



## **Bogdan Koszel**

Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7118-3057>

# Germany's Security Policy versus NATO's and the EU's Security and Defence Policy in the Twenty-First Century

## Introduction

The goal of this article is to scrutinise the security policy of a reunited Germany in terms of its links with NATO and the European security and defence policy from 1998 to 2019. In the research hypothesis, the author makes an attempt to prove that after 1998, Chancellor Gerhard Schröder and the new SPD-Alliance 90/The Greens coalition endeavoured to continue the policy of Germany's non-involvement in international conflicts. In fact, they blocked the development of the EU Common Foreign and Security Policy. However, during the 1998–1999 Kosovo conflict, a growing pressure from the US and European allies forced Germany to participate in military action. Germany, which at the beginning of the twenty-first century gained importance in international politics without any resistance, took part in the military operation in Afghanistan under the banner of the fight against Islamic terrorism. The author poses several research questions as to what arguments NATO had used to make the Germans change their paradigm in their security policy; what factors caused Angela Merkel's rule in 2005–2015 to bring Germany back to a 'culture of restraint'; what impact the failed reform of the Bundeswehr in 2011 had on Germany's credibility as a partner in NATO, which led to increased pressure from NATO and EU partners after 2014 (NATO Summit in Newport) to increase their arms and military capabilities within PESCO.

The study consists of four parts, excluding the list of references. The first introductory part looks at the place and role of the Bundeswehr in NATO after the

remilitarisation of West Germany in 1954 and, at the same time, the growth and shaping of a civil society. The second part focuses on the factors that led Chancellor Schröder to reject the 'culture of continence.' The third part delves into the return to Germany's non-involvement in the development of NATO and ESDP military capabilities under A. Merkel rules ('culture of restraint'). The fourth part discusses the impact of the conflict in Ukraine, the Islamic terrorist attacks in EU countries and the role of the NATO Summit in Newport in 2014 in increasing Germany's interest in its cooperation with EU countries (PESCO), and increasing the Bundeswehr budget.

The article rests on the research methods commonly applied in political sciences: decision-making method, source content analysis, comparative and descriptive. It is largely based on source materials (German government white papers, parliamentary laws, press releases). The issue scrutinised in the paper boasts a rich, mainly German-speaking, literature.

## Reconstruction of the German armed forces and the *Zivilmacht*

The Cold War in Europe and the world resulted in Western Germany's economic and military revival. By virtue of the Paris Agreements, signed on 23 October 1954, the Federal Republic of Germany was granted sovereignty, and the permission to join the North Atlantic Pact (NATO), and the Western European Union (WEU). After these agreements were ratified in 1955, Western German armed forces by the name of the Bundeswehr were established.<sup>1</sup>

As Western Germany's economic potential increased in Western Europe, so did its ambitions to become one of the main players in the Western security system. At the culmination of the Cold War, there were 500,000 soldiers in the Bundeswehr. Due to international protests, the attempts to equip the Bundeswehr with tactical nuclear weapons failed.<sup>2</sup> Nevertheless, in the 1960s and the 1970s, it rose to become the most important US ally and partner in the North Atlantic Alliance. As early as in 1976, the Bundeswehr was the first European and fourth global conventional armed force. NATO leaders' trust in Western Germany was evidenced by its representatives being appointed to the high echelons of the Alliance structures. In 1957, General Hans Speidel was appointed Commander-In-Chief of the Allied Ground Forces in Central Europe. Four years later, General Adolf Heusinger was named the first Inspector General of NATO forces. In the late 1980s, 24 generals and 1,200 high-ranking officers from West Germany worked in all kinds of staffs and commanding bodies of the Alliance. As a matter of prestige, Manfred Wörner, former minister of defence, was appointed NATO Secretary General in 1988–1994, and Klaus Naumann, Chief of Staff of

---

<sup>1</sup> S. Christensen, *Zur Wiederaufrüstung Westdeutschlands 1950–1955. Politische Intentionen und Konzeptionen der Bundesrepublik Deutschland und Frankreichs im Remilitarisierungsprozess*, Regensburg 2002, p. 176.

<sup>2</sup> M. Kaim, *Die deutsche NATO-Politik*, [in:] Th. Jäger, A. Höse, K. Oppermann (eds.), *Deutsche Außenpolitik. Sicherheit, Wohlfahrt, Institutionen und Normen*, Berlin 2010, p. 88.

the Bundeswehr, as Chairman of the NATO Military Committee in December 1994, a post he held until he retired in 1999.<sup>3</sup>

The growing power of the Bundeswehr was accompanied by the increasing public contestation, inspired by the tragic warfare experience resulting from German militarism, of the necessity to maintain a high potential of the West German military forces. The US intervention in Vietnam, the student strikes of 1968, the anti-war 'Easter march' protests regularly staged in West Germany in the 1970s and resulting in the emergence of the Green Party (1980) all led to the adoption of the concept of a 'civil society' in Germany. West Germans started to describe the status of their state as 'civil power' (*Zivilmacht*). Hans W. Maull, the author of this concept and a political scientist from the University of Trier, understood it in terms of focusing on creating Germany's economic prosperity, strict observation of human rights and civil freedoms, abstaining from using military measures in international security policy, predictable and consistent behaviour, preferring multilateral solutions and political trust, and the transfer of sovereignty in the fields of security and defence to communitarian and international institutions.<sup>4</sup>

When the Berlin Wall collapsed in 1989, the two German states were to be reunited by virtue of an agreement signed by Chancellor Helmut Kohl and Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev, and remain in NATO. By 1994, Soviet troops were to be moved from East Germany, but neither the troops of the North Atlantic Alliance nor the nuclear weapons were permitted to be deployed in the territory of former East Germany. The new status of the reunited Germany was established in the Moscow Treaty signed on 12 September 1990 by the United States, the Soviet Union, France and the United Kingdom on the one side and West Germany and East Germany on the other. By virtue of this treaty, Germany formally became a sovereign state. In the preamble, the four states declared that upon the reunification "the rights and responsibilities of the Four Powers relating to Berlin and to Germany as a whole" no longer apply and that the "united Germany shall have accordingly full sovereignty over its internal and external affairs." By virtue of the Moscow Treaty, the Federal Republic of Germany was given the right to exercise its own sovereign foreign policy without any restrictions. Article 6, one of the most important articles of the treaty, gave Germany the right to belong to any alliances it chooses to join.<sup>5</sup>

After the reunification, by virtue of a number of multilateral agreements, German forces were reduced to 340,000 soldiers, but they remained the mainstay of NATO on the continent nevertheless. At that time, they were still well-armed and provided with the cutting edge equipment.<sup>6</sup>

The consolidation of Europe and the bringing of the European Union to life were the priorities of Germany's foreign policy and international security. The policy's basis was the Common Foreign and Security Policy and international cooperation within

---

<sup>3</sup> D. Bradley, H.-P. Würzenthal, H. Model, *Die Generale und Admirale der Bundeswehr, 1955–1999. Die militärischen Werdegänge*, Osnabrück 2005.

<sup>4</sup> H.W. Maull, *Deutschland als Zivilmacht*, [in:] S. Schmidt, G. Hellmann, R. Wolf (eds.), *Handbuch zur deutschen Außenpolitik*, Wiesbaden 2007, pp. 73–84.

<sup>5</sup> K. Kaiser, *Deutschlands Vereinigung. Die internationalen Aspekte. Mit den wichtigen Dokumenten*, Bergisch Gladbach 1991, pp. 264–266.

