn, has to be understood as the concrete effects of the increased pressure towards the German foreign policy consensus and the civilian power –role, which had their origins in the heritage of World War II and the developments during the Cold War. Indeed, if we think about the normative shift in the mid-1990s German strategic culture, then this shift is the ac-

---

[667] See Tewes, Henning 1997, 'The emergence of a civilian power: Germany and central Europe', German Politics, Vol. 6, Issue 2, pp. 95-116; Maull 2000; Cooper, Alice H 1997, 'When Just Causes Conflict with Accepted Means: The German Peace Movement and Military Intervention in Bosnia', German Politics & Society, Vol. 15, No. 3 (44) (Fall 1997), pp. 99-118; Wagener, Martin 2004, 'Auf dem Weg zu einer „normalen Macht"? Die Entsendung deutscher Streitkräfte in der Ära Schröder', Harnisch, Sebastian, Katsioulis, Christos and Overhaus, Marco (eds.), *Deutsche Sicherheitspolitik. Eine Bilanz der Regierung Schröder*, Baden-Baden, 2004, pp. 89–118.

[668] As discussed in Chapter 1, this seems to be compatible with the proponents of Germany as a Civilian Power, which, as argued, seems to further inflate the explanatory power of the concept.

tual normality we should be talking about. As we have witnessed, this did not translate into any military automatisms.

5.3.2. NORMALITY AND THE DIFFERENT DIMENSIONS OF STRATEGIC CULTURE

There is nothing that makes a state's use of military power somehow more 'normal' than the non-use of force. However, even if we do not endorse the realist view of international relations as ruled primarily by anarchy and the logic of military power, the normalization thesis can still be effectively employed analytically. Here, it is worthwhile to grasp 'normality' as that of the other Western nations (Germany's allies), not as some objectively articulated 'normality' concerning the use of military force that is necessitated by systemic forces.

Firstly, from the viewpoint of strategic culture, comparison with Germany's closest allies makes sense as Germany remains firmly committed to both the EU and NATO. Secondly, as argued, the question of the present, alleged 'normality' cannot be properly understood without referring to the historical, negative accounts of German 'Sonderweg' that rest on the assumption that Germany deviated from the liberal-democratic development of the 'West' in one way or the other.

In this context, we can utilize analytical distinctions between different dimensions of strategic culture which can be coined as follows: 1) the level of ambition in international security policy; 2) the scope for action for the executive in decision-making; 3) foreign policy orientation; 4) the willingness to use military force. These dimensions were used in a recent study which examined the existing conditions in EU member states (and Turkey) for the development of a common, European strategic culture.[669] The differences and similarities within these dimensions across the strategic cultures in Europe are summarized in Table 5.[670]

In spite of the general conclusion made by Biehl et al. that there is no single European strategic culture they also posit that based on the 28 case studies on European strategic cultures, patterns of strategic culture indeed do emerge. These patterns are based on a threefold categorization: "[c]ountries whose security and defence policy is driven by the attempt to manifest their own presence in the international system [security policy as manifestation of statehood], countries whose strategic cultures lead them to attempt to shape their multilateral security through international bargaining [security policy as international bargaining], and countries who focus their security and defence policy on the protection and projection of state power [security policy as protecting and projecting state power].[671]

---

[669] Giegerich et. al. 2013.

[670] Ibid., p. 394.

[671] Ibid., p. 391.

As we can see, countries belonging to the first category are small, lacking powerful military forces or resources and often have a tendency towards neutrality in security and defence policy. According to Biehl et al., "their limited resources are paradoxically a driver of their engagement because elites feel the need to show that their country is capable of playing a constructive security and defence role. In practice, such countries are reluctant to use military force and show a preference for civilian means of crisis management and conflict prevention, which seems to be a reflection of their structural inability to provide for their own defence. Countries in this group tend to channel their engagement through the EU rather than NATO, in part because the latter, despite formal equality, is perceived to be dominated by the influence of the primus inter pares, the United States."[672] In any case, the ambition of 'punching beyond its weight' with a preference for civilian crisis management in this group need not be explained by elite preferences of structural deficiencies only, but also with regard to the lessons drawn from historical strategic experience.[673]

According to Biehl et al., the second category covers countries which conduct security and defence policy primarily through and for alliances and organizations. Two types of countries belong to this group: countries whose main purpose of multilateral engagement in NATO is to make sure they have credible security guarantees. This is also often used as a reason for participating in NATO operations, as was the case in Afghanistan and Iraq. These countries also stress the traditional collective defence of NATO (mostly in fear of Russia) more than they do the new security challenges, such as terrorism. The other type includes countries whose main objective is to be perceived as reliable partners within NATO and the EU, partners who can be counted upon to make a contribution even if these countries did not have a particular national interest at stake in the context of particular operations. These countries [Germany included] do not have a clearly defined strategic purpose for their armed forces, which "seems to fluctuate among the political elites in these countries between the more traditional collective defence to a more expeditionary mindset."[674]

The third category involves countries who are convinced that military power can be used to protect and project state power. These countries believe it is their responsibility to engage beyond Europe in order to manage the conflicts that may arise and have repercussions for their own and European security. These countries are often willing to make resources available relative to their size and capacity in order to tackle these crises. If the organizations/institutions designated to manage these conflicts are lacking, these

---

[672] Ibid., p. 392.

[673] See Seppo, Antti & Forsberg, Tuomas 2013, 'Finland', Biehl, Heiko, Giegerich, Bastian & Jonas, Alexandra (eds.), *Strategic Cultures in Europe. Security and Defence Policies Across the Continent*, Springer VS, 2013, pp. 113-125.

[674] Biehl, Giegerich & Jonas 2013, p. 392.

countries are likely to resort to coalition building beyond these organizations, as was the case during the cases of Iraq and Libya. Biehl et al. refer to the UK and France especially, but also mention that smaller countries such as Denmark and Sweden share some of these traits.[675]

Table 5. European Strategic Cultures

European Strategic Cultures			
	Security policy as manifestation of statehood	Security policy as international bargaining	Protecting and projecting state power
Dimension 1: The level of ambition in international security policy	Relatively high (often 'punching above its weight')	Low to medium (activities are expected to lead to indirect effects)	High
Dimension 2: The scope of action for the executive in decision-making	Strong legislative rights	Strong legislative rights	High flexibility for executive in most cases, strong informal ties between executive and legislative in others
Dimension 3: Foreign policy orientation	Tendency towards EU	Functional: NATO for collective defense, otherwise EU	Strong advocates for either NATO or EU
Dimension 4: The willingness to use military force	Low	High for defence purpose, lower for crisis management	High
Countries	Austria, Cyprus, Finland, Hungary, Ireland, Luxembourg, Malta, Portugal	Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Germany, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain	Denmark, France, Greece, Netherlands, Poland, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom

There are a couple of remarks to be made based on the findings of this study because its conclusions are illuminative in terms of the debate on normaliza-

---

[675] Ibid., p. 393.

tion of German strategic culture. First, as we can see, EU member states do not oscillate towards a specific strategic cultural equilibrium understood as the combination of certain ideas and practices because there is no single, overarching concept of European security which would ultimately distinguish 'normal' ideas and practices from 'non-normal' ones. For instance, the European Security Strategy (ESS) has remained largely a declaratory political document without facilitating tangible convergence among European strategic cultures. EU declarations and strategies tend to be rather general in nature without any formal strategic obligations for the member states. Indeed, as often noted, security and defence are still mainly conducted by member states themselves, regardless of the new capacities that the Constitutional Treaty has endowed the European Parliament and the European Commission in these matters. In this rather general sense, there is no such thing as European normality in security and defence policy.

Second, and more importantly, the talk about 'normality' understood as the normal, traditional way of the state to deploy military power would only make sense if the realist maxims were omnipotent and the sole purpose of states' defence and security policy was to maximize their military power. Alternatively, it would make sense if we were able to posit that one of these purposes is in some way more 'normal' than the other – in other words, if one of the purposes represented a collectively accepted norm in *all* strategic cultures. However, the different purposes of security policy, here depicted as either a manifestation of statehood, international bargaining or the protection/projection of state power are all roughly equally represented among the EU member states.

Third, regarding the fourth dimension, it is difficult to pin Germany down to just one category in terms of the purpose for defence and security policy (even though Biehl et al. have done so for the sake of analytical clarity here). It can equally be argued that security and defence policy is a manifestation of statehood for Germany, even though it does not depend on others for its security to the degree that smaller states do and even though there are clear structural deficiencies in its armed forces compared to many other European armies. Germany's preferred mode of international co-operation is still multilateral in its core, even in its 'modified' form (see e.g. Chapter 4.4). Lastly, it is questionable whether Germany's threshold to use force for defence purposes is *considerably* lower than it is in the case of crisis management, particularly as the focus of NATO and EU has been on crisis management, not collective defence – notwithstanding the recent crisis in Ukraine. For instance, in the case of deploying Patriot missiles in Turkey in the NATO context, due to Turkish fears of Iraqi aggression, Germany was conceived of as a rather reluctant partner. After US pressure, the German government decided to deliver 46 Patriot missiles, which had to be fitted to Dutch batteries. According to Harnisch, this had to be done "in order to avoid any participation of German personnel, which would have required a mandate of the Bundes-

tag".[676] In late 2015, Germany decided to withdraw its Patriot-missiles from Turkey. Germany's NATO allies reacted reservedly to Germany's decision, because it was clearly based on a political evaluation of Turkey's conduct as an ally in the Syria question, even though the future of the NATO mission in Turkey was still open.[677] In a similar vein, even though German security (and hence the security of Germany's partners in NATO) has been defended at the Hindukush for years, Berlin has retained its skeptical attitude towards NATO becoming a global intervention force and remains what Noetzel and Schreer have called a 'status-quo' ally.[678] As an overall critique one can also posit that strategic cultures do not only operate via military power but that other forms of state power, such as economic power, soft power or, indeed, cultural power can and do play a role in the evolution of strategic concepts and practices. As discussed above, this can be witnessed for instance in the German concept of Comprehensive Approach on security the means of which rely strongly on other forms of power than military power.

I posit that the argument about German 'normalization' has to be rejected in the sense of 'remilitarization' as well as in the sense of 'becoming more willing to use military force' on the grounds of the nature of German strategic culture described above and in the previous chapters. However, it is more tempting to accept the normalization thesis understood as Germany 'coming to terms with the use of the military in addition (but never exclusively prior to) the use of civilian means and measures'. Moreover, as discussed in Chapter 3, the normative shift from 'never again war' to 'never again Auschwitz' did not generate any automatic patterns regarding the use of force. Rather than pointing out any final state of affairs for German strategic culture regarding normalization, this shift was characteristic of the process of coming to terms with the use of military power. For instance, compared to the UK, Germany remains considerably more skeptical about NATO becoming a global intervention force, and in comparison to France, the more principal understanding of the use of military force as *ultima ratio* seems to persist. Indeed, the fact that the use of military force as *ultima ratio* seems to have solidified itself further as the first-order strategic practice in terms of military deployments does, in effect, offer a powerful critique of the arguments about normalization understood as remilitarization or increased willingness to use force. What is more, mandates that regulate the rules for the use of force in Bundeswehr operations are thoroughly scrutinized in the German Bundestag, even though the hallmark Constitutional Court's ruling changed the majority needed for mandate approval from a two-thirds majority to a simple majority in 1994.

---

[676] Harnisch, Sebastian 2004, 'German Non-Proliferation Policy and the Iraq Conflict', German Politics, Vol 13. No.1, p. 16.

[677] ‚Warum die Bundeswehr die Türkei verlässt', Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, 15.8.2015.

[678] Noetzel, Timo & Schreer, Benjamin 2009, 'Does a multi-tier NATO matter? The Atlantic alliance and the process of strategic change', International Affairs, Vol. 85, No.2 (Mar., 2009), p.216.

5.3.3. 'BUNDESWEHR' IM WANDEL – HAS THE GERMAN ARMY BECOME 'NORMAL' ?

The understanding of normalization as 'coming to terms with the use of military force' is linked with the contemporary understandings of Germany's international responsibility. This can be seen in the process of Bundeswehr reform, which had already been initiated by Defence Minister Volker Rühe and Chancellor Helmut Kohl at the beginning of the 1990s – the aim of which was gradually to accommodate the German populace to the idea of deploying the Bundeswehr outside Germany.[679] The structural changes after the end of the Cold War, the end of bipolarity and hence the disappearance of the common enemy gradually eroded the support for general conscription in Germany, one of the cornerstones of German strategic culture during the Cold War. However, it was clear that the abolition of conscription would not happen overnight. For instance, in 1995 Federal President Roman Herzog still argued in favour of conscription because it

> *"makes all citizens responsible for their body politic and it makes politicians more sensible towards military deployments, because it involves the sons of all German families and layers of society, even their own. Conscription ensures that the army stays in the middle of society and lives as part of the society"* yet he continued that *"the various benefits of conscription for the state are not enough for the justification for the existence of conscription [...] Conscription involves so deeply the individual freedom of the young citizen, that a constitutional democracy can only demand it if the external security of the state dictates it. Conscription is, hence, no universal, eternal principle, but dependent on the concrete security situation. Its preservation, suspension or abolition as well as its length have to be justified in terms of security policy. Societal, historical, financial and army-intern arguments can be used as further justifications. But they will never form the basis of consensus in the dialogue with the citizens. In other words, to maintain a credible conscription means to explain why we still need it despite the disappearance of the direct external threat."[680]*

However, when the final decision to abolish conscription was made in 2010, the reasoning was, paradoxically, first and foremost economic – even though there was cross-party consensus on the fact that a conscript army had outlived its strategic usefulness for Germany. The issue of Bundeswehr reform – in essence, the abolition of conscription and the preference for crisis management tasks instead of traditional territorial defence due to the evolution of

---

[679] See Niven 2007; Longhurst 2004.

[680] Speech by Federal President Roman Herzog at the Bundeswehr Commander Summit, 15.11.1995. Available at: (http://www.bundespraesident.de/SharedDocs/Reden/DE/Roman-Herzog/Reden/1995/11/19951115_Rede.html).