<sup>6</sup> J. Solak, *Rola RFN w NATO w latach 1979–1994*, Warszawa 1999.

the framework of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, which after 1995 became the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe. This meant favouring the “soft” security guarantees (consultations, negotiations, compromises) and keeping away from the “hard” military guarantees of NATO.<sup>7</sup>

However, Germany was soon confronted with the challenges that questioned the functioning of the *Zivilmacht*. The Federal Republic had difficulty in reconciling the historical stipulations and voluntary self-limitation with the challenges brought about by the 1991 Gulf War; or the bloody fighting in Bosnia-Herzegovina (1993–1995). In the war against Iraq, Germany led the so-called check book diplomacy and financially supported “Operation Desert Storm” (circa USD 2 billion) and did not physically take part in it. Germany’s allies criticized them for being passive and evading responsibility. After NATO’s pressures and tumultuous discussions in the Bundestag, two of Germany’s warships were sent to the Adriatic in 1992. At the beginning of 1993, humanitarian actions in Bosnia and participating in missions together with the “blue helmets” were met by allegations of violating the primary law. The allied forces’ attack on Iraq and the bombings of Baghdad were likened to the anti-Hitler coalition during World War II, and the capital of Iraq was called the “Dresden of the desert” by the German pacifists.<sup>8</sup>

## The ‘culture of restraint’ after 1998

In the 1990s, after the reunification of Germany, a ‘culture of restraint’ (*Zurückhaltungskultur*) dominated, due to the activities of pacifist parties in the Bundestag, the Party of Democratic Socialism (PDS), the Greens and part of the leftist wing of the SPD. In spite of EU Treaties from Maastricht and Amsterdam, which promoted the tenets and implementation of Common Foreign and Security Policy, the Ministry of Defence followed the guidelines of the government hindering rather than actively strengthening the EU’s military potential. It was not until the ruling of the Constitutional Tribunal of 12 July 1994, that the long dispute on the constitutional and legal principles regulating the use of German armed forces abroad was ultimately resolved. The Federal Republic of Germany was formally ‘permitted’ to implement its obligation, stated in the preamble to German Constitution, towards its allies in NATO and the European Union and use its armed forces having previously obtained consent from the Bundestag.<sup>9</sup>

The period of “restraint” and “self-restriction” ended in 1998 with Chancellor H. Kohl’s departure from the political scene. For the first time in German history,

---

<sup>7</sup> B. Koszel, *Germany in the Face of 21<sup>st</sup> Century Security Threats: A “Soft” Power or Leader of European Politics?*, [in:] A. Podraza (ed.), *A Transatlantic or European Perspective of World Affairs: NATO and the EU towards Problems of International Security in the 21st Century*, Madrid 2017, p. 87.

<sup>8</sup> Idem, *Mitteleuropa rediviva? Europa Środkowo- i Południowo-Wschodnia w polityce zjednoczonych Niemiec*, Poznań 1999, p. 62.

<sup>9</sup> Bundesverfassungsgericht, Urteil vom 12. Juli 1994, ‘Pressemitteilung Nr. 29/1994 vom 12. Juli 1994’, *Bundesverfassungsgericht – Presse*, <https://www.bundesverfassungsgericht.de/Shared-Docs/Pressemitteilungen/DE/1994/bvg94-029.html> [accessed: 23.07.2018].

parliamentary elections led to creating a new coalition, the SPD-Alliance 90/The Greens. A new generation of politicians entered the political scene in 1998. They did not bring along prejudices or complexes and viewed foreign policy through the prism of national interests. Whenever it was beneficial, the past would have been depoliticized, rejected, and at the same time, gradual relativization of war and exposing Germany's victims proceeded.<sup>10</sup> The new government of Schröder/Fischer was guided by their pragmatism and emphasized national interests, trying to appear more autonomous and assertive in their relations with international partners.

At the beginning of the twenty-first century, after the conflict in Kosovo (1998–1999), European German allies expected a change in its approach to the implementation of the second pillar of the Maastricht Treaty and greater engagement of Germany, which resulted from the reasons:

- the European Council accepting the concept of the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) at the summit in Cologne (June 1999);
- the European Council summit in Helsinki (December 1999) initiating the process of providing an institutional framework to the ESDP and its military component; and the formulation of the European Headline Goal (EHG). In general, the EU was obliged to establish European rapid response forces by the end of 2003;
- terrorist attacks in the United States (2001);
- allied operation in Afghanistan (October 2001);
- establishment of the European Union Military Staff and European Union Military Committee operating within the ESDP (2001);
- establishment of the EU Political and Security Committee (2003);
- invasion in Iraq (April 2003) without the participation of Germany;
- the European Council accepting the European Security Strategy (2003).<sup>11</sup>

Germany demonstrated enormous solidarity after the terrorist attacks on the United States on 11 September 2001. When President George W. Bush requested military support from Berlin for the planned military operation in Iraq, on 6 November, Chancellor Gerhard Schröder and the Ministry of Defence made 3,900 troops available to the allied forces, despite protests from the majority of the German public (57%). The Americans selectively applied the forces participating in the counterterrorism operation, which is why German military potential was used only to a limited extent as was also the case with other forces, except the British. Only a 100-strong elite special unit (*Kommando Spezialkräfte*) took part in the operations.<sup>12</sup>

On account of the unilateral approach of U.S. policy during the presidency of George W. Bush and the disbelief in American claims about Saddam Hussein, Iraqi dictator, being in possession of an arsenal of chemical weapons, Germany opposed an armed intervention in Iraq. This decision was beneficial for the SPD-Green coalition.

---

<sup>10</sup> D. Vernet, 'Kluge Ausschöpfung begrenzter Souveränität. Die Europapolitik der rot-grünen Koalition', *Internationale Politik*, 1999, Vol. 5, pp. 11–18.

<sup>11</sup> Chia-Pin Chang, *ESVP – Kernanliegen der Bundesrepublik Deutschland?: Die deutschen Präferenzen, Positionen und Politiken unter der rot-grünen Bundesregierung in der GASP/ESVP der Europäischen Union*, Bern 2007.

<sup>12</sup> M. Jaworska *Stosunki niemiecko-amerykańskie w latach 1998–2005*, Toruń 2011.

Although it triggered tensions between Berlin and Washington, it was nevertheless the crucial element of the victorious campaign of the ruling coalition in elections to the Bundestag in the fall of 2002.

Germany's favourable attitude to the institutional expansion of the CFSP and ESDP did not mean its abandoning the traditional 'culture of restraint' or increased Germany's military involvement abroad, in the areas of conflict. One of the final acts of the SPD-Green coalition was the adoption by the Bundestag on 18 March 2005 of the Act on parliamentary participation in decisions to deploy armed troops abroad, which made the deployment of German troops abroad yet more dependent on the decision by parliament. From then on, the Bundeswehr was somewhat scornfully dubbed a 'parliamentary army'.<sup>13</sup>

## The follow-up of 'self-restriction' during the Merkel rule

The resulting turmoil and the need to restore proper transatlantic relations prompted the new government of the 'great CDU/CSU-SPD coalition', established in 2005 and headed by Angela Merkel, to review Germany's security policy on the international arena. The government instructed the Federal Ministry of Defence (BMVg) to draw up a document, which was subsequently presented in October 2006 as *The White Paper on Security Policy and the Future of the Bundeswehr*. It emphasized the fact that the security and political stability of the Federal Republic of Germany is founded on the European Union and North Atlantic Alliance for both of whom Germany is a 'reliable partner'. The document identified the challenges and threats to the broadly understood security of Germany, including globalization, terrorism, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and arms build-up, regional conflicts, illicit trafficking in weapons, fragile states, ensuring safe routes to transport resources and communication, energy security, migration, epidemics and pandemics. German interests were clearly stated, such as protecting and ensuring security, rule of law, freedom, democracy and prosperity to German citizens, protecting sovereignty and the territorial integrity of Germany, preventing or countering crises related to regional conflicts that are significant in view of Germany's security, preventing global threats, supporting human rights worldwide, supporting international organizations and global trade. The document also listed the tasks for the Bundeswehr, such as preventing and countering international conflicts, combating terrorism, supporting allies, protecting Germany and its citizens, participating in rescue and humanitarian operations and internal aiding operations. All this was to be performed within the framework of the EU and its ESDP which had been strengthened after the adoption of the European Defence Strategy and the establishment of the European Security Agency.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> Deutscher Bundestag, Gesetz über die parlamentarische Beteiligung bei der Entscheidung über den Einsatz bewaffneter Streitkräfte im Ausland, 2005, <https://www.bundestag.de/bundestag/aufgaben/rechtsgrundlagen/parlamentsbeteiligung> [accessed: 12.12.2018].

<sup>14</sup> Bundesministerium der Verteidigung, *Weißbuch zur Sicherheitspolitik Deutschlands und Zukunft der Bundeswehr*, Berlin 2006, [http://www.humanistischeunion.de/fileadmin/hu\\_upload/doku/frieden/weissbuch2006/WB\\_2006.09.28.pdf](http://www.humanistischeunion.de/fileadmin/hu_upload/doku/frieden/weissbuch2006/WB_2006.09.28.pdf) [accessed: 25.05.2018].