NATO strategy[681] – is also important in terms of the normalization debate. Dyson, for instance, has argued that despite the appearance of a major reform as a streamlined German military (from a post-unification force of 370,000 troops and 170,000 conscripts to 252,000 troops to 50,000 conscripts) during 1990-2005, the reality of German defence reform was that of "partial and gradual adaptation" compared to Germany's closest allies in EU and NATO.[682] Dyson argues in favour of an explanatory framework for policy change that highlights the different leadership roles of three German defence ministers, Rühe, Scharping and Struck in managing the reform. He posits that the approach on strategic culture "suggests that the persistence of conscription and territorial defence is the consequence of Defence Ministry and macropolitical system characterized by institutionally embedded 'logic of appropriateness' about Bundeswehr policy, and of a policy process that reflects a highly path-dependent form of historical conditioning. Ministers act from a cognitive script; they follow historically informed ideas about what can and should be done."[683] Indeed, as suggested by Kerry Longhurst, the persistence of conscription in Germany in the early 2000s relied strongly on the path-dependent structural embeddedness of German political actorness: "political 'actors' or 'agents' certainly appear to be 'hemmed in' by existing structures and practices, which have served to preclude the likelihood of change or even the discussion of it, despite clear imperatives for this to happen, especially since 1989."[684] In contrast, Dyson suggests that policy leaders were not "just hostages to their ideational contexts" but "were able to reproduce and sustain strategic culture selectively, as a resource with which to control the scope, timing, and pace of policy change, particularly within the Defence Ministry".[685]

Dyson's approach is similar to the second generation strategic culture literature, which treats strategic culture as primarily an object of political agency in an instrumental fashion. His argument has merit in criticizing strategic culture for not paying enough attention to policy agency. Quite convincingly, he shows how the policy change in Bundeswehr reform was brought about by the agency of German defence ministers who applied a range of leadership models in its implementation. However, this actor-specific approach down-

---

[681] NATO's strategy has basically developed from the organization's enlargement in Eastern Europe to out-of-area operations on a global scale. Yet the latest developments and the Wales Summit in 2014 suggest that NATO is returning 'back to the roots' in the sense of highlighting collective defense as its most important core tasks in the context of the Ukrainian crisis. This development is also reflected in the general combat fatigue of the Western nation in the context of military out-of-area deployments.

[682] Dyson, Tom 2007, *The Politics of German Defence and Security. Policy Leadership and Military Reform in the Post-Cold War Era*. Berghahn Books 2007, p.183.

[683] Ibid., 191.

[684] Longhurst, Kerry 2003, 'Why aren't Germans debating the draft? Path Dependency and the Persistence of Conscription', German Politics, Vol 12., No.2 (August 2003), p.151.

[685] Dyson 2007, p. 191.

plays the structural significance of strategic culture in empowering political actors and agency in the first place. Even though it is certainly true that policy actors are not 'hostages to their ideational contexts', they cannot act entirely outside of these contexts either if they want to present the public with credible and legitimate policy options. Hence, in this sense, strategic culture is not only the object of policy but also the structure that forms the realm of the different possibilities and determines how agency is empowered by offering ideational frames of reference - hence strategic culture can be understood as a social structure which generates action but which is also (re)generated by action.

Von Bredow's assessment of the Bundeswehr reform is similar to that of Dyson. He argues that the core structural problem concerning German defence and security policy did not vanish after the landmark Constitutional Court decision in 1994: because the formulation of Article 87a of the German Constitution clearly states that the purpose of the Bundeswehr is defence, every international Bundeswehr mission and deployment have to be somehow understood as acts of defence. Hence, according to von Brydow, this formulation can be considered to pertain to deployments that contribute to the preservation of peace and the restoration of a lasting peaceful order in Europe and between the peoples of the world can only in very general and abstract sense.[686] Von Bredow also argues that the steps taken in the Bundeswehr reform have been too small compared to the distance that should have been covered. He posits that there are three explanations for this: 1) Germany's security policy has been slow and overly cautious in adjusting to the post-Cold War structural changes; 2) the Bundeswehr's military leadership has been unable to develop a recipe for surmounting the inner-organizational inertia and the difficulties with the bureaucracy within the Bundeswehr and finally, 3) Germany has been unsuccessful in bringing about a public debate on the future of the Bundeswehr and its new military tasks as well as a discussion on the associated complications with the military occupation in German society.[687]

However, in the context of global and European economic decline, major structural reforms were undertaken under the leadership of Defence Minister zu Guttenberg in 2010 and implemented by his successor de Maiziere. The German conservative-liberal government had already agreed in their coalition agreement in 2009 that the defence minister would appoint a commission to prepare a report on the strengths and weaknesses of the Bundeswehr. The most important change was the abolition of conscription and the introduction of voluntary military service in 2010. The troops were cut from 245,000 to around 185,000 military and 50,000 civilian personnel and major structural changes were initiated in the organization of the Bundeswehr.

---

[686] Von Bredow, Wilfried 2010, 'Bundeswehr-Reform: kleine Schritte und ein großer Sprung', Zeitschrift für Staats- und Europawissenschaften (ZSE), Vol.8, No. 10 (2010), p. 391.

[687] Ibid., 395.

The tasks and purpose of the Bundeswehr during and after these structural changes that were referred to as *Neuausrichtung der Bundeswehr* (reorientation of Bundeswehr), were clarified in the defence political guidelines in 2011 (VPR). According to this document, Germany's strategic environment had changed fundamentally in the sense that territorial threats caused by conventional armed forces were seen as minor compared to the threats caused by failing and failed states, international terrorism, regimes under terrorist influence and dictatorship, criminal networks, climate and environmental catastrophes, migration as well as shortages in supply of natural resources and raw materials as well as possible endangerment of critical infrastructure such as information technology.[688]

Moreover, the 2011 VPR highlight the importance of a value-oriented foreign and security policy that is based on a feeling of responsibility that stems from Germany's strong, central position in Europe. Germany will support the liberal-democratic constitutional order and the fundaments of international law as well as aiming towards a better and more secure world in a more abstract sense. Germany's security political objectives include the securing of the safety and security of German citizens, Germany's territorial integrity and sovereignty and that of its allies as well as awareness of Germany's international responsibility. The Guidelines argue that Germany's security interests emerge from Germany's history, its central geographical position in Europe as well as from Germany's participation in the international political and economic networks and Germany's dependence on resources as a site of high-technology and as an export nation with poor natural resources. According to the VPR, these interests can be further defined in terms of prevention and containment of those crises and conflicts that threaten Germany's and its allies' security as well as the credible and long-term representation of Germany's foreign- and security political positions. Moreover, these interests also include the strengthening of transatlantic and European security and partnership, bolstering the international legitimacy of human rights and democratic principles, global respect for international law as well as decreasing the gap between rich and poor countries as well as securing free access to world economy, high seas and natural resources.[689]

The 2011 Guidelines also stress the importance of the Comprehensive Approach on security. This means that the securing of all the security political interests includes political, diplomatic, economic, developmental, police, humanitarian, social as well as military measures. The guidelines also reaffirm Germany's stance towards multilateralism especially in the context of the UN, NATO and the EU. Foreign deployments should principally be conducted multilaterally except for deployments which directly concern the safe-

---

[688] Verteidigungspolitische Richtlinien 2011. Nationale Interessen wahren – Internationale Verantwortung übernehmen – Sicherheit gemeinsam gestalten. Der Bundesministerium der Verteidigung, Berlin, 18.5.2011.

[689] Ibid.

ty of German citizens abroad. Despite the major changes to the structure of the Bundeswehr, the 2011 VPR underlines the importance of the existence of national armed forces as an *indispensable* instrument of German foreign and security policy and as a fundament of self-assertion and defence-preparedness in terms of its core tasks and capabilities. Finally, the VPR states that the Bundeswehr is to be steered towards a range of international deployments of all intensity levels and that the Bundeswehr should enable Germany to make a politically and militarily appropriate contribution equivalent to Germany's size.[690]

However, despite the evident need for the German foreign and security policy to adapt to the post-Cold War international order, which the VPR 2011 clearly brings into expression, the Bundeswehr reform has been criticized throughout its existence. A recent critique posits that Chancellor Merkel has displayed "a significant lack of interest in German defence policy during the 2009-2013 period" and that "(t)he fundamental task of defence ministers Karl-Theodor zu Guttenberg (2009-2011) and Thomas de Mazière (2011-2013) under her second chancellorship has been to keep the policy area off the news agenda and avoid causing electoral damage to the CDU/CSU in both regional elections the 2013 federal election."[691] Furthermore, it has been argued that Germany's general reluctance to take leadership in defence and security policy is reflected in the laggard reforms of the Bundeswehr and it seriously hampers the overall development of European security in the context of US' "Asia Pivot" policy of rebalancing its relations with South-Eastern Asia as well as the rise of BRIC states as significant actors in global security policy.[692] Hence, the argument is that while the US turns more and more away from Europe, Germany should take more and more responsibility.

A part of the explanation for Germany's contemporary rather slow and cautious movement in the area of defence and security policy can also be found in the global and European context of the financial crisis. Mölling, for instance, has argued that the economic and financial crisis has made interests and values less important as determinants of defence policy, which is reflected in the stagnant state of the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP). Significantly, this has had the effect that the strategic dimension has been almost completely overshadowed by economic constraints in terms of defence planning and procurement.[693] As a response, the so-called German-

---

[690] Ibid.

[691] Dyson, Tom 2014, 'German Defense Policy under the Second Merkel Chancellorship', German Politics, vol. 23, No. 4, p. 460.

[692] See Ratner, Ely 2013, 'Rebalancing to Asia with an Insecure China', The Washington Quarterly, Vol. 36, No.2, pp. 21-38; Ling, Wei 2013, 'Rebalancing or De-Balancing: US Pivot and East Asian Order, American Foreign Policy Interests, Vol.35, pp. 148-154.

[693] Mölling, Christian 2013, 'Europäische Verteidigung in der Krise', in Kempin, Ronja & Overhaus, Marc, *EU-Außenpolitik zu Zeiten der Finanz- und Schuldenkrise*, Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik, pp. 84-95.

Swedish initiative (Ghent Initiative, 2010) of pooling and sharing EU member states' military capabilities and capacities the aim of which was to ease the financial burden of procurement and crisis management deployments of individual member states has also suffered from the lack of concrete implementation and the fact that it is not a politically binding agreement. Yet a more compelling answer is provided if we link the economic downturn with the state of German strategic culture: budgetary constraints favour change and pragmatism instead of continuity and dogmatism in the area of defence policy, as can be seen in the examples of Pooling and Sharing as well as Smart Defence.[694] Moreover, these economic constraints may also change the pattern of defence and security political preferences in the sense of altering the tension between military effectiveness on one hand and national capacities and capabilities on the other. This can especially be detected in the acquisition of new defence equipment and material as the procurement cycles are lengthened or can even be disrupted by the lack of finances.

However, as the Ukrainian conflict has shown, in times of crisis it is more probable to find a common denominator in terms of defence and security than in times of stability despite the economic constraints. Indeed, resurgent Russia represents the former common enemy of all NATO member states unlike the case with the war in Iraq, when opinions differed as to whether Saddam Hussein's Iraq posed a common threat to the West or not. The presiding German Defence Minister von der Leyen, for instance, decided in early 2015 to repurchase decommissioned Leopard tanks to reform one German tank battalion as a response to the rising tensions between NATO and Russia, without having a clear view on how the purchase would be financed.[695]

However, despite the denomination of Germany as a "laggard" in defence and security policy reforms[696], normalization understood as the process of coming to terms with the use of military force is well reflected in the notion of 'Bundeswehr im Einsatz'[697], which, in turn, is quite astutely exemplified by the end of the 13-year long German participation in the OEF/ISAF missions in Afghanistan at the end of 2014. Hence, Afghanistan has been by far the most demanding out-of-area mission the Bundeswehr has ever participated

---

[694] See Faleg, Giovanni & Giovannini, Allessandro 2012, 'The EU Between Pooling & Sharing and Smart Defense. Making a Virtue out of Necessity?' Centre For European Policy Studies (CEPS) Special Report, May 2012.

[695] ,Von der Leyen will Panzerbataillon aktivieren'. Available at: (http://www.welt.de/politik/deutschland/article137887818/Von-der-Leyen-will-Panzerbataillon-aktivieren.html); ,Ursula von der Leyen reaktiviert Panzerbataillon'. Available at: (http://www.tagesspiegel.de/politik/ukraine-konflikt-ursula-von-der-leyen-reaktiviert-panzerbataillon/11436432.html).

[696] Wagner, Wolfgang 2005, 'From Vanguard to Laggard: Germany in European Security and Defense Policy', German Politics, Vol. 14, Issue 4, 2005, pp. 455-469.

[697] Description used in Germany to describe the transformation of Bundeswehr to an army 'in deployment'. See e.g. the website of German Defense Ministry, (http://bmdv.de) and Bundeswehr website (http://www.einsatz.bundeswehr.de/portal/a/einsatzbw).

in, and its scope and depth goes far beyond the German participation in the crisis management of the Balkans and Kosovo considering the tasks and duties required of the Bundeswehr.

German participation in ground combat seems to be the last military taboo to be removed during the course of the ISAF mission in Afghanistan. And yet, the involvement of Bundeswehr soldiers in ground combat does not present a clear-cut case for change in German strategic culture in this respect. There are a number of reasons for this. Firstly, as discussed, this can be seen in the conceptual discrepancy between the strategic policy concepts on the level of German political elite (or lack thereof) and the operational reality on the ground. As has been criticized in many instances[698], NATO did not have a clear strategy for the implementation of the ISAF mission because the 26 NATO member states had diverging interests concerning Afghanistan. The same pertained to successive German governments during the course of the Bundeswehr's longest out-of-area operation as part of ISAF – the aims and purpose of German policy in Afghanistan were only vaguely or abstractly determined, if at all – and this pertains particularly to the use of the military.[699] The discrepancy between political beliefs and the reality in the theatre of operations was also reflected in the German political elites' view of the German soldier as a 'well-digger' long after German troops had actually participated in the counterinsurgency operations of ISAF. It can also be argued that this discrepancy impeded the smooth functioning of the Comprehensive Approach, as a report from a German aid-worker in Afghanistan quite astutely testifies: she was confused about the inability of the Bundeswehr to provide safety and argued that there was a drastic deficit of Bundeswehr soldiers actually operating outside of the protected camps (who actually were in a position to provide security for the civilian workers).[700] It wasn't until the first German casualty in combat operations in April 2009 when the then Defence Minister zu Guttenberg admitted that the Bundeswehr was operating under "warlike" circumstances in Afghanistan; the German domestic discourse before this had concentrated on depicting a picture of German troops undertaking a "stabilizing" mission in Afghanistan.[701]

Secondly, the Bundestag ISAF mandates were ambivalent on the issue of Bundeswehr's use of force in terms of Rules of Engagement (RoE). On the one hand, the consecutive German ISAF mandates acknowledged the right of

---

[698] See e.g. Noetzel, Timo & Scheer, Benjamin 2009, p.217.

[699] See Hilpert 2014.