In 2009, the Ministry of Defence and, first and foremost, the foreign missions of the Bundeswehr, once again became the subject of a nationwide debate on the rationale of involving Germany's armed forces abroad. The debate was triggered by German troops, responsible for the reconstruction of infrastructure in Afghanistan, bombing Taliban fuel tanks and killing several members of the Taliban and around 100 civilians in the process. The BMVg became the target for the media and was condemned by the public. Minister of Labour and Minister of Defence in the former Merkel administration, Franz Josef Jung was forced to resign. A parliamentary investigation committee was established, the work of which resulted in the deposing of General Wolfgang Schneiderhan, Chief of Staff of the Bundeswehr, and the State Secretary in the BMVg, Peter Wichert. This was followed by the resignation of President Horst Köhler on 31 May 2009, after his unfortunate statement that it was necessary for Germany to defend Hindukush in order to protect Germany's economic interests. The media and commentators were in unison saying that the Bundeswehr defending Germany's economic interests abroad was in breach of the Constitution of Germany.<sup>15</sup>

The discussion on how to define the role of the Bundeswehr in the world and in implementing Germany's foreign policy intensified after the 2009 parliamentary elections, which resulted in the CDU/CSU-FDP coalition headed by Chancellor Merkel coming back to power. She was aware that the situation in the armed forces had deteriorated and the atmosphere in the Ministry of Defence was difficult. From 1998, the pacifist Green Party alongside the post-communist PDS (after 2007 the Left) had successfully blocked the necessary reforms and outlays for arms build-up. In 2003, a British taxpayer spent an average of USD 722 for defence, a French taxpayer – USD 765, whereas a German, not more than USD 426. Budgetary expenditure for Merkel's Bundeswehr was frozen at around 1.5% of GDP, which was equivalent to slightly over EUR 24 billion annually. The United Kingdom and France spent EUR 16 billion more each. During the first government of Angela Merkel the expenditure for the military increased only marginally from EUR 24.1 billion in 2005 to EUR 26.2 billion in 2007.<sup>16</sup>

The coalition agreement of 24 October 2009 obliged the Minister of Defence to appoint a commission in charge of developing by the end of 2009 the main tenets of a new organizational structure proposed for the Bundeswehr. In line with these instructions, from June 2010, the BMVg started to work on a range of variants of the reform in the Bundeswehr when the government presented budget cuts planned for the following four years and obliged the ministry to generate savings of EUR 8.3 billion. Such economic circumstances forced the ministry to take serious steps aiming to restructure the army while restoring its attractiveness both as a formation and a workplace.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> 'German president Horst Köhler quits over Afghanistan gaffe', *The Guardian*, 31.05.2009, <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2010/may/31/german-president-horst-kohler-quits> [accessed: 28.04.2021].

<sup>16</sup> J. Gotkowska, 'Reforma Bundeswehry – po co RFN profesjonalna armia?', *Analizy OSW*, 25.05.2011, <https://www.osw.waw.pl/pl/publikacje/analizy/2011-05-25/reforma-bundeswehry-po-co-rfn-profesjonalna-armia> [accessed: 17.02.2018].

<sup>17</sup> A. Przybył, 'Reforma Bundeswehry w kontekście *mentalnej remilitaryzacji* Republiki Federalnej Niemiec', *Biuletyn Niemiecki*, 2010, Vol. 11, p. 5, <http://fwpn.org.pl/assets/biuletyny/BN11.pdf> [accessed: 16.09.2018].

To avoid any suspicion of bias the Commission for the Reform of the Bundeswehr Structure was formed outside of the Ministry of Defence. It was supervised by the head of the Federal Labour Agency, Frank-Jürgen Weise and included only one professional soldier, the highest-ranking German officer in NATO, General Karl-Heinz Lather.

The Commission for the Reform of the Bundeswehr Structure authored a 114-page long report entitled *Task-oriented Thinking. Concentration, Flexibility, Efficiency (Vom Einsatz der denken. Konzentration, Flexibilität, Effizienz)* which described the operations of the Ministry of Defence as 'inefficient' and forecasted that the Bundeswehr would be 'thoroughly renewed', in particular in terms of arms, equipment and the size of the army.<sup>18</sup>

As a result of numerous arrangements, on 11 July 2011, a reform of the Bundeswehr was launched. Conscription army was replaced by a professional army. By 2010, Bundeswehr forces had shrunk to 250,000 soldiers, a number which was reduced to 185,000 after the reform and faced further cuts down to 175,000. The cuts concerned the personnel of the armed forces base, that is, their logistics and supplies, air force and naval personnel, as well as the medical corps. Staffs were considerably reduced. The New Minister of Defence, Thomas de Maizière sought to reduce the number of Bundeswehr garrisons and bases by 64, and reaching the target number of 264 by 2017.<sup>19</sup>

In connection with the reorganization of the Bundeswehr and the abandonment of universal military service, Minister of Defence Thomas de Maizière issued new guidelines on 27 May 2011 (*Verteidigungspolitische Richtlinien: Nationale Interessen wahren – Internationale Verantwortung übernehmen – Sicherheit gemeinsam gestalten*) which defined new threats and set the directions for transatlantic cooperation and cooperation within the European Union. It was indicated in the document that:

- security is not defined solely in terms of geography. The situation in the peripheries of Europe and in the territories outside of the European zone of security and stability may bear direct influence on Germany's security;
- growing global networks are conducive to the rapid dissemination and use of high technology, in particular IT. This is associated with great opportunities and risks alike;
- the proliferation of the weapons of mass destruction and improvement of the means to carry them pose an increasing danger to Germany;
- free trade routes and secure supplies of raw materials are essential for the future of Germany and Europe.

---

<sup>18</sup> Bericht der Strukturkommission der Bundeswehr: *Vom Einsatz her denken. Konzentration, Flexibilität, Effizienz*, Berlin 2010, <https://www.roderich-kiesewetter.de/fileadmin/Service/Dokumente/20101026-weise-kommissionsbericht.pdf> [accessed: 20.11.2018]; 'Strukturkommission hält Verteidigungsministerium für ineffizient', *Die Zeit*, 24.10.2010, <https://www.zeit.de/gesellschaft/zeitgeschehen/2010-10/bundeswehr-struktur-kommission> [accessed: 17.05.2018].

<sup>19</sup> E. Stasik, 'Radykalna reforma Bundeswehry. Odpowiedź na wyzwania XXI wieku', *Deutsche Welle*, 16.05.2013, <http://www.dw.com/pl/radykalna-reforma-bundeswehry-odpowiedz%20na-wyzwania-xxi-wieku/a-16818697> [accessed: 17.05.2018]; A. Gasztold, *Koncepcja bezpieczeństwa Niemiec*, [in:] R. Zięba (ed.), *Bezpieczeństwo międzynarodowe w XXI wieku*, Warszawa 2018, pp. 167–169.



It was reiterated in the guidelines that the principles that Germany had pursued in its defence policy in the past would not change after universal military service was abandoned. In its international involvement, Germany would continue to emphasize multilateral operations conducted within the framework of various missions of the UN, NATO and the EU. In the part dedicated to cooperation within the EU it was stressed that the Union:

- has to develop security policy capable of efficient operation and assume responsibility for facing the challenges to joint security inside and outside of Europe;
- should develop an extensive portfolio of civilian and military measures aiming to prevent conflicts, manage crises and ensure recovery after conflicts subside, and use the capacity of NATO as needed. The conceptual framework of the Common Security Policy and Permanent Structured Cooperation are defined in the provisions of the Lisbon Treaty. The strengthened NATO-EU cooperation and reliance on the joint resources and structures remain essential for joint security and will result in increased political significance of the EU;
- EU civilian and military capacity should be consistently developed as well as industrial and technological cooperation within the European Union. Extensive technical foundations should make it possible for the competitive European defence industry to develop.<sup>20</sup>

Germany declared its support for the development of European armed forces under the CSDP, but its weak spot was excessive trust in the 'soft' means of influencing foreign and security policy which is the outcome of social sentiment in Germany and the presence of pacifist parties in the parliament. A 'culture of restraint' and decreasing the military potential of the Bundeswehr brought Germany to a dead end. It is true that 2,528 soldiers (as of January 2015) took part in foreign missions of the Bundeswehr across the world, followed by 3,262 soldiers in 2019 (as of 7 January 2019), but the results of public polls were unanimous. Surveys commissioned by the *Die Zeit* weekly in December 2014 showed that 51% of Germans rejected any form of Germany's involvement in armed conflicts abroad, and no more than 31% believed that its participation in international armed campaigns was justified. 82% of respondents were of the opinion that Germany's armed forces should limit the number of their military missions, and 62% believed that their country should be extremely cautious in foreign policy<sup>21</sup>. In 2018, the *Die Welt* daily commissioned a survey in which a tricky question was asked of whether the Bundeswehr should take part in an armed mission in Syria if the forces of President Bashar al Asad had carried out a chemical attack on civilians. Even then, over 73% of respondents were against and only 20% were in favour of such a decision.