[700] Lipovac, Susana 2015, 'Zwei Welten, ein Ziel?! Erfahrungen einer deutschen Hilfsorganisation im Rahmen der zivil-militärischen Zusammenarbeit',Glatz, Rainer R. & Tophoven, Rolf (eds.), *Am Hindukusch – und weiter? Die Bundeswehr im Auslandseinsatz: Erfahrungen, Bilanzen, Ausblicke*, Bundeszentrale für Politische Bildung, 2015, pp. 203-217.

[701] See ,Tabu-Bruch: Guttenberg spricht von Krieg in Afghanistan', Spiegel Online, 4.4.2010; Lohse, Eckardt 2009, ,Kriegsähnliche Zustände in Kundus und Berlin', Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, 16.12.2009.

the Bundeswehr to take all necessary steps in the implementation of UNSC mandate 1384 on Afghanistan, but, as Münch has convincingly argued, the caveats made by the German Defence Ministry to the RoE in 2006 were confusing.[702] The pocket manual (*Taschenkarte*) distributed by the Defence Ministry to Bundeswehr soldiers covered the NATO RoE including national caveats – Bundeswehr soldiers were granted the authority to 'exercise proportionate violence' in anticipation of the actions of hostile persons – hence the use of violence was allowed in terms of fulfilling the mission. Yet as the guidelines of the pocket manual argued, the use of violence was allowed for self-defence and as emergency-relief, it also implicitly meant that the use of violence was allowed *only* in those circumstances, and this was the prevailing view among the soldiers of the Bundeswehr. Münch has argued that the ambivalence created by the German Defence Ministry was purposeful: in the event of a scandal involving civilian casualties one could refer to the general nature of the RoE allowing the use of force for self-defence and emergency-relief and in case Germans were accused by their NATO partners of exercising restraint in terms of the NATO RoE, one could always fall back on the national caveats.[703] Similarly to the shifting domestic view from a 'stabilization mission' to an engagement in 'warlike' circumstances, these caveats to the RoE were withdrawn by the Defence Ministry only after the first German casualty in ground combat in April 2009. Also, the 'Kunduz affair' in 2009, when the German commander of Regional Command North, Colonel Klein, gave the order to bomb two fuel tankers in the possession of the Taliban in fear of insurgent attacks against German troops, led to a number of civilian casualties and functioned as a sort of shock therapy in Germany, considering the nature of the Bundeswehr deployment in Afghanistan.[704]

Thirdly, the use of, or the decision to deploy military force is still strongly considered to be *ultima ratio*, and German politicians tend to repeat it like a mantra whenever possible. However, despite the existing conceptual gaps between the political level and the reality as experienced by German soldiers on the ground, the lack of a clear strategy, confusion in the implementation of NATO RoE, or even the principal restraint in the use of military force, Afghanistan still represents a scenario in which the use of force did become the norm rather than the exception for those German soldiers operating beyond the boundaries of fortified camps when things took a turn for the worse in the German controlled northern part of Afghanistan sometime from 2007 onwards. This can also be witnessed in the introduction of the new highest

---

[702] Münch, Philipp 2011, 'Strategielos in Afghanistan. Die Operationsführung der Bundeswehr im Rahmen der International Security Assistance Force', SWP-Studie (Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik), Berlin, 2011, p.16.

[703] Ibid., p.18.

[704] See Geis, Mathias & Lau, Jörg 2009, ‚Das Wahre Gesicht des Krieges. Der Angriff von Kundus und die Nachrichtenpolitik der Regierung stellen den Afghanistan-Einsatz in Frage', Die Zeit, Nr. 52, 17.12.2009.

military decoration for armed service, the Bundeswehr Cross of Honour for Valour (*Ehrenkreuz der Bundeswehr für Tapferkeit*) since 2008. The re-introduction of a medal of honour reflects the need to decorate for heroism soldiers who are deployed in increasingly dangerous missions involving ground combat, the long-time taboo in German strategic culture. For instance, *Kommando Spezialkräfte* (KSK) (German Special Forces) had already participated in the hunt for Serb war criminals in the Balkans in 1997 and later in numerous combat operations throughout the history of the Enduring Freedom/ISAF missions in Afghanistan. Even though the significance of symbolic acts such as the bestowal of medals or the erection of memorial sites for fallen soldiers should not be exaggerated, they still testify to the fact that Germany has officially acknowledged the value of heroism of German soldiers in ground combat – a peculiar feat in a society which has often been deemed 'post-heroic'.[705]

5.4. THE ASPECT OF CHANGE FROM A COUNTERFACTUAL PERSPECTIVE: WHAT IF SREBRENICA HAD NOT TAKEN PLACE?

One way to argue for the importance of the process of 'coming to terms with the German past' in terms of the evolution of German strategic culture is to provide a counterfactual account of the events in which this process is claimed to be causally significant. In the following, I will provide a counterfactual account of possible worlds in which the massacre of Srebrenica did not take place. As was discussed in Chapter 3, this event, which took place in the summer of 1995 in Bosnia was considered pivotal in the German military engagement later in Kosovo, because it unravelled the ideational structure of German strategic culture and brought about the shift from 'never again war' to 'never again Auschwitz'.

Possible worlds, alternate futures?

In contrast to realists who claim that war is a systemic feature of the international system[706], proponents of strategic culture argue that wars, conflicts, crises or traumatic events appear as external shocks, which makes them rather *contingent*. Even though it can be argued that one of the primary purposes of strategic culture is precisely to reduce this contingency by providing clarity, this is not always successful or even possib-

---

[705] See Schüßler, Konstantin & Heng, Yee-Kuang 2013, 'The Bundeswehr and the Kunduz air-strike 4 September 2009: Germany's post-heroic moment?', European Security, Vol.22, Issue 3, 2013, pp. 355-375.

[706] See e.g. Waltz 1979 & 1988.

le. The end of the Cold War and the German reunification were prerequisites for a German strategic actorness without external strings attached, and in this sense they fundamentally changed German strategic culture. But it was the actual experience of warfare after the end of the Cold War, combined with the re-interpretations of the German past that actually changed the strategic practices in terms of the use of military force. Hence, while systemic shifts may radically change the way strategic cultures are able to operate; it is the *contingent* nature of external shocks that makes them a powerful source of change in strategic cultures.

For instance, it can be argued that this was the case with the end of the Cold War and German strategic culture – unlike the aftermath of the World War II, the end of the Cold War and German re-unification considerably reduced the military threat posed to Germany. Moreover, the culture of military restraint that was at the heart of the security and defence policy of the *Bonner Republik*, only changed when German historical lessons were confronted with experiences of warfare after the end of the Cold War. The argument put forward is that at least two instances that I have deemed fundamental in terms of German strategic cultural change (normative shift from 'never again war' to 'never again Auschwitz' and the socio-cognitive shift from guilt to responsibility) would not have occurred the way they did without the impact of contingent factors. In the former case, which I will address in detail below, two contingent and interrelated factors seem to have been critical in bringing about change: the massacre at Srebrenica and the political leadership of the then German Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer. In the latter case, contingency relates to the many unexpected turns that took place in the context of US president Reagan's visit to Bitburg, which set the frame-work for later elaboration of the question of guilt and responsibility. Howev-er, from this we cannot deduce that the more contingent the external shock the more likely a change in strategic culture; the argument here is merely to pinpoint that contingency matters but it does not increase the likelihood of change *per se*.

Lebow categorizes counterfactuals used in the study of history and IR to 'plausible world' and 'miracle' counterfactuals. Plausible world counterfactu-als portray an alternate world that could have very well come to pass if we were allowed a 'small rewrite of history', as Lebow calls it.[707] However, what makes plausible world counterfactuals good counterfactuals according to Le-bow, is not that they could have happened given this small historical rewrite, but rather that they must possess a significant probability of leading to an alternate outcome.[708] However, as Lebow notes, this is not the only criterion of a good counterfactual. He goes on to list a number of things that make it so: 1) realism, 2) clarity, 3) logical consistency or cotenability, 4) enabling

---

[707] Lebow 2010, p. 44.

[708] Ibid.

counterfactuals should not undercut the antecedent, 5) historical consistency, 6) theoretical consistency, 7) avoidance of conjunction fallacy, 8) recognition of the interconnectedness of causes and outcomes and 9) consideration of second-order counterfactuals.[709]

In addition, counterfactuals should "arise from the context", "specify the conditions that would have to be present for the antecedent to occur", "not undercut any of the principles linking it to consequent" as well as "specify, within reason, what else is likely to change as a result of a hypothesized antecedent, and consider how the change that appears the most important might influence the probability of the consequent."[710] Also, counterfactual arguments should avoid the 'conjunction fallacy', which, according to Lebow, means that, statistically, "the probability of a consequent is the multiple of the probability of each counterfactual step linking it to the antecedent".[711] Hence, what this means is that if bringing about a counterfactual outcome requires many subsequent counterfactual steps, the likelihood of that outcome occurring becomes exceedingly low, because the subsequent counterfactual steps needed to reach the desired consequent are hardly causally linear but interact with each other in different ways, decreasing the probability of the desired world and increasing the probability of further alternate worlds, desirable or not.

As I argued in detail in Chapter 3, the massacre of around 8,000 Muslim men and boys during the Bosnian war, committed by Serb forces in the safe enclave of Srebrenica in the summer of 1995, was key in triggering the shifts in the normative structure of German strategic culture (from 'never again war' to 'never again Auschwitz'), which eventually resulted in German military participation in NATO's air war against Serbia in the Kosovo conflict in 1999. In the following, I will depict two plausible alternate worlds that resulted because the massacre of Srebrenica need not have taken place. I will also briefly elaborate on Lebow's assertion, that "(e)ven when there is good reason to believe that the antecedent will produce the desired consequent the possibility remains that subsequent developments will return history more or less to the course from which it was initially diverted by the antecedent."[712]

There are at least a couple of good reasons to argue why the massacre in Srebrenica need not have taken place. The first relates to the role of UN peacekeepers in Bosnia, specifically to the DutchBat III – the Dutch battalion of 370 men and women tasked by the UN with protecting the safe enclave of Srebrenica in Eastern Bosnia. The inability of the DutchBat III to prevent the worst atrocity in Europe since the end of World War II has resulted in the resignation of a government, thousands of pages of official reports and mul-

---

[709] Ibid., pp. 54-57.

[710] Ibid.

[711] Ibid., p. 57.

[712] Ibid.

tiple criminal and civil lawsuits.[713] But perhaps more importantly, it has traumatized a generation of Dutch peacekeepers, who still bear the scars of Srebrenica. Another argument which has circulated ever since it was voiced by the Dutch veterans themselves: had the US, UK and France not blocked airstrikes against Bosnian Serb positions, it could have saved the enclave or at least reduced the number of deaths.[714] This argument reflects the overall neglect or inability of the Western allies to counter the Serb threat: the UNSC mandate on UNPROFOR was practically null and void, because, while it clearly stated that UNPROFOR was mandated to 'deter attacks against safe areas'[715] it severely lacked the manpower to do so. According to the UN estimates around 34,000 troops were needed in order to guarantee the security of the safe zones, but fewer than 8,000 troops were initially available for this task.[716] Hence, in terms of numbers, the small Dutch contingent was far overwhelmed by the vastly superior Serb forces, and this may be one of the reasons why the UN mandate was so restrictive to begin with even with the principal restraint in the use of force: without committing more forces to the enclave, there was no plausible way to resist the Serbs with force.

And yet, it seems plausible to argue that the opposite could just as likely have happened. The UN and NATO could have worked better together by detecting the threat that the Serb forces posed to the safe enclave and acting accordingly, because it was no secret that the Serb General Ratko Mladic was amassing large forces near Srebrenica as he was harried by the NATO airstrikes intended to force compliance with a UN ultimatum to remove heavy weapons from the Sarajevo area. Hence, the Western coalition could have acted more decisively and have been more timely in the matter by either blocking passage of Serb forces to Srebrenica with further air strikes (which were ultimately blocked by UN) or concentrated enough forces in the enclave to deter and repel the Serb aggression (this in particular would have required early detection and reaction). Moreover, Sarajevo suffered the longest siege in modern warfare, from April 1992 to February 1996, and this could have been taken as an indication of the relentlessness of the Serb forces. After the war, General Mladic was one the main culprits to be indicted by the Interna-

---

[713] See Robinson, Duncan 2015, 'The Dutch still grapple with the shame of Srebrenica', Financial Times, 10.5.2015. Available at: (http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/93a5c67a-26d2-11e5-9c4ea775d2b173ca.html#axzz48jVdw4LN).

[714] See Seybolt, Taylor M. 2007, *Humanitarian Military Intervention. The Conditions for Success and Failure*, Oxford University Press, 2007, pp. 202-3.

[715] UN Security Council, Resolution 836 on UNPROFOR mandate enlarged to protect 'safe areas' incl. 'air power.' June 4, 1993. Available at: (http://www.nato.int/ifor/un/u930604a.htm).

[716] UN Security Council, 'Report of the Secretary-General Pursuant to Resolution 844 (1993)', May 9.1994, (S/1994/555). Available at: (http://repository.un.org/bitstream/handle/11176/45185/S_1994_555-EN.pdf?sequence=3&isAllowed=y).

tional Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia (ICTY) for crimes against humanity, genocide and war crimes.[717]

Now, let us turn to the counterfactual situation in Germany, given that the Western coalition was able to prevent Srebrenica from happening. As was discussed in Chapter 3, in Germany, the debate regarding the issue of out-of-area operations was legally disclosed with the July 1994 Constitutional Court decision, which maintained that every Bundeswehr out-of-area operation was to be approved by simple majority of the members of the Bundestag. However, in our alternate world (call it world 'B') Germany did not participate in IFOR/SFOR because the SPD and the Greens regarded the Kohl-Kinkel government's stance on alliance solidarity as not a plausible enough reason to participate, even though the nature of IFOR and, later SFOR, was to facilitate the conditions for peace and ensure that the requirements of the Dayton Peace Accords were met.[718] In the factual vote on IFOR in December 1995, two-thirds of Social Democrats and half of the Greens voted in favour, and of those who did, the vast majority were compelled to do so by the lesson of Srebrenica. As illustrated at length in Chapter 3, the then foreign minister Joschka Fischer's leadership was pivotal not only in turning the tide within the Green Party, but also as the most vocal 'leftist' politician in Germany to vote for German participation in IFOR given the developments that had taken place during the Green Party special summit in the summer of that year and Fischer's famous reinterpretation of 'never again Auschwitz'. Hence, it is plausible to assume that without this contextual framework, the normative shift from 'never again war' to 'never again Auschwitz' would not have taken place and hence the required majority in the Bundestag could not have been amassed.