---

<sup>20</sup> Bundesministerium der Verteidigung, Verteidigungspolitische Richtlinien: *Nationale Interessen wahren – Internationale Verantwortung übernehmen – Sicherheit gemeinsam gestalten*, Berlin 2011, p. 18, <https://www.bmvg.de/resource/blob/13568/28163bcaed9f30b27f7e3756d812c280/g-03-download-die-verteidigungspolitische-richtlinien-2011-data.pdf> [accessed: 17.05.2018].

<sup>21</sup> 'Sollte Deutschland mehr Geld für Verteidigung ausgeben oder nicht?', *Statista*, März 2015, <http://de.statista.com/statistik/daten/studie/410644/umfrage/umfrage-zur-erhoehung-der-ausgaben-fuer-die-bundeswehr-nach-parteiangehaengerschaft> [accessed: 17.05.2018].

This operation was ruled out also by the board of the SPD, including Andrea Nahles, the Secretary General of the party.<sup>22</sup>

Doubtless, public opinion in Germany is reinforced in its beliefs by the fact that they have proved to be right about the rash intervention in Iraq and irresponsible attempts to topple the Gaddafi regime in Libya. On the other hand, the consistent diplomacy and conciliatory attitude of Chancellor Merkel contributed to achieving the Minsk agreement (February 2015) and ceasefire in eastern Ukraine.

## A return to military engagement?

Since 2014 Germany has come under strong pressure from its NATO allies and EU partners who expected them to fulfil their commitments both in civilian and military terms of security policy and in line with Germany's role in Europe and globally. The information released in 2015 that due to a disastrous condition of its armed forces, Germany was unable to provide effective help on the NATO eastern flank in case of a threat from Russia stirred public opinion, especially in Poland; while in Germany triggered a wave of criticism against the Ministry of Defence. Pressured by the events in Ukraine, the threat from Islamic state and the wave of refugees, Germany withdrew its reservations about the rotating deployment of NATO forces and bases in Poland and Baltic states. The unpredictable behaviour of Russia made the government of Chancellor Merkel realize that it was necessary to increase spending on defence and supply the army with more modern equipment, especially tanks and aircraft. In line with the postulates brought forward at the Newport NATO Summit (4–5 September 2014), Germany obliged itself to increase its military spending from 1.2% of GDP to the 2% of GDP as requested by NATO. 53% of German citizens were for, but 43% were against it.<sup>23</sup>

The terrorist attacks in Paris and Saint Denis in November 2015 had little impact on German sentiments. On 4 December 2015, the Ministry of Defence managed to persuade the Bundestag to make a decision on Germany's contribution to the fight against Islamic state in support of France, Iraq and the international coalition. This contribution was nevertheless limited to providing tanker aircraft, performing reconnaissance and intelligence tasks on the sea and in the air (with Tornado aircraft), supporting the protection of maritime operations and supporting operational staff. A total of 1,200 soldiers and personnel were to be involved. In a roll-call vote, 445 deputies from the Bundestag were in favour of involving the German military, 146 were against and seven abstained.<sup>24</sup>

<sup>22</sup> 'Fast drei Viertel der Deutschen gegen Bundeswehr Einsatz in Syrien', *Die Welt*, 11.09.2018, <https://www.welt.de/politik/ausland/article181491964/WELT-Trend-Fast-drei-Viertel-der-Deutschen-gegen-Bundeswehr-Einsatz-in-Syrien.html> [accessed: 15.09.2019]; R.L. Glatz, W. Hansen, M. Kaim, J. Vorrath, *Die Auslandseinsätze der Bundeswehr im Wandel, SWP-Studie*, Mai 2018, Vol. 7, [https://www.swp-berlin.org/fileadmin/contents/products/studien/2018S07\\_kim\\_EtAl.pdf](https://www.swp-berlin.org/fileadmin/contents/products/studien/2018S07_kim_EtAl.pdf) [accessed: 12.12.2018].

<sup>23</sup> 'Sollte Deutschland mehr Geld...', *op. cit.*

<sup>24</sup> 'Bundestag billigt Einsatz der Bundeswehr gegen IS', *Deutscher Bundestag – Dokumente*, 2015, <https://www.bundestag.de/dokumente/textarchiv/2015/kw49-de-bundeswehreinsatz-isis-Freitag/397884> [accessed: 16.07.2016].

Germany's perplexity with regard to its military involvement abroad could also be seen during the Warsaw NATO Summit on 8–9 July 2016. The German Ministry of Defence developed its 2D (Deterrence and Dialogue) goals. On the one hand, Germany declared allegiance to its allies and obligations and the intention to strengthen the southern and south-eastern flank of NATO due to a threat from Russia. On the other one (Dialogue), the need to converse with Russia was firmly stressed and to maintain communication channels with Russia on account of its increasing role in the Syrian conflict. In Warsaw, Germany supported all the previously agreed military solutions. It consented to take command of a multinational battalion (composed of French, Dutch and Belgian soldiers) deployed in Lithuania, which was supposed to emphasize Germany's credibility as an ally. It made no reservations about the deployment of a U.S. heavy armoured brigade (4,200–4,500 soldiers) with M1A2 Abrams tanks and M2 Bradley armoured transporters in the countries of the eastern flank of NATO, or strengthening the U.S. air contingent in Germany. Germany promised to support operations against Islamic state, strengthen the Frontex agency activities in the Mediterranean Sea and maintain the NATO training mission in Afghanistan. Germany also agreed to aid Kiev in modernizing Ukrainian armed forces and continue the 'open door' policy towards Ukraine and Georgia, although no declarations were made as to whether these two states would be encompassed by the Membership Action Plan.<sup>25</sup>

Germany's doubts, reservations, the perception of its own and allies' security and plans for the future were to be resolved and comprehensively presented by a new *White Paper*, officially presented on 13 July 2016, after eighteen months of work. The *White Paper* was primarily authored by the Ministry of Defence alongside the Office for Foreign Affairs and, eventually, the Chancellery. Consultations between ministries were conducted over the period of its drafting, as well as expert and social consultations. Over 1,800 participants in a series of workshops organized internally and abroad discussed a variety of aspects of the German security policy; members of the public could join in, for instance, through an online platform. However, the *White Paper* was not submitted for discussion by the Bundestag which sparked criticism from the parliamentary opposition: the Greens and the Left. Similar to the previous *White Paper* of 2006, it comprised two parts: one addressed the matters of security policy while the other discussed the consequences of this policy for the Bundeswehr.<sup>26</sup>

The first part was divided into two subchapters: *Security Policy (Zur Sicherheitspolitik)* and *Germany's Strategic Priorities (Deutschlands Strategische Prioritäten)* which listed the most serious threats to the internal and international security of

<sup>25</sup> 'Nato-Gipfel in Warschau. Ergebnisse von Warschau', Berlin, 11. Juli 2016, <https://www.bundesregierung.de/Content/DE/Infodienst/2016/07/2016-07-11-nato-gipfel/2016-07-11-nato-gipfel-warschau.html> [accessed: 17.05.2018]; K. Szubart, 'Szczyt NATO w Warszawie – konsekwencje dla Niemiec', *Biuletyn Instytutu Zachodniego*, 2016, Vol. 260, <http://www.iz.poznan.pl/publikacje/biuletyn-instytutu-zachodniego/nr-260-szczyt-nato-w-warszawie-konsekwencje-dlaniemiec> [accessed: 17.05.2018].