Now, considering the plausibility of our alternate world 'B', even if Germany would have participated in IFOR/SFOR due to external pressure and the government's stance on alliance solidarity as well as Germany's prior commitment to the UNPROFOR, the debate within the German left on the lessons of the German past would surely not have occurred. This is a logical conclusion given how prominently Srebrenica was featured in the heated debates that took place in the German Bundestag in the course of the latter part of 1995 over IFOR and how the massacre was used in the legitimation of 'never again Auschwitz' instead of 'never again war'. However, it is important to note that the alternate world, had Germany participated in IFOR/SFOR (call it world 'C') would have been quite different than in case of world 'B'

---

[717] For more information on the proceedings in the Mladic trial, see the website of ICTY: (http://www.icty.org/en/cases/ratko-mladic-case-key-information-timeline). The trial judgment is expected in November 2017.

[718] See UN Security Council Resolution 1031 (1995) on the mandate of IFOR, 15.12.1995. Available at: (http://www.nato.int/ifor/un/u951215a.htm).

where Germany did not participate and this can be portrayed by contemplating Germany's position as part of the Western alliance.

In the event that Germany had not participated in IFOR/SFOR, world 'B' would have come to pass. In this world, the Germans would have isolated themselves from their allies, and suffered harsher criticism than being blamed for 'cheque-book' diplomacy, as was the case during the first Gulf War. Most importantly, Germany would have deviated from the principle 'never again alone' and this would have led to scrutiny over Germany's alleged multilateralism. Moreover, Germany's position and respect in NATO would have drastically declined and Germany's commitment to the European integration and its ability to take responsibility would have suffered a serious blow. It would also have undermined the German conservative-liberal coalition and perhaps led to new elections earlier than anticipated. In any case, it is plausible to assume that the red-green government would have won the 1998 elections with a considerably wider margin. Moreover, in world 'B', it is likely that the Bundeswehr reform would have progressed even more slowly than it actually did. Indeed, it is reasonable to assume that, in world 'B', Germany would have put primacy on the aspect of NATO territorial defence instead of out-of-area operations given the established nature of 'never again war' and would have adhered strictly to the tenets of the UN above those of NATO. Most likely, Germany's reluctance to engage in out-of-area operations would also have had repercussions on the debate regarding the role of conscription in Germany.

In the event that Germany had participated in IFOR/SFOR, world 'C' would have come to pass. In this world, Germans would have dutifully participated in the international efforts to bring peace to the Balkans, but its allies would have continued to doubt Germany's resolve considering the military aspects of crisis management and the capability of its conservative-liberal government to implement the requirements as a partner in NATO. Moreover, there would have been serious political clashes in the Bundestag over German Balkan policy as a whole, because according to the political left, there was no compelling reason for Germany to deploy military force in the region. However, in world 'C', German participation in IFOR/SFOR would have had the consequence that the debate on the means and ends of the use of military force would have been discussed more intensively, even though there was nothing that would have 'tipped the scales' in terms of a major shift from 'never again war' to something else. In contrast to world 'B', however, the position of 'ethical pacifists' in world 'C' would have been more contested politically. In world 'C', the German government would have had to put considerable effort into reassuring its allies that Germany was committed to maintaining peace in Europe, but that Germany would not be ready to cross the threshold in participating in the NATO bombing campaign. In world 'B', Germany would have had to do the same, but the implications for German strategic culture would have been different since in this world it was clear from the outset that Germany would not participate militarily.

The critical point here, however, is that in both worlds, the normative shift from 'never again war' to 'never again Auschwitz' did not take place. However, the consequences of this would have had drastically different effects in both worlds in terms of the war in Kosovo. In world 'B', the principal orientation of German foreign and security policy would have been at stake. Germany had now been considered a nuisance for years and an obstacle to decision-making and consensus-building in NATO. German political constellations had firmly moved towards the left because of deep societal dissatisfaction with Kohl's policies domestically. However, after the red-green victory in the Bundestag elections in 1998, the Kohl Doctrine remained largely intact, because it was strongly bound to the principle 'never again war'. Even though Germany's future as an integral part of the West was at stake, Germany remained firm in its Balkan policy and refused to partake in NATO air war in Kosovo, orchestrated with loud criticism of the fact that the UN had not sanctioned NATO actions. However, after the war, under the leadership of Foreign Minister Fischer, Germany was able to regain some of its lost credibility by introducing the Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe in the summer of 1999.

In world 'C', in turn, it would seem logical to assume that Germany would have been at even greater pains with the decision to participate in the NATO air war in Kosovo, because Germany had not properly discussed the issue of the use of military force politically during the 1990s. Given this context, it seems highly unlikely that Germany would have participated militarily, because there was no external shock forceful enough that would have reinforced the credence of military option over civilian and diplomatic measures, even though Schröder and Fischer had given indications that they would be inclined to abandon the Kohl -doctrine if it was deemed absolutely necessary. In world 'C', the principle 'never again war' was still considered superior to 'never again alone', even though it was under considerable more pressure than in world 'B'.

It is useful to briefly elaborate the differences of world 'B' and world 'C' after the war in Kosovo in order to highlight the probable impact of alternate realities on the further evolution of German strategic culture compared to what actually took place. After the war in Kosovo, in world 'B', Germany was now considered an untrustworthy ally. It had not only proved to be an unreliable partner in NATO, but it had severely questioned the NATO bombings in Kosovo and strongly lamented the loss of life in the bombings. Germany had attempted to compensate for the loss of its credibility within NATO by crafting closer ties to Russia. This could be facilitated on the basis of the seemingly close relationship between Chancellor Schröder and Russian President Vladimir Putin. After the 9/11 terrorist strikes in 2001, while Germany was sympathetic to the plight of the Americans, Germany's show of solidarity was not expressed in 'unconditional' terms, because of the deep skepticism that the German government had to the use of force referring to the NATO bombings in Kosovo. It is hence reasonable to assume that in world 'B', Ger-

many would not have participated in OEF/ISAF. This, in turn, would have most likely caused a deep rift in transatlantic relations that would have gone beyond the impact that the crisis had actually had. The clear opposition to the US would have led to an even more serious political contestation between the conservative-liberal opposition and the governing red-green than the one that actually took place, with a focus on the repercussions of the continuous breaches with the 'never again alone' –principle in terms of Germany's NATO membership. Hence, in world 'B', the future of NATO would have already been severely undermined before the Iraq crisis by Germany's actions and this would have most likely caused irreparable damage to the bilateral relations between the US and Germany.

In world 'C', in turn, the war in Kosovo was seen in Germany as a 'necessary evil' to oust Milosevic and to deter the threat of the escalation of the conflict. Even though Germany had not participated in the actual bombings, the German red-green government was principally in favour of military action since it acknowledged that it was necessary to remove Milosevic from power. This development seems plausible given how difficult the decision to participate was for the red-green government. However, Germany's non-participation in Kosovo was met with skepticism regarding the future orientation of German policy, especially as Germany had principally shown readiness to participate militarily in conflict management, as was the case in IFOR/SFOR. Hence, it would seem reasonable to assume that in world 'C', the issue of 'never again war' would have surfaced in different light after the war in Kosovo than how it did in world 'B'. This is because in world 'C', the US had more reason to expect Germany's support, even militarily, given Germany's principal support of NATO in Kosovo and its participation in IFOR/SFOR. However, it is unclear whether Germany would have participated in OEF/ISAF under these premises. The impact of 9/11 as an external shock would have perhaps had slightly different implications on German strategic culture in world 'C' than what it had, because the Germans might have felt more compelled to participate militarily, given that they did not do so in Kosovo. However, there is no strong argument to be made that this would have been consequential in terms of the use of military force, given that there had not been an external shock forceful enough to shake the normative foundations of German strategic culture.

Several things can be concluded from this limited counterfactual thought experiment. Firstly, it might seem radical and even controversial to think that had the DutchBat III or the Western coalition been able to prevent the Srebrenica massacre, Germany would not have participated in the NATO air war in Kosovo. However, if we follow the lines of argumentation presented above, and while the depiction of the cosmos of events that took place during 1995-1999 is presented in a very condensed form, it is enough to show that Germany's abstinence in Kosovo could have been a plausible consequence had the Srebrenica massacre (the antecedent event) not taken place. Secondly, however, this experiment also confirms Lebow's argument regarding the

'conjunction fallacy' in an interesting way, because while alternate world 'B' might seem more plausible up until the point right after the IFOR/SFOR, it loses credibility because it takes more subsequent counterfactual steps than world 'C' before the point of Kosovo is reached.This becomes even more evident when we assess the likely developments in these worlds after the war in Kosovo. Hence, alternate world 'C' seems more consistent overall with what actually happened. The point is, however, that both worlds are plausible, with one being just more likely than the other. Thirdly, it goes without saying that these two alternate worlds do not exhaust the realm of counterfactual arguments regarding the impact of Srebrenica. But it does go to show how important Srebrenica, as an external shock, actually was for the evolution of German strategic culture.

Finally, regarding the question of whether subsequent developments are able to return history more or less to the course from which it was initially diverted by the antecedent event or occurrence, we can attempt a twofold answer. First, it seems plausible to assume that the debate over the issue on the use of military force would have surfaced due to external pressure on German strategic culture at some point, given that Germany's alliance patterns have remained relatively constant. But the more important question regarding strategic cultural change is would this have altered the ideational-normative framework and the strategic practices of the Federal Republic to the degree that Srebrenica did? Because our alternate worlds did not actually come to pass, no definite answer can be given. Moreover, and second, it needs to be noted that to date, the massacre at Srebrenica remains in a class of its own in the sense of being the worst atrocity and crime against humanity committed in Europe since the end of World War II, and once again, it seems plausible to assume that had Srebrenica not taken place, it would have required an external shock of similar gravity and magnitude within a similar context that could have returned history to its actual course.

5.5. SUMMARY

In this chapter, I have argued that German strategic culture is still strongly affected by reinterpretations of the German past. This has direct consequences for how we should understand and explain continuity and change in German strategic culture. The core point this chapter has attempted to convey is that we need to understand not only the broad strokes of 'the brush of the past' but also the issues 'under the surface' which affect the whole psyche of a nation: guilt and responsibility. In terms of continuity and change in German strategic culture, the evolving relationship between these two has been key in the unfolding change in German strategic culture. In general, the direction has been from guilt to responsibility, as can be seen in the expansion of the Bundeswehr's remit and in the German concept of *Vernetzte Sicherheit,* but, as Jaspers has argued, the metaphysical aspect of German guilt is there to

stay. Therefore, the guilt of the past remains as a restricting feature in German strategic culture, even though the roles of both the perpetrator and victim can also enable and legitimize pro-military solutions. Some have argued that Germany has moved from *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* to *Erinnerungskultur* (from 'coming to terms with the past to a 'culture of remembrance'), thereby implying that the problems and issues that the German past has posed have somehow transpired and that the past has become 'business as usual'. Nothing could be further from the truth in terms of strategic culture. As argued in this chapter, 'normalization' does not equate with coming to terms with the German past in the sense of 'unburdening' even though it indeed equates with coming to terms with the use of military force, as has been shown in the case of German deployment in Afghanistan.

At the end of this chapter, I conducted a counterfactual thought experiment in order to illustrate the causal significance of the massacre at Srebrenica for the further evolution of German strategic culture. This showed at least two things: first and foremost, to contemplate the likelihood and plausibility of alternate worlds is to reveal how complex the 'world out there' actually is and secondly, the fact is that the actualization of observable outcomes may depend on a multitude of factors which makes them rather contingent. Nonetheless, by contemplating the plausibility of a reality which did not take place, we are in a position to provide better arguments on the causal significance of events that did in fact take place.

6 CONCLUSIONS

> *"Germany's path to greater military assertiveness has not been linear, and it never will be. Germans do not believe that talking at roundtables solves every problem, but neither do they think that shooting does. The mixed track record of foreign military interventions over the past 20 years is only one reason for caution. Above all, Germans share a deeply held, historically rooted conviction that their country should use its political energy and resources to strengthen the rule of law in international affairs. Our historical experience has destroyed any belief in national exceptionalism-for any nation."[719]*
> *(Frank-Walter Steinmeier)*

In this thesis, I have studied the question of strategic cultural change in Germany after the end of the Cold War. In particular, by questioning some of the key arguments made about German security and defence policy and strategic culture that culminate in the premise of cultural continuity, I've argued at length that the incorporation of the notion of strategic cultural change to our theories and analyses of strategic culture will not only enable us to tell better stories about strategic cultures but will urge us to move beyond the surface of directly observable reality – into the 'deep'. However, as I have attempted to argue, this is not a 'leap of scholarly faith' but rather a refined methodological posture that enables us to grasp the socio-cognitive aspects of strategic culture as meaningful and causally significant. Subsequently, one of the key findings of this thesis is that we need to acknowledge the fact that while strategic cultural continuity and change are often simultaneous processes that can be both complementary and contradictory, it is imperative that we make an analytical distinction between change and continuity because it adds to the explanatory power of the concept of strategic culture.

In particular, this thesis has argued that critical realist metatheory is useful in providing conceptual tools for an analytical framework through which we can analyse strategic cultural change as a social and political process and capture this deeper layer of reality. Indeed, the critical realist notion of a 'stratified reality' which includes the observable outcomes as well as the deep structure of reality – i.e. what lies beyond the empirically directly observable – has proven valuable in assessing strategic culture as an entity the socio-cognitive qualities of which play an important role in 'what there is to know' about strategic culture and its evolution. While it might seem self-explanatory that these factors are important and 'real', critical realism allows us to pinpoint the instances in which these become causally relevant in terms of strategic cultural change.

---

[719] Steinmeier 2016, p. 110.

First, as a general conclusion, based on the theoretical premises for this study, this thesis has aimed to paint a picture which portrays the dynamic, not static, nature of German strategic culture. An understanding of culture as a principally dynamic social and political entity reinforces the idea that cultures can and do change, even though the very fact that we can talk about 'culture' initially necessitates some form of continuity both in the ideational/normative framework as well as in the related practices.

Second, this thesis has focused in detail in explicating the question of how the German past matters in contemporary German strategic culture and how it links with the question of strategic cultural change. Previous studies on German strategic culture have functioned on the theoretical premise that 'German past matters' or condensed that idea into discussing the impact or relevance of the 'never again framework' on German strategic culture. This thesis has gone far beyond that in describing and analysing the socio-cognitive processes and historical events that substantiated this framework in the first place. The key argument of this analysis is that the socio-cognitive shift from 'guilt of the past' to 'international responsibility' is integral to an explanatory account of German strategic cultural change. This shift has been detectable throughout the major changes in German strategic culture since the end of the Cold War, which include, as argued, changes on the level of ideas and norms as well as practices.

Third, regarding the empirical case studies, it can be concluded in general that fundamental change has not been a very common phenomenon in the case of German strategic culture since the end of the Cold War and that change has mostly occurred in terms of incremental adaptation. However, shifts in the experience of warfare, of which the reinterpretations of the past are an integral part, (caused mostly by emerging external challenges, threats and shocks), best explain these fundamental changes that can be observed in ideational/normative change (e.g. from 'never again war' to 'never again Auschwitz') or the introduction and institutionalization of new strategic practices (e.g. regarding Bundeswehr out-of-area operations).

Fourth, the case studies have provided a comprehensive picture of a Germany whose strategic culture has been constantly evolving since the end of the Cold War. In particular, the notion of Germany as a civilian power does not seem to fit the Germany of 2016 as well as it fitted the Germany of 1990. This is particularly detectable in the erosion of the 'culture of antimilitarism' (not cultural restraint) after the end of the Cold War which is ultimately due to the fact that 'unconditional' or 'ethical' pacifism is not a viable policy for German governments to pursue because the external challenges (emerging threats, pressure towards German leadership, systemic shifts) as well as domestic structural and institutional changes (e.g. changes in the Bundeswehr structure, capability and operational remit) have all pulled Germany towards a reality in which a categorical rejection to use military force is no longer possible.

Fifth, there is a notable shift in the overall discourse in terms of the German out-of-area operations from the 'never again' framework to 'business as usual' if one compares the 1990s to the more recent debates. This stems partly from the new German activism in the field of defence and security but one can also attribute it to the process of *Enttabuisierung* (removal of military taboos) as well as to the fact that Germany has deployed over 380,000 troops in over 39 crisis- and conflict -management operations since the first Bundeswehr participation in the UN operation in Cambodia 1992/1993. In essence, the focus of the debate has shifted from whether or not Germany can use military force in international affairs to a discussion of what German international responsibility entails if and when it deploys military force. However, in practice Germany continues to exercise military restraint in terms of the use of military force (*ultima ratio*) and favour policies that highlight the civilian aspect of international crisis and conflict management. Moreover, the case studies have shown that the criticism levelled at the ability of the political decision makers to 'cherry-pick' missions or strategy (i.e. mission explains strategy) is based on an instrumental understanding of how strategic culture functions. As I have shown in this thesis, this is an overly simplistic view of the workings of strategic culture, because it falsely assumes that strategic actors have perfect control over their strategic environment. If this indeed was the case, then we would be better to find something else to do, rather than to study strategic culture.

Sixth, it needs to be noted that the question of the use of military force has largely surfaced in terms of the 'out-of-area' debate in post-Cold War Germany. This is reflected e.g. in the shift of strategic focus from territorial defence to international crisis management, the abolition of conscription and the Bundeswehr reform. However, this thesis found no empirical evidence to suggest that the Germans would have been particularly reluctant to defend German territory militarily after German reunification. Indeed, the ongoing crisis in Ukraine has highlighted the importance of geopolitical factors in German security and defence policy by stressing the aspects of territorial defence and alliance solidarity in NATO. Moreover, the White Paper of 2016 clearly defines NATO as the most important factor in maintaining German security, and as long as NATO's commitment to Europe remains intact, there is nothing to suggest a major change in terms of Germany's alliance patterns. In addition, realists could argue that the fact that German security has been defended 'at the Hindukush' does not diminish the importance of geopolitical factors in terms of German security and defence policy, but rather reinforces them because it is in the national interests of Germany to defend its security wherever it might be most threatened. However, while geopolitical factors might provide rational, interest-driven explanations of German security and defence policy, they alone do not provide sufficient explanations for the changes in German strategic culture in terms of the use of military force after the end of the Cold War.

Seventh, I've also shown with a discussion regarding Wendt's account of the cultures of anarchy how the system level affects strategic culture and how it might provide either contrasting or complementary arguments to the analytical model I presented. While a comprehensive view of the workings of the system level goes far beyond Wendt's rather generic take on international interaction based on enmity, rivalry or friendship, it proved to be quite useful in highlighting aspects that go beyond the notion of experience of warfare. As a conclusion, one could posit that the prevailing logic of Lockean anarchy has proved to be a major challenge and that the changes that have occurred in German strategic culture after the end of the Cold War can be seen as a German response in trying to accommodate the Lockean culture (periodic war) with the Kantian tenets of German strategic culture ('never again war'). Interestingly, however, there is no linearity to be detected in that the more the system has resembled a Lockean one where rivals occasionally interact in terms of limited warfare, the more Germany has attempted to stress the Kantian traits of its strategic culture. There are cases in which this has happened (Iraq for instance) but there are also cases which indicate that Germany has more or less adapted to the systemic logic (i.e. Kosovo, Ukraine). Hence, in terms of the hypotheses presented, the results are mixed if mirrored against the long-term track record of German strategic culture. Another way to address this issue is to argue that after the end of the Cold War, the systemic level as such (regardless whether we argue that it is Lockean or Kantian or something else) has not been very stable in terms of its ability to generate processes of collective identity formation (i.e. structural change), given the premise that the process of identifying with the belief-systems at the macro-level (i.e. what Wendt calls 'internalization') is supposed to cause identical behaviour among the units and hence contribute to the stability of given anarchy. If this were the case, then we should have witnessed a much more 'adaptive' German strategic culture after the end of the Cold War. Indeed, while these systemic logics as presented by Wendt offer another way of looking at the evolution of strategic cultures, they do not offer a complete picture of the evolution of German strategic culture, because they mostly side-line the socio-cognitive specifics of strategic cultures of the units that are an integral part of an explanation of strategic culture and its continuity/change.

Moreover, the inclusion of the Wendtian account of cultures of anarchy to the study of strategic culture raises a further question about the general applicability of system-level approaches to the study of unit-level phenomena. Specifically, in terms of explaining strategic cultural change, it raises a question about 'the extent phenomena at the level of the 'system-structure' explain changes in the entities at the unit-level'. The point here is that system-level approaches function according to 'methodological structuralism', which attempts to account for the causal effect of structure on state behaviour by appealing to a systemic logic that operates as a whole under the assumption that states are unitary, rational actors. As argued, critical realism is helpful in

this regard since it shifts the attention from the causal impact of holistic systemic structures to the causal impact of a variety of factors that may or may not be 'structurally' defined. Hence, even if there was a consensus among the IR scholarship beyond the realist camp that 'war is a systemic feature of the international system', it would not help us much in determining how this systemic feature affects any given strategic culture without a clearly articulated analytical framework. This framework needs to differentiate between the varying impact that this systemic feature, combined with other factors, might have on the process of strategic cultural change.

Eighth, 'normality' is a category which can only be applied in the study of German strategic cultural change with caution, in order to avoid tautological arguments regarding a 'militarization' of German strategic culture. Caution is also warranted because the term usually either refers to a realist understanding of normality in a Hobbesian world where it is 'normal' for the sovereigns to fight over power or to an understanding that normality is the opposite of the alleged German *Sonderweg*. However, as was argued and analysed, 'normality' is not some objectively articulated 'normality' concerning the use of military force or one that is necessitated by systemic forces. It is best understood as a benchmark of the strategic practices of Germany's peers, allies and strategic partners, and that is the most plausible way to argue for any degree of German normality, given the condition that German strategic cultural premises have not been left out of the equation. Hence, in the final analysis German normality would seem to coincide rather well with the idea of 'coming to terms with the use of military force' rather than referring to any arguably qualitative state of mind, e.g. 'more willing to use military force', that give rise to tautological arguments regarding the German stance on the use of force. Similarly, normality is not to be juxtaposed with the notion of increased responsibility, because the latter refers to a much broader spectrum of issues than just the question of the use of military force – and most importantly, it entails normative and moral aspects to the use of military force which is largely missing from the debate concerning 'normality'.

Finally, if the purpose of strategic culture is to establish clarity regarding the possible outcomes of questions and choices related to the issue of peace and war in general and the use of military force in particular, what can we say about how German strategic culture has fared in this task since the end of the Cold War? Firstly, it needs to be stressed that the process of coming to terms with the German past is not to be treated as some finite, clearly definable or even always empirically observable social and political process, but that there are 'echoes' of the need to come terms with the questions related to the issue of German guilt and responsibility that have steered the process ever since the end of World War II and become often manifest during times of tension. The events at Bitburg and the Historians' Controversy were examples of manifestations of these echoes. Secondly, because the nature of the existing normative framework of German strategic culture is inherently conflictual, it continues to be a source of tension within German strategic culture, even

though the process of *Enttabuisierung* is considered to be concluded now that Bundeswehr soldiers have participated in ground combat in Afghanistan. Hence, the process of the 'removal of military taboos' does not exhaust the impact that the process of coming to terms with the German past has had and continues to have, on the evolution of German strategic culture, because the tension between the guilt of the past and the responsibility for the future remains, despite the overall shift from guilt to responsibility. The functionality of German strategic culture, that is, its ability to provide clarity depends on how well the Germans are able to manage these tensions in the future. As Jaspers put it, "(h)ere we Germans face an alternative. Either acceptance of the guilt not meant by the rest of the world but constantly repeated by our conscience comes to be a fundamental trait of our German self-consciousness – in which case our soul goes the way of transformation – or we subside into average triviality of indifferent, mere living."[720]

Moreover, a number of conclusions could be made, the repercussions of which go beyond the immediate findings of this thesis. Firstly, the study of strategic culture does make a difference to how we study the fundamental issue of peace and war. It is not so much the fact that strategic culture focuses on the multitude of issues regarding the use of military force that makes it useful, but rather the fact that a cultural view of peace and war is likely to provide answers that go beyond the immediate and explicit findings related to the use of military force which, in turn, makes it a valuable analytical tool. Subsequently, the usefulness of the approach is partly connected to the scope and depth of the empirical analysis, because a single case-study can rarely provide us with evidence that transcends the immediately observable; the tendency lies on empirically verifiable outcomes. As has been argued in this thesis, it is not adequate for an in-depth explanatory analysis on strategic cultural change. Therefore, a more comprehensive strategic cultural analysis could be argued to be one that highlights the underlying social and political processes over time and how they connect with the evolution of strategic culture.

Secondly, while it may seem from the outset that the German case appears as if it were 'tailor-made' for a strategic cultural analysis given the importance attributed to the strong normative claims and the significance of the German past, the arguments and findings in this study indicate that there are clear limits to the explanatory power of the approach. As was discussed early in the thesis with regard to causality, the study of strategic culture should not be taken as an approach that is ultimately capable of providing waterproof explanations for defence and security policy behaviour but rather as one that offers a culturally constructed explanatory account focusing on the cultural premises for these policies. Moreover, by laying out these premises, strategic culture has the potential to provide clarity regarding the potential policy outcomes of questions and choices related to the issue of peace and war and the

---

[720] Jaspers 2000, p. 111.

use of military force, hence functioning as an indispensable framework for political decision-making.

Thirdly, the analytical framework presented in this study is useful but rather rudimentary and needs to be developed further in order to provide even more nuanced assessments regarding strategic cultural change. In particular, there are a number of important questions that the analytical framework in its current iteration is not able to directly address. For instance, it does not further categorize 'external shocks' in terms of their explanatory power and in particular the question of what makes them such powerful sources of change in the first place. The answer that can be given based on the findings in this study is that the more directly and forcefully an external shock affects the 'experience of warfare' of any given strategic culture, the more likely it is to bring about change in strategic culture. Furthermore, we could try to incorporate system-level variables directly into the analytical framework without making it redundant in terms of its explanatory power. This could reduce the perplexity regarding the level of complementarity vs. contrast in unit vs. system level analyses. Finally, a more refined analysis is needed that elaborates more closely the impact of 'secondary' and 'tertiary' mechanisms of change. Importantly, while the findings in this study confirm the primacy of 'experience of warfare' there are several contexts in which the other mechanisms might be even more important, in particular given that fundamental change is a less common of a phenomenon in strategic cultures in general.

Fourthly, it is necessary to discuss the general applicability of the proposed analytical framework, in particular with regard to the argument that 'experience of warfare' is the key mechanism of strategic cultural change. Hence, the question is whether 'experience of warfare' constitutes the most important mechanism in explaining strategic cultural change in any given strategic culture. First, the argument made in this study that the process of coming to terms with the past is an integral part of the 'experience of warfare' in Germany, may not be generally applicable as such. This is because if we follow the premises of critical realism, it can hardly be argued that the impact of the past would always manifest itself in experience (of warfare) the way it often does in case of Germany. This is conceivable even without much theoretical elaboration – it is evident that strategic cultures differ in what lessons they draw from the past. However, this does not mean that the past would not possess causal properties in any given strategic culture. Indeed, the part of this argument that is generally applicable would be to posit that the past has the potential power to shape strategic cultures and their experience of war and warfare, whether it becomes empirically manifest or not the way we expect it to. Hence, the question of general applicability becomes somewhat different if we approach it with the critical realist premises in mind. Second, if we accept the notion that the core of any strategic culture revolves around the question of the use of military force (this could be argued to be the lowest common denominator of the plethora of definitions for strategic culture), it is difficult to imagine a strategic culture in which the experiences of warfare

would not be highly relevant in terms of the use of military force. However, it does not follow from this that the second order mechanisms could not in some instances cause fundamental change in strategic culture. Moreover, as argued, fundamental change in strategic culture is not an every-day phenomenon, and therefore the second and tertiary mechanisms might actually play a more significant role in the long-term (consider the long-term effects of 'socialization' for instance) by fine-tuning and incremental adaptation. Indeed, the point of arguing for the primacy of 'experience of warfare' was not to depict it as some sort of 'ultimate causal mechanism' in bringing about strategic cultural change. The part which is generally applicable in terms of the analytical framework, I would argue, is that 'experience of warfare' is more likely to cause fundamental change in any given strategic culture than the second and tertiary mechanisms, because it directly involves the questions pertaining to the use of military force.

Finally, the study of strategic cultural change in particular shows that there is still room for analyses of strategic culture within the field of IR. The added value of the strategic culture approach is highlighted in particular when we shift the focus of research from epistemology to ontology, from the surface to the deeper layers of reality and from a composition of strategic culture as a static to dynamic entity, because then we are better situated to take the aspect of change in strategic culture seriously. What is more, the phenomenon of 'change' as such is something that is never totally complete, or locked temporally or spatially to a certain context *ad infinitum*. Rather, as this study has shown, as a process, it is constantly evolving into something new that goes beyond any particular instantiation of 'change' at any given time, place or context. While the transcendental nature of change (meaning that it goes beyond our direct experience of phenomena) makes it difficult to capture, it also makes it worth studying because it lies within the reach of potential knowledge.