<sup>26</sup> Bundesministerium der Verteidigung, *Weissbuch 2016 zur Sicherheitspolitik und zur Zukunft der Bundeswehr*, Berlin, Juni 2016, <https://www.bundesregierung.de/resource/blob/975292/736102/64781348c12e4a80948ab1bdf25cf057/weissbuch-zur-sicherheitspolitik-2016-download-bmvg-data.pdf?download=1> [accessed: 17.05.2018].

Germany and its allies, and the role of the main international organizations, such as NATO, the EU, OSCE and the UN. In terms of security policy, Germany's interests involved the protection of its citizens and the state's sovereignty and territorial integrity; the protection of territorial integrity, sovereignty and citizens of Germany's allies; maintaining the rules-based international order on the basis of international law; ensuring prosperity for citizens through a strong German economy as well as free and unimpeded world trade; promoting the responsible use of limited goods and scarce resources throughout the world; deepening European integration; and consolidating the transatlantic partnership. When discussing threats, the *White Paper* indicated Russia in the first place, which was breaching the principle of sovereignty and respect for borders; this was directly related to the annexation of Crimea and the conflict in eastern Ukraine. Moscow was stigmatized as an international player that is trying to alter the present architecture of security by using force or threatening to use it. The paper ensured that the long-term goal of NATO was a strategic partnership with Russia. However, the current behaviour of Russia requires a dual approach based on "credible deterrence and defence capability as well as a willingness to engage in dialogue." Therefore, the durability of the Euro-Atlantic unity and allies' obligations stipulated in Arts. 4 and 5 of the Washington Treaty were stressed. The paper emphasized the threat of hybrid conflicts and declared that while Germany promotes non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, they should remain one of the most important elements of the military doctrine of nuclear powers. The North Atlantic Alliance, including Germany, must be able to use nuclear weapons as part of an extensive range of deterrence measures against potential aggressors. It was therefore resolved to refer to NATO nuclear policy (*Nuclear Sharing*) which enables some member states to tap into the U.S. tactical nuclear arsenal. Other threats were not neglected, such as breaching cybersecurity, illegal migration, proliferation of WMD, illegal trafficking in conventional weapons, energy security, fragile states and threats to health and life, such as epidemics and pandemics.

The second part discussed the future of the Bundeswehr and presented development plans for the German armed forces for the following decade. First and foremost, the efficiency of the operations of the Bundeswehr was to increase through a gradual rise in expenditure on arms build-up and maintaining the army to eventually reach the level of 2% of GDP, as agreed in Newport. The Bundeswehr intended to take a more active part in UN peace missions and assume command of such missions. Germany reminded others that the first step was the mission in Mali, where 240 Bundeswehr soldiers trained Malian military. Germany declared itself to be ready to intensify efforts to reform the UN Security Council, including becoming a permanent member of this crucial UN body; a goal Germany had been pursuing with varied intensity from the reunification. Convinced of significant drawbacks of the Lisbon Treaty in the military dimension, Germany committed itself to strengthen the ESDP in this respect; the core of this strengthening would be the German-French initiative to establish a Joint European Union for Security and Defence. The *White Paper* also provided for the establishment of the European Headquarters, European field hospital, and offered the possibility to serve in the German army to volunteers from other EU states, which sparked a media sensation. French-German cooperation was

to be extended to encompass the cooperation with Poland under the Weimar Triangle, and other states that have traditionally cooperated with Germany, such as the Netherlands. The German army was to be provided with modern equipment which was why great importance was attached to supporting research conducted within European arms consortia, such as Airbus Group and MEADS, among others, and in the European Defence Agency.<sup>27</sup>

This most recent approach of Germany to the ESDP corresponded well with the initiative of the European Commission which launched the European Defence Fund on 7 June 2017. The fund had been proposed by the European Commission in September 2016 and supported by the European Council in December 2016. Its task is to co-finance the development of technology and military capacity of the European Union, coordinate, supplement and increase national investment in defence, prototype development and purchase of military equipment and technology.<sup>28</sup>

Two weeks later, at the EU Summit on 22 June 2017, it was decided that a group of volunteering countries could build the core of the EU defence. The Council made a decision allowing the mechanism of Permanent Structured Cooperation (PESCO) to be launched, as provided in the Lisbon Treaty, and aiming to enhance defence integration of a group of EU states. On 13 November 2017, ministers from 23 member states jointly signed a notification on Permanent Structured Cooperation, and on 11 December 2017, the Foreign Affairs Council made a formal decision to this effect. Without doubt, this event marked a watershed as previously the EU had lacked the political will to implement such a mechanism. This mainly resulted from the financial crisis in the euro zone which forced governments to make considerable cutbacks in their defence budgets and additionally increased social resistance to closer defence cooperation in the EU. In response to Brexit, deepening divisions inside the Union and increasing transatlantic tensions, Germany, France, Italy and Spain began to promote the idea to launch PESCO in which they were aided by EU institutions. The signatory states have to be prepared to increase their budgets on arms purchases, harmonize defence planning and enhance practical military cooperation, such as building joint military units, launching multinational arms programs, strengthening the inter-operationality of existing forces, and more cooperation in logistics, training and so on. Programs launched within PESCO will have privileged access to the resources in the European Defence Fund. Following Germany's postulate, in order not to make an impression of further dividing the EU, the Council decided that PESCO should be 'inclusive and ambitious' and involve many states in cooperation while generating measurable outcomes.<sup>29</sup>

<sup>27</sup> Ibid.; E. Cziomer, 'Znaczenie Białej Księgi 2016 dla oceny nowych wyzwań w polityce bezpieczeństwa Niemiec', *Bezpieczeństwo. Teoria i Praktyka*, 2017, No. 1, pp. 37–52; K. Miszczak, 'Niemcy w polityce globalnej (Biała Księga)', *Rocznik Polsko-Niemiecki*, 2017, No. 25, pp. 11–18.

<sup>28</sup> 'Der Europäische Verteidigungsfonds: 5,5 Mrd. EUR pro Jahr, um Europas Verteidigungsfähigkeiten zu stärken', *Europäische Kommission – Pressemitteilung*, 2016, [http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release\\_IP-17-1508\\_de.htm](http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-17-1508_de.htm) [accessed: 19.03.2018]; M. Terlikowski, 'PESCO: Unia Europejska zacieśnia współpracę obronną', *Komentarz PISM*, 2017, Vol. 31, <http://www.pism.pl/publikacje/komentarz/nr-31-2017> [accessed: 17.05.2018].

<sup>29</sup> 'Gemeinsam stärker durch „PESCO“', *Bundesregierung – Aktuelles*, 2017, <https://www.bundesregierung.de/Content/DE/Artikel/2017/11/2017-11-13-pesco.html> [accessed: 30.03.2018]; 'PESCO: EU countries sign off on plan for closer defence cooperation', *European Parliament – News*,

A serious tension occurred in the relations between the Ministry of Defence and Hans-Peter Bartels (SPD), Parliamentary Commissioner for the Armed Forces, in February 2018. He presented a report implying that the Ministry was grossly negligent in the field of defence. Bartels indicated that 21,000 officer and NCO posts remained vacant accounting for over 10% of the whole Bundeswehr staff. He called the command of the armed forces and the government to accelerate the reforms aiming to resolve permanent staff and equipment shortages, which held back Bundeswehr training and operations while Germany, along the remaining NATO states, made greater commitment to improve defence in the face of threat from Russia. Bartels indicated that the armed forces were 'overburdened' in many respects. There were not enough operating helicopters, aircraft, ships or tanks, while those that were fully operational were overburdened because they were heavily used in order to make up for shortages. In general, the combat readiness of some weapon systems "dramatically deteriorated" due to the lack of spare parts and intensified use during manoeuvres which were organized more often. Supposedly, none of the Bundeswehr six submarines was capable of carrying out combat operations. There were frequent cases of none of the new A400M transportation aircraft being available for the military which resulted in delayed movement of troops, among other things. Numerous pilots of a variety of aircraft, including Eurofighter and Tornado fighters and all the most important types of helicopters, failed to complete training due to an insufficient number of vehicles necessary to fly for the required number of hours. Instead of the declared fifteen frigates and corvettes, the German navy had only nine vessels which needed to be sent for maintenance more often due to their ageing. According to the ministry itself, the wear indicator for tanks and other types of weapons nearly doubled in the previous year due to frequent manoeuvres, growing maintenance requirements and the demand for spare parts which were in short supply due to the lack of purchases.<sup>30</sup>

The report triggered a poignant retort from the Bundeswehr Chief of Staff, General Volker Wieder, who had formerly denied media reports that the Bundeswehr did not have the resources to participate in the NATO 'eastern picket' (Very High Readiness Joint Task Force, VJTF). He admitted that there were some drawbacks in the readiness of the armed forces, especially regarding Leopard 2 tanks; but he also argued that the army had a plan to gradually increase its annual budget for armed forces. All in all, in the opinion of the BMVg, the equipment of the Bundeswehr was sufficient enough to perform its tasks both internally and abroad (in the present 15 missions). He was backed by Minister Ursula von der Leyen, who pointed to positive 'trends' especially regarding the government increasing military spending.