REFERENCES

Adler, Emanuel & Haas, Peter 1992, 'Conclusion: epistemic communities, world order, and the creation of a reflective research program', International organization, Vol. 46, No.1, pp.367–390.

Adler, Emanuel 1997, 'Seizing the Middle Ground: Constructivism in World Politics', European Journal of International Relations, Vol.3, No.3, p. 329

Adler, Emanuel & Barnett, Michael 1998, *Security Communities*, Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Allens, Robin Marc 2016, 'Are We Doing Enough? Change and Continuity in the German Approach to Crisis Management', German Politics, pp. 1-22.

Anderson, Jeffrey J & Goodman John B. 1993, 'Mars or Minerva? A United Germany in a Post-Cold War Europe', Keohane. Robert, Nye, Joseph & Hoffmann, Stanley (eds.) (1993), *After the Cold War: International Institutions and State Strategies in Europe 1998-1991*, Harvard University Press, 1993, pp. 23-62.

Archer, Margaret et al. (ed.) 1998, *Critical Realism: Essential Readings*, Routledge, London and New York 1998.

Arendt, Hannah 1994, 'Organized Guilt and Political Responsibility', Kohn, Jerome (ed.), *Essays in Understanding 1930-1954: Formation, Exile, and Totalitarianism*, Hannah Arendt Literary Trust Bluecher 1994.

Art, David 2005, *The Politics of the Nazi Past in Germany and Austria*, Cambridge University Press 2005.

Bach, J & Peters, S 2002, 'The New Spirit of German Geopolitics', Geopolitics, Vol. 7, No.3, pp. 1-18.

Bange, Oliver 2005,'Kiesingers Ost- und Deutschlandpolitik von 1966 bis 1969', Buchstab, Günter, Gassert, Philipp & Lang, Peter T. (eds.), *Kurt Georg Kiesinger 1904-1988 – Von Ebingen bis Kanzleramt*, Freiburg 2005, p. 455-500.

Baumann, Rainer 2005, 'Der Wandel des deutschen Multilateralismus. Verschiebungen im außenpolitischen Diskurs in den 1990ger Jahren', Ulbert, Cornelia & Weller, Christoph (eds.), *Konstruktivistische Analysen der Internationalen Politik*, VS. Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften 2005, pp. 99-125.

Baumann, Rainer & Hellmann, Gunther 2001, 'Germany and the Use of Military Force: 'Total War', 'The Culture of Restraint' and the Quest for Normality', German Politics, April 2001, pp. 68-89.

Baumann, Rainer, Rittberger, Volker & Wagner, Wolfgang 2001, 'Neorealist foreign policy theory', Rittberger, Volker (ed.), *German Foreign Policy Since Unification: Theories and Case Studies*, Manchester University Press, 2001, pp. 37-67.

Becker, Sophia 2013, 'Germany and War: Understanding Strategic Culture under Merkel Government', Paris Papers, 2013, No. 9, IRSEM Publication (Institut de Recherche Sratégique de l'Ecole Militaire.

Behr, Timo 2008, 'Enduring Differences? France, Germany and Europe's Middle-East Dilemma', Journal of European Integration, Vol. 30, No.1, pp. 79-97.

Bellamy, Alex. J. 2015, *Responsibility to Protect: A Defence*. Oxford University Press, 2015.

Bellamy, Alex. J 2011, 'Libya and the Responsibility to Protect: The Exception and the Norm', Ethics & International Affairs, Vol. 25, No. 3 (Fall 2011), pp. 263-269.

Belkin, Paul 2007, CRS Report for Congress. Germany's Relations with Israel: Background and Implications for German Middle-East Policy, Congressional Research Service, 2007.

Bennett, Andrew & George, Alexander L. 2005, *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*, MIT Press, 2005.

Bennett, Andrew, Lepgold, Joseph & Unger, Danny 1994, 'Burdensharing in the Persian Gulf War', International Organization, vol 48, No.1 (Winter 1994), pp. 39-75.

Berger, Thomas U. 1998, *Cultures of Antimilitarism: National Security in Germany and Japan*. Johns Hopkings University Press 1998.

Berger, Stefan. 1995, 'No More Sonderweg: Germany's Return to the 'Normality' of the Nation State', Journal of Area Studies, Number 7 (Autumn 1995), pp. 86-99.

Biehl, Heiko 2010, 'Bürger und Sicherheitspolitik – Auf der Suche nach einem sicherheitspolitischen Konsens', Dörfler-Dierken, Angelika & Portugall, Gerd (eds.), *Friedensethik und Sicherheitspolitik. Weißbuch 2006 und EKD-Friedensdenkschrift 2007 in der Diskussion*, VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften , Wiesbaden 2010, pp.169-184

Biehl, Heiko, Giegerich Bastian & Jonas, Alexandra (eds.), *Strategic Cultures in Europe. Security and Defence Policies Across the Continent*, Springer Vs.,2013.

Bjola, Corneliu & Kornprobst, Markus 2013, *Understanding international diplomacy: Theory, Practice and Ethics*, Routledge 2013.

Blackbourn, David & Eley, Geoff 1980, *Mythen deutscher Geschichtsschreibung. Die gescheiterte bürgerliche Revolution von 1848*, Frankfurt a.M/Berlin/Wien 1980.

Bloomberg, Alan 2012, 'Time to Move On: Reconceptualizing Strategic Culture Debate', Contemporary Security Policy, Vol. 33, No.2, pp. 437-461.

Boekle, Rainer, Rittberger, Volker & Wagner, Wolfgang 2001, 'Constructivist foreign policy theory', Rittberger (ed.) (2001*), German Foreign Policy Since Unification: Theories and Case Studies*. Manchester University Press, 2001, pp. 105-140.

Brockmeier, Sarah, Kurtz, Gerrit & Junk, Julian. 2014, 'Emerging norm and rhetorical tool: Europe and the responsibility to protect', Conflict, Security & Development, Volume 14, Issue 4, 2014, pp. 429-460.

Brockmeier, Sarah 2013, 'Germany and the Intervention in Libya', Survival, Vol. 55, No. 6, pp. 63-90.

Checkel, Jeffrey T. 1998, 'The constructivist turn in international relations theory', World Politics, Volume 50, Number 2, January 1998, pp. 324-348.

Chmiel, Mark 2001, *Elie Wiesel and the Politics of Moral Leadership*, Temple University Press, Philadelphia 2001.

Cooper, R.H. & Kohler, J.V. (ed.) 2010, *Responsibility to Protect. The Global Moral Compact for the 21st Century*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

Cooper, Alice H 1997, 'When Just Causes Conflict with Accepted Means: The German Peace Movement and Military Intervention in Bosnia', German Politics & Society, Vol. 15, No. 3 (44) (Fall 1997), pp. 99-118.

Cooper, Alice .H. 2004, 'Media framing and social movement mobilization: German peace protest against INF missiles, the Gulf War, and NATO

peace enforcement in Bosnia', European Journal of Political Research, 41:2002, pp. 37-80.

Conway, John S. 1987, 'How Shall the Nations Repent? The Stuttgart Declaration of Guilt, October 1945', The Journal of Ecclesiastical History, Vol.38, Issue 4, October 1987, pp. 596-622.

Crawford, Beverly 2007, *Power and German Foreign Policy. Embedded Hegemony in Europe*, Palgrave MacMillan 2007

Crawford, Beverly 1996, 'Explaining Defection from International Cooperation: Germany's Unilateral Recognition of Croatia', World Politics, Vol. 48, No. 4 (Jul., 1996), pp. 482-521.

Crawford, Beverly & Lipschutz, Andrew 1994, Discourses of War: Security and the Case of Yugoslavia. YCISS Occasional Paper Number 27, December 1994.

Dalgaard-Nielsen, Anja 2006, *Germany, Pacifism and Peace-Enforcement*, Manchester University Press 2006.

Dalgaard-Nielsen, Anja 2005, 'The Test of Strategic Culture: Germany, Pacifism and Pre-Emptive Strikes', Security Dialogue Vol. 36 (3), pp. 339-359.

Desch, Michael J. 1998, 'Culture Clash: Assessing the Importance of Ideas in Security Studies', International Security, Vol., 23, No. 1 (Summer, 1998), pp. 141-170.

Deutsch, Karl W. et al. 1957, *Political Community and the North Atlantic Area: International Organization in the Light of Historical Experience*, Princeton: Princeton University Press 1957.

Duchêne, Francois 1973, 'The European Community and the Uncertainties of Interdependence', Kohnstamm, M. and Hager, W. (eds), *A Nation Writ Large? Foreign-Policy Problems Before the European Community*, London: Macmillan, 1973, pp. 1-21.

Duffield, John 1998, *World Power Forsaken. Political Culture, International Institutions and German Security Policy After Unification*, Stanford University Press, 1998.

Duffield, Mark 2013, 'Liberal Interventionism and the Fragile State: Linked by Design?', Duffield, Mark & Hewitt, Vernon (eds.) 2013, *Empire, Development and Colonialism: The Past in the Present*, Boydell & Brewer Ltd, 2013., pp. 116-129.

Dyson, Tom 2014, 'German Defence Policy under the Second Merkel Chancellorship', German Politics, vol. 23, No. 4, pp. 460-476.

Dyson, Tom 2007, *The Politics of German Defence and Security*, Berghahn 2007.

Finnemore, Martha & Sikkink, Kathryn 2005, 'International Norm Dynamics and Political Change', International Organization, Vol. 52, Issue 04 (September 2005), pp. 887–917.

Faleg, Giovanni & Giovannini, Allessandro 2012, 'The EU Between Pooling & Sharing and Smart Defence. Making a Virtue out of Necessity?' Centre For European Policy Studies (CEPS) Special Report, May 2012.

Fischer, Joschka 2012, "I Am Not Convinced". Der Irak-Krieg und die Rot-Grünen Jahre, Droemer Knaur 2012.

Forsberg, Tuomas 2016, 'From *Ostpolitik* to 'frostpolitik'? Merkel, Putin and German policy towards Russia', International Affairs, Vol. 92, No.1, pp. 21-42.

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

Freedman, Lawrence 2014, 'Ukraine and the Art of Conflict Management', Survival, Vol. 56, No.3, pp. 7-42.

Friedrich, Roland 2005, *Die Deutsche Außenpolitik im Kosovo-Konflikt*, VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, Wiesbaden 2005.

Fukuyama, Francis 1989, 'The End of History', The National Interest, Summer 1989.

Fulbrook, Mary 1998, German National Identity After the Holocaust, Polity Press 1998

Gavin, Victor 2009, 'Power through Europe? The case of the European Defence Community in France (1950-1954)', French History, Vol. 23, Issue 1, pp. 86-87

Gerster, Florian 1994, *Zwischen Pazifismus und Verteidigung. Die Sicherheitspolitik der SPD*, Nomos Verlag 1994.

Giddens, Anthony 1987, Social Theory and Modern Sociology, Cambridge, Polity Press 1987.

Rose, Gideon 1998, 'Neoclassical Realism and Theories of Foreign Policy', World Politics, Vol. 51, No. 1 (October 1998), pp. 144-172.

Glenn, John 2009, 'Realism vs. Strategic Culture: Competition and Collaboration?', International Studies Review, Vol.11, No. 3 (Sept. 2009), pp. 524-551.

Goldhagen, Daniel Jonah 1996, *Hitler's Willing Executioners*, Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1996.

Gray, Colin 2007, 'Out of the Wilderness: Prime Time for Strategic Culture', Comparative Strategy, Vol. 26, Issue 1, pp. 1-20.

Gray, Colin 1999, 'Strategic culture as context: the first generation of theory strikes back', Review of International Studies, Volume 25, Issue 1, January 1999, pp. 49-69.

Gray, Colin 1981, 'National Styles in Strategy: The American Example', International Security, 6:2, 1981, pp. 21-47.

Gray, Colin 1986, *Nuclear Strategy and National Styles*, Lanham, Md.: Hamilton Press, 1986.

Granieri, Ronald J. 2003, *The Ambivalent Alliance. Konrad Adenauer, the CDU/CSU, and the West, 1949-1966*, Berghahn 2003.

Haas, Peter 1992, 'Introduction: Epistemic communities and international policy coordination', International Organization, Vol. 46, pp. 1-35.

Hampton, Mary N. 2000, 'The Past, Present, and the Perhaps' is Germany a Normal Power?' Security Studies, 10 (2), pp. 179-202.

Hansen, Lene 2006, *Security as Practice: Discourse Analysis and the Bosnian War*, Routledge, New York 2006.

Harnisch, Sebastian 2004, 'German Non-Proliferation Policy and the Iraq Conflict', German Politics, Vol 13. No.1, pp. 1-34.

Harnisch, Sebastian 2004, 'Deutsche Sicherheitspolitik auf dem Prüfstand: Die Nonproliferationspolitik gegenüber dem Irak', Harnisch, Sebastian, Katsioulis, Christos & Overhaus, Marco (eds.), *Deutsche Sicherheitspolitik. Eine Bilanz der Regierung Schröder*, Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlag, pp. 173-200.

Harnisch, Sebastian 2001, *Germany as a Civilian Power?: The Foreign Policy of the Berlin Republic*. Manchester University Press, 2001.

Harnisch, Sebastian 2001, 'Change and Continuity in Post-Cold War German Foreign Policy', German Politics, vol. 10, issue 1, 2001, pp. 35-60.

Harnisch, Sebastian & Wolf, Raimund 2010, 'Germany; The Continuity of Change', Kirchner, Emil & Sperling, James (eds.), *National Security Cultures: Patterns of Global Governance*, Routledge, London 2010, pp. 43-65.

Harnisch, Sebastian & Maull, Hanns W. (eds.) 2001, *Germany as a civilian power? The foreign policy of the Berlin Republic*, Manchester University Press, 2001.

Hart, B.H. Liddell 1932, *The British Way of Warfare,* New York, NY: Macmillan, 1932.

Haukkala, Hiski 2016, 'A Perfect Storm; Or What Went Wrong and What Went Right for the EU in Ukraine', Europe-Asia Studies, Vol. 68, No. 4, pp. 653-664.

Hay, Colin 2002, *Political Analysis*, Basingstoke, Macmillan 2002.

Hellmann, Gunther 1996, 'Goodbye Bismarck? The Foreign Policy of Contemporary Germany', Mershon International Studies Review, Vol.40, No.1 (April 1996), pp.1-39.

Hellmann, Gunther 2009, 'Fatal attraction? German foreign policy and IR/foreign policy theory', Journal of International Relations and Development, Vol. 12, No. 3, pp. 257-292.

Hellmann, Gunther 2009, 'Pragmatism in International Relations', International Studies Review, Vol. 11, No.3, (Sep., 2009), pp. 638-662.

Hillgruber, Andreas 1986, *Zweierlei Untergang. Die Zerschlagung des Deutschen Reiches und das Ende des Europäischen Judentums*. Siedler Verlag, Corso bei Siedler, Berlin 1986.

Hilpert, Carolin 2014, *Strategic Cultural Change and the Challenge for Security Policy. Germany and the Bundeswehr's Deployment to Afghanistan*, Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.

Hippler, Jochen 1991, 'Iraq's Military Power: The German connection', Middle East Report, No. 168, Jan-Feb 1991, pp. 27-31.

Hopf, Ted 1998, 'The Promise of Constructivism in International Relations Theory', International Security, Vol. 23, No. 1, pp. 171-200.

Hoffmann, Arthur & Longhurst, Kerry 1999, 'German strategic culture in action', Contemporary Security Policy, Vol. 20, No.2, pp. 31-49.

Hollis, Martin & Smith, Steve 1990, *Explaining and Understanding International Relations*, Oxford University Press, 1990.

Hyde-Price, Adrian 2015, 'The "sleep-walking giant" awakes: resetting German foreign and security policy', European Security, Vol. 24, No. 4, pp. 600-616.

Hyde-Price, Adrian 2007, *European Security in the Twenty-First Century: The Challenge of Multipolarity*, Routledge 2007.

Hyde-Price, Adrian 2004, 'European Security, Strategic Culture, and the Use Of Force', European Security, 13(4) 2004, p. 324.

Hyde-Price, Adrian 2001, 'Germany and the Kosovo War: Still a Civilian Power?', Webber, Douglas (ed.), N*ew Europe, New Germany, Old Foreign Policy? German Foreign Policy Since Unification*, Routledge 2001, pp. 19-34..

Hyussen, Andreas 2006, 'Air War Legacies: From Dresden to Baghdad', Niven, Bill (ed.), *Germans as Victims*, Palgrave Macmillan 2006, pp. 181-194.

Jacobsen, Kurt 1995, 'Much ado about ideas: The cognitive factor in economic policy', World Politics, Vol. 47, pp. 317-349.

Jakobsen, Viggo 1995, 'Myth-Making and Germany's Unilateral Recognition of Croatia and Slovenia', European Security, Vol.4, No.3 (Autumn 1995), pp. 400-416.

Jaspers, Karl 2000, *The Question of German Guilt*, Fordham University Press, New York 2000. (Originally published as *Die Schuldenfrage* in 1947, Piper Verlag München, Germany).

Jensen, Richard J. 2007, *Reagan at Bergen-Belsen and Bitburg*, Texas A&M University Press 2007.

Jepperson, Ronald L. and Swidler, Ann 1994, 'What Properties of Culture do we Measure?' Poetics, Vol. 22, No. 4 (1994), pp. 359-371.

Johnston, Alastair Iain 1999, 'Strategic cultures revisited: reply to Colin Gray', Review of International Studies, Vol. 25, Issue 3 (July 1999), pp. 519-523.

Johnston, Alastair Iain 1995, *Cultural Realism: Strategic Culture and Grand Strategy in Chinese History*. Princeton University Press, 1995.

Jünemann, Annette, 2005 'German policies in the Mediterranean', Fernández, Haizam Amirah & Youngs, Richard (eds.) 2005, *The Euro–Mediterranean Partnership: assessing the first decade*, Madrid, Fride, pp. 111–120.

Kappel, Robert 2014, 'Global Power Shifts and Germany's New Foreign Policy Agenda', Strategic Analysis, Vol. 38, No. 3, pp. 341-452.

Karp, Regina 2005, 'The new German foreign policy consensus', Washington Quarterly, vol.29, no.1 (Winter 2005-2006), pp. 61-82.

Katsioulis, Christos 2011, 'Die Deutsche Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik nach der Intervention in Libyen', Internationale Politik und Gesellschaft, Vol. 4, pp. 27-44.

Katzenstein, Peter J. (ed.) 1996, *The Culture of National Security. Norms and Identity in World Politics*, Columbia University Press, 1996.

Keller, Patrick 2012, 'Germany in NATO: The Status Quo Ally', Survival, Vol. 54, No.3, p. 95-110.

Kempf, W. & Palmbach U. 1995, *Hitlers Wiedergänger – Medienpsychologische Analysen der Feindbildproduktion im Golfkrieg*, Universität Konstanz 1995.

Kier, Elizabeth 1997, *Imagining War: French and British Military Doctrine Between the Wars*, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1997.

Kiesewetter, Roderich 2015, 'Die Bundeswehr als Instrument (neuer) deutscher Außenpolitik', Zeitschrift zur Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik, Vol. 8, pp.355-364.

Kirchner, Emil J. 1990, 'Genscher and what lies behind Genscherism', West European Politics, vol.13, issue 2, 1990, pp. 159-177.

Kirste, Knut & Maull, Hanns W. 1996, 'Zivilmacht und Rollentheorie', Zeitschrift für Internationale Beziehungen, 3:2, 1996, pp. 283-312.

Klein, Bradley 1988, 'Hegemony and Strategic Culture: American Power Projection and Alliance Defence Politics', Review of International Studies, 14 (1988), pp. 133–48.

Kleinert, Sebastian 1992, *Vom Protest zur Regierungspartei. Die Geschichte der Grünen*, Eichborn Verlag, 1992.

Kleuters, Joost 2009, 'Between Continuity and Change: Ostpolitik and the Constructivist Approach Revisited', German Politics, vol. 18, issue 4, 2009, pp. 522-524.

Klusmeyer, Douglas & Papademetriou, Demetrious 2009, *Immigration Policy in the Federal Republic of Germany. Negotiating membership and Remaking the Nation*, Berghahn Books, 2009.

Kocka, Jürgen 1988, 'German History before Hitler: The Debate about the German Sonderweg', Journal of Contemporary History, vol. 23, no.1 (Jan. 1988), pp. 3-16.

Kocs Stephen A. 1995, *Autonomy or Power? The Franco-German Relationship and Europe's Strategic Choices, 1955-1995*, Greenwood Publishing Group 1995.

Kondylis, Pejoratis 1993, 'Der Deutsche „Sonderweg" und die Deutschen Perspektiven', Zitelmann, Rainer, Weißmann, Karlheinz & Großheim, Michael (eds.), *Westbindung. Chancen und Risiken für Deutschland*, Propyläen, Frankfurt a.M, 1993, pp. 21-38.

Kratochwil, Friedrich 1991, *Rules, Norms, and Decisions: On the Conditions of Practical and Legal Reasoning in International Relations and Domestic Affairs*, Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Kratochwil, Friedrich and Ruggie, John G. 1986, 'International organization: a state of the art on an art of the state', Vol. 40, No. 4, p. 767

Kundnani, Hans 2015, 'Leaving the West behind', Foreign Affairs, Vol. 93, No.1, pp. 108–16.

Kundnani, Hans 2001, 'Germany as a Geo-economic Power', The Washington Quarterly, vol.32, no.3, pp. 31-45.

Kurki, Milja 2006, 'Causes of a divided discipline: rethinking the concept of cause in International Relations theory', Review of International Studies, Vol. 32, No. 2, pp. 189-216.

Kurki, Milja 2007, 'Critical Realism and Causal Analysis in International Relations,' Millennium, Journal of International Studies, Vol. 35, No.2, pp. 361-378.

Lakoff, George 1991, 'Metaphors and War : The metaphor system to justify war in the Gulf', Peace Research, Vol. 23, No. 2/3 (May 1991), pp. 25-32

Lantis, Jeffrey 2002, *Strategic Dilemmas and the Evolution of German Foreign Policy Since Unification*, Greenwood Publishing 2002.

Lantis, Jeffrey 2002, 'The Moral Imperative of Force: The Evolution of German Strategic Culture in Kosovo', Comparative Strategy, 21:1, pp. 21-46.

Large, David Clay 1996, *Germans to the Front: West German rearmament in the Adenauer era*, Chapel Hill: University of California Press 1996.

Lebow, Richard Ned 2010, *Forbidden Fruit. Counterfactuals and International Relations*. Princeton University Press, 2010.

Le Gloannec, Ann-Marie, 'The Implications of German Unification for Western Europe', Stares, Paul B. (ed.) *The New Germany and the New Europe*, Brookings Institution Press, pp. 251-257.

Legro, Jeffrey W, 1995, *Cooperation Under Fire: Anglo-German Restraint during World War II*, Cornell University Press, 1995.

Levy, Jack 1994, 'Learning and foreign policy: Sweeping a conceptual minefield', International Organization, Vol, 48, pp. 279-312.

Libal, Michael 1997, *Limits of Persuasion: Germany and the Yugoslav Crisis*, 1991-1992, Greenwood Publishing, 1997.

Libel, Tamir 2016, 'Explaining the security paradigm shift: strategic culture, epistemic communities, and Israel's changing national security policy', Defence Studies, Vol. 16, No. 2, pp. 137-156.

Ling, Wei 2013, 'Rebalancing or De-Balancing: US Pivot and East Asian Order', American Foreign Policy Interests, Vol.35, pp. 148-154.

Lipovac, Susana 2015, 'Zwei Welten, ein Ziel?! Erfahrungen einer deutschen Hilfsorganisation im Rahmen der zivil-militärischen Zusammenarbeit', Glatz, Rainer R. & Tophoven, Rolf (eds.), *Am Hindukusch – und weiter? Die Bundeswehr im Auslandseinsatz: Erfahrungen, Bilanzen, Ausblicke*, Bundeszentrale für Politische Bildung, 2015, pp. 203-217.

Longhurst, Kerry 2003, 'Why aren't Germans debating the draft? Path Dependency and the Persistence of Conscription', German Politics, vol 12., No.2 (August 2003), pp.147-165.

Longhurst, Kerry 2004, *Germany and the use of force*, Manchester University Press, 2004.

Lord, Carnes 1985, 'American Strategic Culture', Comparative Strategy, 5:3, 1985, pp. 269-93.

Loquai, Heinz 2000, *Der Kosovo-Konflikt. Wege in einen vermeidbaren Krieg. Die Zeit von Ende November 1997 bis März 1999*,Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, Baden-Baden 2000.

Lucarelli, Sonja 1997, 'Germany's recognition of Slovenia and Croatia: An institutionalist perspective', International Spectator: Italian Journal of International Affairs, 32:2, pp. 65-91.

Luckham, Robin 1984, 'Armament Culture', Alternatives, 10:1 (1984), pp. 1–44.

Maier, Charles 1997, *The Unmasterable Past. History, Holocaust, and German National Identity*, Harvard University Press, 1997.

Malici, Akan 2006, 'Germans as Venutians: The Culture of German Foreign Policy Behaviour', Foreign Policy Analysis, Vol. 2, Issue 1, pp. 37-62.

Matlary 2006, 'When Soft Power Turns Hard: Is an EU Strategic Culture Possible?' Security Dialogue, March 2006, vol. 37, No.1, pp 105-121.

Markovits, Andrei S. & Reich, Simon 1999, 'The Contemporary Power of Memory: The Dilemmas for German Foreign Policy', Brady, John S, Crawford, Beverly & Williarty, Sarah Elise (eds.), *The Postwar Transformation of Germany: Democracy, Prosperity, and Nationhood*, Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1999, pp. 439–72.

Maull, Hanns 2011, 'Deutsche Aussenpolitik: Orientierungslos', Zeitschrift für Politikwissenschaft, no. 1, 2011, pp. 95–119.

Maull, Hanns W. 2006, *Germany's uncertain power: the foreign policy of the Berlin Republic*, Palgrave Macmillan 2006.

Maull, Hanns W. 2000, 'German foreign policy, Post-Kosovo: Still a 'civilian power?', German Politics, Vol.9, No. 2, pp.1-24.

Maull, Hanns W. 1992, 'Zivilmacht Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Vierzehn Thesen für eine neue deutsche Außenpolitik', Europa Archiv, Vol. 47, No. 10, pp. 269-278.

Maull, Hanns W. 1990, 'Germany and Japan: The New Civilian Powers', Foreign Affairs, Vol. 69, Nr. 5, pp. 91-106.

Halbwachs, Maurice 1992, *On Collective Memory*, Coser, Lewis A. (ed.), Chicago University Press, 1992.

Mearsheimer, John J. 1990, 'Why We Will Soon Miss the Cold War', Atlantic Monthly, Vol.266, No.2, p. 39.

Mearsheimer, John J. 1990, 'Back to the Future: Instability in Europe after the Cold War', International Security, vol. 15, no.1 (Summer 1990), pp. 5-56.

Menon, Anand 2011, 'European Defence Policy from Lisbon to Libya', Survival, Vo. 53, No. 3, pp. 75-90.

Merkl, Peter H. 1974, 'The German Janus: From Westpolitik to Ostpolitik', Political Science Quarterly, vol. 89, no. 4 (Winter, 1974-1975), pp. 803-824.

Meyer, Christoph O. 2006, *The Quest for a European Strategic Culture. Changing Norms on Security and Defence in the European Union*, Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

Milliken, Jennifer 1999, 'The Study of Discourse in International Relations: A Critique of Research and Methods', European Journal of International Relations, Vol. 5, No. 2, 1999, pp. 225-254.

Miskimmon, Alister 2012, 'German Foreign Policy and the Libya Crisis', German Politics, Vol. 21, Issue 4, 2012, pp, 392-410.

Miskimmon, Alister 2009, 'Falling into Line? Kosovo and the course of German foreign policy', International Affairs, vol. 85, no. 3 (2009), pp. 561-573.

Morozov, Viacheslav 2008, 'Sovereignty and Democracy in contemporary Russia: a modern subject faces the post-modern world', Journal of International Relations and Development, vol. 11, June 2008, pp. 152-180.

Müller, Harald 2011, 'Ein Desaster. Deutschland und der Fall Libyen', HSFK Standpunkte, no. 2, 2011.

Müller, Harald 2000, 'Nuclear Weapons and German Interests: An Attempt at Redefinition', PRIF-Report No. 55/2000, Peace Research Institute Frankfurt.

Münch, Philipp 2011, 'Strategielos in Afghanistan. Die Operationsführung der Bundeswehr im Rahmen der International Security Assistance Force', SWP-Studie (Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik), Berlin, 2011.

Mölling, Christian 2013, 'Europäische Verteidigung in der Krise', in Kempin, Ronja & Overhaus, Marc, *EU-Außenpolitik zu Zeiten der Finanz- und Schuldenkrise*, Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik, pp. 84-95.