---

11.12.2017, <https://www.europarl.europa.eu/news/en/headlines/security/20171208STO89939/pesco-eu-countries-sign-off-on-plan-for-closer-defence-cooperation> [accessed: 15.08.2018].

<sup>30</sup> H.-P. Bartels, 'Die Einsatzbereitschaft ist schlechter geworden', *Die Zeit*, 20.02.2018; 'Wehrbeauftragter zeichnet düsteres Bild der Bundeswehr', *Der Tagesspiegel*, 20.02.2018, <https://www.tagesspiegel.de/politik/spd-politiker-hans-peter-bartels-wehrbeauftragter-zeichnet-duesteres-bild-der-bundeswehr/20982352.html> [accessed: 1.11.2020]; 'Wehrbeauftragter: Lücken bei Bundeswehr noch größer geworden', *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 20.02.2018, <https://www.faz.net/aktuell/politik/inland/hans-peter-bartels-luecken-bei-bundeswehr-noch-groesser-geworden-15458844.html> [accessed: 28.12.2020].

She also promised to eliminate the deficiencies and negligence by 2030, as stated in the agenda of Wieder.<sup>31</sup>

In July 2019, Annegret Kramp-Karrenbauer, the leader of the CDU, took over as Minister of Defence, which was interpreted as an attempt to strengthen Germany's military range. She called for Germany to become more involved in the world. This includes the willingness "to use the spectrum of military means together with our allies and partners if necessary." Kramp-Karrenbauer declared that Germany had given NATO's goal of increasing its allies' military expenditure towards two percent of gross domestic product (GDP). She is aware that you "cannot achieve this overnight". But it was also clear that "you really have to go there."<sup>32</sup> In October, the new minister called for a protection zone for northern Syria with German participation, which brought her keen criticism from the coalition partner. The initiative had not been coordinated with the SPD. The acting SPD leader Thorsten Schäfer-Gümbel warned of "an armament policy according to Donald Trump's wishes."<sup>33</sup>

## Conclusions

On the whole, it can be said that Germany's defence and security policy in the twenty-first century have become hostage to the pacifist political parties in the Bundestag and German society, which has long cultivated the spirit of *Zivilgesellschaft* and a 'culture of restraint.' The group of parliamentary parties contesting the development of military forces of Germany and its involvement in foreign missions was joined in 2017 by the right-wing Alternative for Germany. Pursuing the principle of *sacroegoismo* and driven solely by its own interests it was strongly against Germany's involvement in the international missions in Mali, Afghanistan and Iraq.<sup>34</sup> The irresponsible public statements made by US President Donald Trump, even questioning the advisability of NATO are met with enthusiastic reactions from right-wing party of the AfD and the Left. It is difficult to predict how this strengthening of the 'anti-militaristic' front in the Bundestag will impact Germany's commitment to enhanced European security (PESCO, European Defence Fund). Before meeting the directorship of the Ministry of Defence and Bundeswehr generals and admirals in Berlin on 14 May 2018, in her televised address to soldiers,

---

<sup>31</sup> T. Jungholt, 'Die zwei Welten der Ursula von der Leyen und ihrer Soldaten', *Die Welt*, 20.02.2018, <https://www.welt.de/politik/deutschland/article173774744/Bundeswehr-Die-zwei-Welten-der-Ursula-von-der-Leyen-und-ihrer-Soldaten.html> [accessed: 28.12.2018].

<sup>32</sup> 'Rede der Ministerin: „In Verantwortung für die Zukunft Deutschlands“', *Bundesministerium der Verteidigung – Aktuelles*, 24.07.2019, <https://www.bmvg.de/de/aktuelles/regierungserklaerung-rede-annegret-kramp-karrenbauer-76920> [accessed: 1.11.2020].

<sup>33</sup> M. Kettenbach, M. Dimitriu, P.D. Pries, *Trotz Kritik von Kollege: Mehrheit der AfD-Abgeordneten will zu AKK-Vereidigung kommen*, *Merkur.de*, 7.01.2019, <https://www.merkur.de/politik/akk-erklaert-ihre-erste-forderung-als-ministerin-und-loest-koalitionsstreit-aus-zr-12828508.html> [accessed: 20.01.2020].

<sup>34</sup> 'AfD-Fraktion lehnt Bundeswehreinsätze in Mali, Afghanistan und Irak ab', *AfD-Kompakt*, 19.03.2018, <https://afdKompakt.de/2018/03/19/afd-fraktion-lehnt-bundeswehreinsaetze-in-mali-afghanistan-und-irak-ab/> [accessed: 14.11.2018].

Chancellor Merkel promised to continue the gradual (*Schritt für Schritt*) implementation and development of this form of cooperation. At the same time, however, she also implied that building a European army in the immediate future is out of the question and the current programs should be considered as sufficient and it would be enough to continue supporting them. In spite of the difficult relations with the United States ruled by Donald Trump, the North Atlantic Alliance would remain the main point of reference for Germany's activity in the field of security.

## References

- 'AfD-Fraktion lehnt Bundeswehreinsetze in Mali, Afghanistan und Irak ab', *AfD-Kompakt*, 19.03.2018, <https://afdkompakt.de/2018/03/19/afd-fraktion-lehnt-bundeswehreinsetze-in-mali-afghanistan-und-irak-ab/> [accessed: 14.11.2018].
- Bartels, H.-P., 'Die Einsatzbereitschaft ist schlechter geworden', *Die Zeit*, 20.02.2018.
- Bericht der Strukturkommission der Bundeswehr: *Vom Einsatz her denken. Konzentration, Flexibilität, Effizienz*, Berlin 2010, <https://www.roderich-kiesewetter.de/fileadmin/Service/Dokumente/20101026-weise-kommisionsbericht.pdf> [accessed: 20.11.2018].
- Bradley, D., Würzenthal, H.-P., Model, H., *Die Generale und Admirale der Bundeswehr, 1955–1999. Die militärischen Werdegänge*, Osnabrück 2005.
- Bundesministerium der Verteidigung, Verteidigungspolitische Richtlinien: *Nationale Interessen wahren – Internationale Verantwortung übernehmen – Sicherheit gemeinsam gestalten*, Berlin 2011, <https://www.bmvg.de/resource/blob/13568/28163bcaed9f30b27f7e3756d812c280/g-03-download-die-verteidigungspolitische-richtlinien-2011-data.pdf> [accessed: 17.05.2018].
- Bundesministerium der Verteidigung, *Weißbuch zur Sicherheitspolitik Deutschlands und Zukunft der Bundeswehr*, Berlin 2006, [http://www.humanistischeunion.de/fileadmin/hu\\_upload/doku/frieden/weissbuch2006/WB\\_2006.09.28.pdf](http://www.humanistischeunion.de/fileadmin/hu_upload/doku/frieden/weissbuch2006/WB_2006.09.28.pdf) [accessed: 25.05.2018].
- Bundesministerium der Verteidigung, *Weißbuch 2016 zur Sicherheitspolitik und zur Zukunft der Bundeswehr*, Berlin, Juni 2016, <https://www.bundesregierung.de/resource/blob/975292/736102/64781348c12e4a80948ab1bdf25cf057/weissbuch-zur-sicherheitspolitik-2016-download-bmvg-data.pdf?download=1> [accessed: 17.05.2018].
- 'Bundestag billigt Einsatz der Bundeswehr gegen IS', *Deutscher Bundestag – Dokumente*, 2015, <https://www.bundestag.de/dokumente/textarchiv/2015/kw49-de-bundeswehreinsatz-isis-Freitag/397884> [accessed: 16.07.2016].
- Bundesverfassungsgericht, Urteil vom 12. Juli 1994, 'Pressemitteilung Nr. 29/1994 vom 12. Juli 1994', *Bundesverfassungsgericht – Presse*, <https://www.bundesverfassungsgericht.de/SharedDocs/Pressemitteilungen/DE/1994/bvg94-029.html> [accessed: 23.07.2018].
- Chang, Chia-Pin, *ESVP – Kernanliegen der Bundesrepublik Deutschland?: Die deutschen Präferenzen, Positionen und Politiken unter der rot-grünen Bundesregierung in der GASP/ESVP der Europäischen Union*, Bern 2007.
- Christensen, C.S., *Zur Wiederaufrüstung Westdeutschlands 1950–1955. Politische Intentionen und Konzeptionen der Bundesrepublik Deutschland und Frankreichs im Remilitarisierungsprozess*, Regensburg 2002.
- Deutscher Bundestag, Gesetz über die parlamentarische Beteiligung bei der Entscheidung über den Einsatz bewaffneter Streitkräfte im Ausland, 2005, <https://www.>