Nehring, Holger 2005, 'National Internationalists: British and West German Protests against Nuclear Weapons, the Politics of Transnational Communications and the Social History of the Cold War, 1957–1964', Contemporary European History, vol. 14, Issue 04, November 2005, pp. 559-581.

Neumann, Iver B. & Heikka, Henrikki 2005, 'Grand Strategy, Strategic Culture, Practice', Co-operation and Conflict, Vol. 40, No.1 (2005), pp. 5-23.

Niven, Bill 2006, *Germans as Victims. Remembering the Past in Contemporary Germany*, Palgrave Macmillan 2006.

Noetzel, Timo & Schreer, Benjamin 2009, 'Does a multi-tier NATO matter? The Atlantic alliance and the process of strategic change', International Affairs, Vol. 85, No.2 (Mar., 2009), pp. 211-226.

Olick, Jeffrey K. & Levy, Daniel 1997, 'Collective Memory and Cultural Constraint: Holocaust Myth and Rationality in German Poltitics', American Sociological Review, Vol. 62, No. 6 (Dec., 1997), pp.921-936.

Onuf, Nicholas 1989, *World of Our Making: Rules and Rule in Social Theory and International Relations*, University of South Carolina Press, 1989.

Oppermann, Kai 2012, 'National Role Conceptions, Domestic Constraints and the New 'Normalcy' in German Foreign Policy: the Eurozone Crisis, Libya and Beyond', German Politics, Vol. 21, No. 4, pp. 502-519.

Overhaus, Marco 2004, 'In search of a post-hegemonic order: Germany, Nato and the European security and defence policy', German politics, Vol. 13, Issue 4, 2004, pp. 551-568.

Palan, Ronen 2000, 'A world of their making: an evaluation of the constructivist critique in International Relations', Review of International Studies, Volume 26, Issue 4 (October 2000), pp. 575-598.

Patomäki, Heikki 2014, 'On the Reality of Causes: A Response to Ned Lebow', Qualitative & Multi-Method Research, Fall 2014, Vol. 12, No.2, pp. 11-16.

Patomäki, Heikki & Wight, Colin 2000, 'After Postpositivism? The Promises of Critical Realism', International Studies Quarterly (2000), Vol, 44, pp. 213-237.

Peters, John E. 2001, *European Contributions to Operation Allied Force*, Santa Monica, CA: Rand, pp. 32-33.

Peters-Pierre-King 2005, 'The Politics of Path Dependency: Political Conflict in Historical Institutionalism', The Journal of Politics, Vol. 67, No. 4 (Nov. 2005), pp.1275-1300.

Popper, Karl 2002, *Logic of Scientific Discovery*, Routledge 2002 (first published in 1959).

Pulzer, Peter. 1994, 'Unified Germany: A normal state?' German Politics, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp.1-17.

Ratka, Edmund 2012, 'Germany and the Arab Spring - Foreign Policy Between New Activism and Old Habits', German Politics and Society, Issue 102, Vol. 30, No. 2, Summer 2012, pp. 59-74.

Ratner, Ely 2013, 'Rebalancing to Asia with an Insecure China', The Washington Quarterly, Vol. 36, No.2, pp. 21-38.

Readman, Kristina S. 2011, 'Conflict and Cooperation in Intra-Alliance Nuclear Politics: Western Europe, the United States, and the Genesis of NATO's Dual-Track Decision, 1977–1979', Journal of Cold War Studies, vol. 13, no.2, Spring 2011, p. 39-89..

Record, Jeffrey 2007, 'The Use and Abuse of History: Munich, Vietnam and Iraq', Survival, vol. 49, no.1, Spring 2007, pp. 163-180.

Risse, Thomas 2004, 'Beyond Iraq: The Crisis of the Transatlantic Security Community', Held, David & Koenig-Archibugi, Mathias (eds.) *American Power in the 21st Century*, Cambridge: Polity Press, pp.214-240.

Rudolf, Peter 2005, 'The Myth of the 'German Way': German Foreign Policy and Transatlantic Relations', Survival, Spring 2005, Vol. 47, Issue 1, pp. 133-152.

Russett, Bruce M, Risse-Kappen, Thomas and Mearsheimer, John J. 1990, 'Back to the Future, Part III: Realism and the Realities of European Security', International Security, Vol. 15, No. 3 (Winter, 1990-1991), p.222.

Rühl, Lothar 2011, 'Deutschland und der Libyenkrieg', Zeitschrift für Aussen- und Sicherheitspolitik, Vol. 4, No. 4, November 2011, pp. 561-571.

Sangar, Eric 2015, 'The Weight of the Past(s): The Impact of the Use of Bundeswehr's Use of Historical Experience on Strategy-Making in Afghanistan', Journal of Strategic Studies, Vol. 38, No. 4, pp.411-444.

Sayer, Andrew 1997, 'Essentialism, social constructionism and beyond', The Sociological Review, Vol.45, No. 3, pp. 453-487.

Sawyer, Ralph D. 1993, *The Seven Military Classics of Ancient China*, West View Press, Colorado 1993.

Schlaffer, Rudolf J. 2010, 'The Significance of the Balkans as a Strategic-Operational Area for the Bundeswehr', Journal of Military and Strategic Studies, Vol. 13, Issue 1, Fall 2010, pp. 104-125.

Schmidt-Zula (ed.) 2013, *European Security Policy and Strategic Culture*, Routledge 2013.

Schmitt, Olivier 2012 'Strategic Users of Culture: German Decisions For Military Action', Contemporary Security Policy, Vol, 33:1, pp. 59-81.

Schoch, Bruno 1992, *Deutschlands Einheit und Europa's Zukunft*, Friedensanalysen 26, Suhrkamp Verlag Frankfurt am Main 1992.

Schöllgen, Gregor 1999, *Die Außenpolitik der Bundesrepublik Deutschland: von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart*, Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung, Köln 1999.

Schumacher, Tobias 2015, 'Uncertainty at the EU's borders: narratives of EU external relations in the revised European Neighbourhood Policy towards the southern borderlands', European Security, Vol. 24, No. 3, p. 392. pp. 381-401.

Schüßler, Konstantin & Heng, Yee-Kuang 2013, 'The Bundeswehr and the Kunduz air-strike 4 September 2009: Germany's post-heroic moment?', European Security, Vol.22, Issue 3, 2013, pp. 355-375.

Schwab-Trapp, Michael 2002, *Kriegsdiskurse. Die Politische Kultur des Krieges im Wandel 1991-1999*, Springer Verlag, 2002.

Seppo, Antti & Forsberg, Tuomas 2013, 'Finland', Biehl, Heiko, Giegerich, Bastian & Jonas, Alexandra (eds.), *Strategic Cultures in Europe. Security and Defence Policies Across the Continent*. Springer VS, 2013, pp. 113-125.

Seybolt, Taylor M. 2007, *Humanitarian Military Intervention. The Conditions for Success and Failure*, Oxford University Press, 2007.

Snyder Jack L. 1977, 'The Soviet Strategic Culture: Implications for Limited Nuclear Operations', A Project AIR FORCE Report prepared for the United States Air Force, Rand Corporation, Santa Monica, 1977.

Shpiro, Shlomo 2008, 'UNIFIL and EU BAM: The Limits of European Security Engagement in the Middle East Nathanson', Roby & Stetter, Stephan (ed.) *The Israeli European Policy Network Renewing the Middle East: Climate Changes in Security and Energy and the New Challenges for EU-Israel Relations*, Friedrich-Ebert Stiftung 2008, pp. 85-112.

Steinmeier, Frank-Walter 2016, 'Germany's New Global Role. Berlin Steps Up', Foreign Affairs, pp. 106-113.

Stuart, C. Reginald 1982, *War and American Thought: From the Revolution to the Monroe Doctrine*, Kent State University Press, 1982.

Strauss, Franz-Josef 1965, 'An Alliance of Continents', International Affairs, vol.41, no.2 (Apr. 1965), pp. 201-202.

Suri, Jeremi 2006, *Transforming NATO in the Cold War: Challenges Beyond Deterrence in the 1960s*, CSS Studies in International Relations 2006.

Swidler, Ann 1986, 'Culture in Action: Symbols and Strategies', American Sociological Review, Vol. 51, No. 2, (Apr., 1986), pp. 273-286.

Tamás, G.M. 1992, 'Socialism, Capitalism, and Modernity', Journal of Democracy, Volume 3, Number 3, July 1992, The Johns Hopkins University Press, pp.60-74.

Tewes, Henning 1997, 'The emergence of a civilian power: Germany and central Europe', German Politics, Vol. 6, Issue 2, pp. 95-116.

Tewes, Henning 2002, *Germany, Civilian Power and the New Europe. Enlarging NATO and European Union*, Palgrave Macmillan 2002.

Timm, Angelika 1997, 'The Burdened Relationship between the GDR and the State of Israel', Israel Studies, Volume 2, Number 1, Spring 1997, pp. 22-49.

Tzu, Sun 2009, *The Art of War*, Thrifty Books, 2009.

Unterseher, Lutz 2015, *Das Dilemma militärischer Sicherheit. Kritische Berichte aus den Jahrzehnten*, Springer VS 2015.

Van Langenhove, Luk 2010, 'The EU as a Global Actor in a Multipolar World and Multilateral 2.0 Environment', Egmont Paper 36. Brussels, Egmont Royal Institute for, International Relations, March 2010.

Visuri, Pekka 1989, *Totaalisesta sodasta kriisinhallintaan. Puolustusperiaatteiden kehitys läntisessä Keski-Euroopassa ja Suomessa vuosina 1945-1985*, Otava 1989.

Von Bredow, Wilfried 2010, 'Bundeswehr-Reform: kleine Schritte und ein großer Sprung', Zeitschrift für Staats- und Europawissenschaften (ZSE), Vol. 8, No. 10 (2010), pp. 384-411.

Von Clausewitz, Carl 2015, *Vom Kriege*, Null Papier Verlag 2012.

Von Krause, Ulf 2013, *Bundeswehr als Instrument Deutscher Aussenpolitik*. Springer Verlag, 2013.

Von Oppen, Karoline 2013, 'From "civilian power" to "civilizing power": The German mission to the Hindu Kush 2001-2011', Journal of War and Culture Studies 2013, (6)3, pp. 215-225.

Von Weizsäcker, Richard 2015, 'Praktizierte Verantwortungspolitik', Brauckhoff-Schwaetzer (ed.), Hans-Dietrich Genschers Aussenpolitik, Springer VS 2015, pp. XX

Wagener, Martin 2004, 'Auf dem Weg zu einer „normalen Macht"? Die Entsendung deutscher Streitkräfte in der Ära Schröder', Harnisch, Sebastian, Katsioulis, Christos and Overhaus, Marco (eds.), *Deutsche Sicherheitspolitik. Eine Bilanz der Regierung Schröder*, Baden-Baden, 2004, pp.89–118.

Wagner, Wolfgang 2005, 'From Vanguard to Laggard: Germany in European Security and Defence Policy', German Politics, Vol. 14, Issue 4, 2005, pp. 455-469.

Waltz, Kenneth 2000, 'Structural realism after the end of the Cold War', International Security, vol. 25, issue 1, pp. 5-41.

Waltz, Kenneth 1993, 'The Emerging Structure of International Politics', International Security 18:2 (Fall), 1993, pp. 44-79.

Waltz, Kenneth 1988, 'The origins of war in neorealist theory', Journal of Interdisciplinary History, vol. 18, no. 4 (Spring 1988), pp. 615-628.

Waltz, Kenneth 1979, *Theory of International Politics*, Mc-Graw Hill, 1979.

Weißmann, Karl-Heinz 1993, 'Der „Westen" in der Historiographie nach 1945', Zitelmann, Rainer, Weißmann, Karlheinz & Großheim, Michael (eds.), *Westbindung. Chancen und Risiken für Deutschland*, Propyläen, Frankfurt a.M, 1993, pp.352-355.

Wendt, Alexander 2001, *Social Theory of International Politics*, Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Wendt, Alexander 2000, 'The Constructivist Challenge to Structural Realism', International Security, Vol. 25, No.2, pp. 187-212.

Wendt, Alexander 1992, 'Anarchy is what States Make of it: The Social Construction of Power Politics', International Organization, Vol. 46, No. 2 (Spring 1992), pp. 391-425.

Wettig, Gerhard 2009, 'The last Soviet offensive in the Cold War: emergence and development of the campaign against NATO euromissiles, 1979–1983', Cold War History, vol. 9, Issue 1, 2009, pp.79-110.

Wilke, Tobias 2007, *German Strategic Culture Revisited. Linking the past to contemporary German strategic choice*, Lit Verlag, Berlin 2007.

Wittkowsky, Andreas & Meierjohann, Jens P. 2011,'Das Konzept der Vernetzten Sicherheit: Dimensionen, Herausforderungen, Grenzen', Zentrum für internationale Friedenseinsätze (Die AG Vernetzte Sicherheit), Policy Briefing April 2011.

Wittlinger, Ruth 2006, 'Taboo or Tradition? The 'Germans as Victims' Theme in the Federal Republic until the mid-1990s', Niven, Bill (ed*.) Germans as Victims*, Palgrave Macmillan, 2006, pp.62-76.

Wittmann, Klaus 2015, 'Genscher und der NATO-Doppelbeschluss', Brauckhoff, Kerstin & Schwaetzer, Irmgard (eds.) Hans-Dietrich Genscher's Aussenpolitik, Akteure der Aussenpolitik. Springer Verlag, 2015, pp. 141-165.

Yee, Albert S. 1996, 'The Causal Effects of Ideas on Policies', International Organization, Vol. 50, No. 1 (Winter, 1996), pp. 69-108.

Yirit, Nugettin 2015*, Arab Spring in Berlin and Paris. German and French Policy Between Continuity and Change*, Anchor Academic Publishing Hamburg, 2015.

Zangl, Martin 1995, 'Ansatz der Zwei-Ebenen Spiele. Eine Brücke zwischen dem Neoinstitutionalismus und seinen KritikerInnen?', Zeitschrift für Internationale Beziehungen 2/1995, p.398.

Zapfe, Martin 2016 'Strategic Culture Shaping Allied Integration: The Bundeswehr and the Joint Operational Doctrine', The Journal of Strategic Studies, Vol. 39, Issue 2, 2016, pp. 246-260.

Zehfuss, Maja 2002, *Constructivism in International Relations: The Politics of Reality*, Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Zehfuss, Maja 2001, 'Constructivism and Identity: A Dangerous Liaison', European Journal of International Relations, Vol. 7, No. 3, pp. 315-348.