- bundestag.de/bundestag/aufgaben/rechtsgrundlagen/parlamentsbeteiligung [accessed: 12.12.2018].
- 'Der Europäische Verteidigungsfonds: 5,5 Mrd. EUR pro Jahr, um Europas Verteidigungsfähigkeiten zu stärken', *Europäische Kommission – Pressemitteilung*, 2016, [http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release\\_IP-17-1508\\_de.htm](http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-17-1508_de.htm) [accessed: 19.03.2018]
- 'Fast drei Viertel der Deutschen gegen Bundeswehr Einsatz in Syrien', *Die Welt*, 11.09.2018, <https://www.welt.de/politik/ausland/article181491964/WELT-Trend-Fast-drei-Viertel-der-Deutschen-gegen-Bundeswehr-Einsatz-in-Syrien.html> [accessed: 15.09.2019].
- Cziomer, E., 'Znaczenie Białej Księgi 2016 dla oceny nowych wyzwań w polityce bezpieczeństwa Niemiec', *Bezpieczeństwo. Teoria i Praktyka*, 2017, No. 1, pp. 37–52.
- Gasztold, A., *Koncepcja bezpieczeństwa Niemiec*, [in:] R. Zięba (ed.), *Bezpieczeństwo międzynarodowe w XXI wieku*, Warszawa 2018.
- 'Gemeinsam stärker durch „PESCO“', *Bundesregierung – Aktuelles*, 2017, <https://www.bundesregierung.de/Content/DE/Artikel/2017/11/2017-11-13-pesco.html> [accessed: 30.03.2018].
- 'German president Horst Köhler quits over Afghanistan gaffe', *The Guardian*, 31.05.2009, <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2010/may/31/german-president-horst-kohler-quits> [accessed: 28.04.2021].
- Glatz, R.L., Hansen, W., Kaim, M., Vorrath, J., 'Die Auslandseinsätze der Bundeswehr im Wandel', *SWP-Studie*, Mai 2018, Vol. 7, [https://www.swp-berlin.org/fileadmin/contents/products/studien/2018S07\\_kim\\_EtAl.pdf](https://www.swp-berlin.org/fileadmin/contents/products/studien/2018S07_kim_EtAl.pdf) [accessed: 12.12.2018].
- Gotkowska, J., 'Reforma Bundeswehry – po co RFN profesjonalna armia?', *Analizy OSW*, 25.05.2011, <https://www.osw.waw.pl/pl/publikacje/analizy/2011-05-25/reforma-bundeswehry-po-co-rfn-profesjonalna-armia> [accessed: 17.02.2018].
- Jaworska, M., *Stosunki niemiecko-amerykańskie w latach 1998–2005*, Toruń 2011.
- Jungholt, T., 'Die zwei Welten der Ursula von der Leyen und ihrer Soldaten', *Die Welt*, 20.02.2018, <https://www.welt.de/politik/deutschland/article173774744/Bundeswehr-Die-zwei-Welten-der-Ursula-von-der-Leyen-und-ihrer-Soldaten.html> [accessed: 28.12.2018].
- Kaim, M., *Die deutsche NATO-Politik*, [in:] Th. Jäger, A. Höse, K. Oppermann (ed.), *Deutsche Außenpolitik. Sicherheit, Wohlfahrt, Institutionen und Normen*, Berlin 2010.
- Kaiser, K., *Deutschlands Vereinigung. Die internationalen Aspekte. Mit den wichtigen Dokumenten*, Bergisch Gladbach 1991.
- Kettenbach, M., Dimitriu, M., Pries, P.D., *Trotz Kritik von Kollege: Mehrheit der AfD-Abgeordneten will zu AKK-Vereidigung kommen*, *Merkur.de*, 7.01.2019, <https://www.merkur.de/politik/akk-erklaert-ihre-erste-forderung-als-ministerin-und-loest-koalitionsstreit-aus-zr-12828508.html> [accessed: 20.01.2020].
- Kozel, B., *Germany in the Face of 21<sup>st</sup> Century Security Threats: A "Soft" Power or Leader of European Politics?*, [in:] A. Podraza (ed.), *A Transatlantic or European Perspective of World Affairs: NATO and the EU towards Problems of International Security in the 21st Century*, Madrid 2017, pp. 81–95.
- Kozel, B., *Mitteuropa rediviva? Europa Środkowo- i Południowo-Wschodnia w polityce zjednoczonych Niemiec*, Poznań 1999.
- Maull, H.W., *Deutschland als Zivilmacht*, [in:] S. Schmidt, G. Hellmann, R. Wolf (eds.), *Handbuch zur deutschen Außenpolitik*, Wiesbaden 2007, pp. 15–44.

- Miszczak, K., 'Niemcy w polityce globalnej (Biała Księga)', *Rocznik Polsko-Niemiecki*, 2017, No. 25, pp. 11–18.
- 'Nato-Gipfel in Warschau. Ergebnisse von Warschau', Berlin, 11. Juli 2016, <https://www.bundesregierung.de/Content/DE/Infodienst/2016/07/2016-07-11-nato-gipfel/2016-07-11-nato-gipfel-warschau.html> [accessed: 17.05.2018].
- 'Pesco: EU countries sign off on plan for closer defence cooperation', *European Parliament – News*, 11.12.2017, <https://www.europarl.europa.eu/news/en/headlines/security/20171208STO89939/pesco-eu-countries-sign-off-on-plan-for-closer-defence-cooperation> [accessed: 15.08.2018].
- Przybyll, A., 'Reforma Bundeswehry w kontekście *mentalnej remilitaryzacji* Republiki Federalnej Niemiec', *Biuletyn Niemiecki*, 2010, Vol. 11, <http://fwpn.org.pl/assets/biuletyny/BN11.pdf> [accessed: 16.09.2018].
- 'Rede der Ministerin: „In Verantwortung für die Zukunft Deutschlands“', *Bundesministerium der Verteidigung – Aktuelles*, 24.07.2019, <https://www.bmvg.de/de/aktuelles/regierungserklaerung-rede-annegret-kramp-karrenbauer-76920> [accessed: 1.11.2020].
- Solak, J., *Rola RFN w NATO w latach 1979–1994*, Warszawa 1999.
- 'Sollte Deutschland mehr Geld für Verteidigung ausgeben oder nicht?', *Statista*, März 2015, <http://de.statista.com/statistik/daten/studie/410644/umfrage/umfrage-zur-erhoehung-der-ausgaben-fuer-die-bundeswehr-nach-parteihaengerschaft> [accessed: 17.05.2018].
- Stasik, E., 'Radykalna reforma Bundeswehry. Odpowiedź na wyzwania XXI wieku', *Deutsche Welle*, 16.05.2013, <http://www.dw.com/pl/radykalna-reforma-bundeswehry-odpowied%5C%BA-na-wyzwania-xxi-wieku/a-16818697> [accessed: 17.05.2018].
- 'Strukturkommission hält Verteidigungsministerium für ineffizient', *Die Zeit*, 24.10.2010, <https://www.zeit.de/gesellschaft/zeitgeschehen/2010-10/bundeswehr-struktur-kommission> [accessed: 17.05.2018].
- Szubart K., 'Szczyt NATO w Warszawie – konsekwencje dla Niemiec', *Biuletyn Instytutu Zachodniego*, 2016, Vol. 260, <http://www.iz.poznan.pl/publikacje/biuletyn-instytutu-zachodniego/nr-260-szczyt-nato-w-warszawie-konsekwencje-dlaniemiec> [accessed: 17.05.2018].
- Terlikowski, M., 'PESCO: Unia Europejska zacieśnia współpracę obronną', *Komentarz PISM*, 2017, Vol. 31, <http://www.pism.pl/publikacje/komentarz/nr-31-2017> [accessed: 17.05.2018].
- Vernet, D., 'Kluge Ausschöpfung begrenzter Souverenität. Die Europapolitik der rot-grünen Koalition', *Internationale Politik*, 1999, Vol. 5, pp. 11–18.
- 'Wehrbeauftragter: Lücken bei Bundeswehr noch größer geworden', *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 20.02.2018, <https://www.faz.net/aktuell/politik/inland/hans-peter-bartels-luecken-bei-bundeswehr-noch-groesser-geworden-15458844.html> [accessed: 28.12.2020].
- 'Wehrbeauftragter zeichnet düsteres Bild der Bundeswehr', *Der Tagesspiegel*, 20.02.2018.
- Wiegold, T., 'Merkel betont Bedeutung von Bundeswehr-Auslandseinsätzen für deutsche Sicherheit', *Augen geradeaus!*, 12.05.2018, <https://augengeradeaus.net/2018/05/merkel-betont-bedeutung-von-bundeswehr-auslandseinsaetzen-fuer-deutsche-sicherheit/> [accessed: 23.12.2018].

## *Niemiecka polityka bezpieczeństwa i obrony a NATO i Europejska Polityka Bezpieczeństwa i Obrony w XXI wieku* *Streszczenie*

Celem artykułu jest analiza polityki bezpieczeństwa zjednoczonych Niemiec pod kątem ich powiązań z NATO oraz Europejską Polityką Bezpieczeństwa i Obrony w latach 1998–2019. Rozwój potencjału obronnego Niemiec i ich wkład w NATO i Wspólną Politykę Bezpieczeństwa i Obrony w dużej mierze zależy od ideologicznych zasad rządzących koalicji. W XXI w. niemiecka polityka obronna i bezpieczeństwa stała się zakładnikiem pacyfistycznych partii politycznych w Bundestagu i społeczeństwa niemieckiego, które od lat jest wychowywane w duchu *Zivilgesellschaft* i „kultury powściągliwości”. Cięcia w wydatkach budżetowych na niemieckie siły zbrojne i kontrowersyjna reforma Bundeswehry doprowadziły do zmniejszenia ich potencjału i podważyły wiarygodność Niemiec w oczach ich sojuszników w NATO i UE. Konflikt na Ukrainie, ataki terrorystyczne w państwach UE i szczyt NATO w 2014 r. w Newport spowodowały wzrost zainteresowania Niemiec współpracą z państwami UE (PESCO) oraz zwiększenie budżetu Bundeswehry. Nieodpowiedzialna polityka prezydenta USA Donalda Trumpa wobec NATO i zachodnich sojuszników stworzyła szansę na wzmocnienie zainteresowania Niemiec budową europejskiej tożsamości obronnej.

**Słowa kluczowe:** Niemcy, polityka bezpieczeństwa i obrony, NATO, UE, XXI wiek

## *Germany's Security Policy versus NATO's and the EU's Security and Defence Policy in the Twenty-First Century* *Abstract*

The goal of this article is to analyse the security policy of a reunited Germany in terms of its links with NATO and European Security and Defence policy from 1998 to 2019. The development of Germany's defence potential and its contribution to NATO and the Common Security and Defence Policy of EU depends to a great extent on the ideological principles of the currently ruling coalitions. In the twenty-first century, the German defence and security policy have become hostage to pacifist political parties in the Bundestag and to German society, which has been raised for years in the spirit of the *Zivilgesellschaft*, and a 'culture of restraint'. The cuts in the budgetary expenditure on Germany's armed forces and controversial reform of the Bundeswehr have led to their reduced potential and brought Germany's credibility in the eyes of its allies in NATO and the EU into question. The conflict in Ukraine, terrorist attacks in EU countries and the 2014 NATO Summit in Newport resulted in increasing German interest in cooperation with EU countries (PESCO) and increasing the Bundeswehr budget. The irresponsible policy of U.S. President Donald Trump towards NATO and Western allies created an opportunity to strengthen Germany's interest in building a European defence identity.

**Key words:** Germany, Security and Defence Policy, NATO, EU, twenty-first century

## *Deutsche Sicherheits- und Verteidigungspolitik vs. NATO und Europäische Sicherheits- und Verteidigungspolitik im 21. Jahrhundert*

### *Zusammenfassung*

Ziel dieses Artikels ist es, die Sicherheitspolitik des wiedervereinigten Deutschlands im Hinblick auf seine Verbindungen zur NATO und zur europäischen Sicherheits- und Verteidigungspolitik von 1998 bis 2019 zu analysieren. Die Entwicklung des Verteidigungspotenzials Deutschlands und sein Beitrag zur NATO und zur Gemeinsamen Sicherheits- und Verteidigungspolitik der EU hängt in hohem Maße von den ideologischen Prinzipien der derzeit regierenden Koalitionen ab. Im 21. Jahrhundert wurde die deutsche Verteidigungs- und Sicherheitspolitik zur Geißel pazifistischer politischer Parteien im Bundestag und der deutschen Gesellschaft, die seit Jahren im Geiste der Zivilgesellschaft eine „Kultur der Zurückhaltung“ verfolgen. Die Kürzungen der Haushaltsausgaben für die deutschen Streitkräfte und die umstrittene Reform der Bundeswehr haben zu einem geringeren Potenzial geführt und die Glaubwürdigkeit Deutschlands in den Augen seiner Verbündeten in der NATO und der EU in Frage gestellt. Der Konflikt in der Ukraine, Terroranschläge in EU-Ländern und der NATO-Gipfel im Jahr 2014 führten zu einem zunehmenden Interesse Deutschlands an einer Zusammenarbeit mit EU-Ländern (PESCO) und einer Erhöhung des Haushalts der Bundeswehr. Die unverantwortliche Politik des US-Präsidenten Donald Trump gegenüber der NATO und westlichen Verbündeten bot die Gelegenheit, das Interesse Deutschlands am Aufbau einer europäischen Verteidigungsidentität zu stärken.

**Schlüsselwörter:** Deutschland, Sicherheits- und Verteidigungspolitik, NATO, EU, 21. Jahrhundert

## *Политика Германии в области безопасности и обороны по отношению к НАТО и европейской Политике безопасности и обороны в XXI веке*

### *Резюме*

В статье представлен анализ политики безопасности объединенной Германии с точки зрения ее связей с НАТО и европейской Политикой безопасности и обороны в 1998–2019 гг. Развитие оборонного потенциала Германии и ее вклад в НАТО и Общую политику безопасности и обороны, во многом зависят от идеологических принципов правящей коалиции. В XXI веке политика Германии в области обороны и безопасности стала заложником пацифистских политических партий в Бундестаге и немецкого общества, которое в течение уже многих лет воспитывается в духе Zivilgesellschaft (гражданского общества) и «культуры сдержанности». Сокращение бюджетных расходов на вооруженные силы Германии и дискуссионная реформа Бундесвера, привели к снижению их потенциала и подорвали доверие к Германии в глазах ее союзников в НАТО и ЕС. Конфликт в Украине, теракты в странах ЕС и саммит НАТО в 2014 г. в Ньюпорте, повысили интерес Германии к сотрудничеству со странами ЕС (PESCO) и стали поводом увеличения бюджета Бундесвера. Безответственная политика президента США Дональда Трампа по отношению к НАТО и западным союзникам, усилили заинтересованность Германии в создании европейской оборонной идентичности.

**Ключевые слова:** Германия, политика безопасности и обороны, НАТО, ЕС, XXI век