

Rational Bureaucratic Actors: Examining Germany's  
*Russlandpolitik*

by

Davina Sophie Basse

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral  
Affairs in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree

of

Master of Arts

in

European, Russian and Eurasian Studies

Carleton University

Ottawa, Ontario

©2020

Davina Sophie Basse

## Abstract

The relationship between Germany and Russia is complex, with Germany often considered the bridge between the West and Russia. Although balancing western priorities and good relations with Russia has always been a challenge, relations have become even more strained since Russia's annexation of Crimea in 2014. Since then, Germany has supported economic sanctions against Russia, sent troops to Russia's borders, played an integral role in the Minsk Accord negotiations, and supported the construction of the Nord Stream 2 pipeline. To explain Germany's seemingly contradictory behaviour, this thesis goes beyond the commonly accepted "dual-track policy" of Germany's *Russlandpolitik* by analyzing Germany's Russia policies through the lenses of the rational actor and bureaucratic/governmental politics models. Though the bureaucratic/governmental politics model may seem more applicable in describing Germany's *Russlandpolitik* at first, this thesis finds that the rational actor model more adequately, albeit not perfectly, explains Germany's behaviour vis-à-vis its allies and Russia.

## Acknowledgements

The author would like to express her sincere gratitude to all advisors who provided their time to help with this thesis. The author would like to thank Dr. Joan DeBardleben for her advice, conversations, and revisions and the thesis committee for reviewing this thesis. The author would also like to thank Karin and Rainer Basse, Neda McClelland, and Kiernan McClelland for their never-ending support, which helped drive the completion of this thesis.

## Table of Contents

<b>Chapter 1: Introduction</b> .....	1
<b>1.1. Introduction</b> .....	1
<b>1.2. Research Question and Hypothesis</b> .....	6
<b>1.3. Research Gaps</b> .....	8
<b>1.4. Overview of the Thesis</b> .....	9
<b>Chapter 2: Theory, Methodology, and Literature Review</b> .....	12
<b>2.1. Introduction</b> .....	12
<b>2.2. Theoretical Framework</b> .....	13
<b>2.3. Methodology</b> .....	17
<i>2.3.1. Operationalizing the Methodology</i> .....	22
<b>2.4. Theoretical Literature Review</b> .....	23
<b>2.5. Literature Review of Germany’s Foreign Policy and <i>Russlandpolitik</i></b> .....	33
<i>2.5.1. German Foreign Policy Toward Russia</i> .....	33
<i>2.5.2. German-Russian Bilateral Relations</i> .....	40
<i>2.5.3. German-Russian Relations and NATO</i> .....	46
<i>2.5.4. Shortcomings of the Existing Literature</i> .....	47
<b>2.6. Conclusion</b> .....	48
<b>Chapter 3: History of the Federal Republic of Germany’s Federal Ministries</b> .....	50
<b>3.1. Introduction</b> .....	50
<b>3.2. 1949 to 1990</b> .....	51
<i>3.2.1. West German Governmental Structure</i> .....	53
<i>3.2.2. West German Governmental Structure: Foreign Affairs</i> .....	56
<i>3.2.3. West German Governmental Structure: Defence</i> .....	58
<i>3.2.4. West German Governmental Structure: Economic Affairs</i> .....	61
<b>3.3. 1990 to 2019</b> .....	65
<i>3.3.1. German Governmental Structure</i> .....	66
<b>3.4. Conclusion</b> .....	69
<b>Chapter 4: History of West German-Soviet and German-Russian Relations</b> .....	71
<b>4.1. Introduction</b> .....	71
<b>4.2. 1949 to 1990/1991</b> .....	72
<i>4.2.1. German-Soviet Relations</i> .....	72
<i>4.2.2. German-Soviet Relations: Ostpolitik</i> .....	75

4.3. 1990/1991 to 2019 .....	78
4.3.1. German-Russian Relations .....	79
4.4. Conclusion .....	85
<b>Chapter 5: The German Federal Ministry of Foreign Affairs.....</b>	<b>87</b>
5.1. Introduction.....	87
5.2. Overview of the Ministry .....	88
5.3. Ministerial Leadership .....	94
5.4. Case Study: Ukraine Peace Process .....	102
5.5. Concluding Analysis.....	106
<b>Chapter 6: The German Federal Ministry of Defence .....</b>	<b>110</b>
6.1. Introduction.....	110
6.2. Overview of the Ministry .....	111
6.3. Ministerial Leadership .....	122
6.4. Case Study: NATO's Enhanced Forward Presence .....	125
6.5. Concluding Analysis.....	128
<b>Chapter 7: The German Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy .....</b>	<b>133</b>
7.1. Introduction.....	133
7.2. Overview of the Ministry .....	135
7.3. Ministerial Leadership .....	142
7.4. Case Study: German Energy Security and the Nord Stream 2 Pipeline Project .....	151
7.5. Concluding Analysis.....	156
<b>Chapter 8: Conclusion .....</b>	<b>161</b>
8.1. Review of the Thesis .....	161
8.2. Summary of Findings.....	165
8.3. Future Research.....	170
<b>Bibliography.....</b>	<b>171</b>

## Chapter 1: Introduction

### 1.1. Introduction

When German Chancellor Angela Merkel spoke at the 55<sup>th</sup> Munich Security Conference in February 2019, a sentence in her speech specifically underlined the complexity of the geopolitical situation in Europe: “I would like to start with one issue that is a particular focus of my work [...] namely our relationship with Russia.”<sup>1</sup> Merkel summarized Germany’s relationship with Russia and Russia’s relationship with the West since the end of the Cold War, highlighting the NATO-Russia Founding Act, and the exchange of ratification instruments for the New START Treaty between the United States (US)’s and Russia’s ministers of foreign affairs in 2011. Finally, Merkel touched on the Russian annexation of Crimea in 2014, calling it “a clear violation of international law.”<sup>2</sup> Merkel’s speech at the 2019 Munich Security Conference underlined the geopolitical developments that have been affecting Germany, Germany’s allies, and Russia, and has drastically changed the political and military balances that had been established in Europe following the end of the Cold War.

The relationship between Germany and Russia has been complex. Even before the deterioration of relations between Russia and the West, Germany has always played a special role in this geopolitical relationship. Due to its geographic location and the fact that Germany was split into East and West during the Cold War, thus standing right on the edge between East and West, Germany has been depicted as the bridge between Russia, or the Soviet Union, and the West. Further cementing Germany’s role was West Germany’s *Ostpolitik*, which was adopted

---

<sup>1</sup> Bundesregierung, “Speech by the Federal Chancellor Dr Angela Merkel on 16 February 2019 at the 55<sup>th</sup> Munich Security Conference,” *The Federal Government*, 16 February 2019.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

in 1969 with the intention of re-opening relations with those countries east of the Iron Curtain.<sup>3</sup> As this balancing act proved to be successful, West Germany's position of being open to courteous relations with the East continued beyond the end of the Cold War and German reunification. Arguably, the relationship between Mikhail Gorbachev and West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl was a lynchpin in establishing a post-Cold War German-Russian relationship that aimed to bring about economic prosperity and establish beneficial long-lasting relations between the two powers, and by extent between Russia and the West.<sup>4</sup> As a new, post-Cold War relationship began to form during the 1990s, Germany and Russia highlighted the positive aspects of their shared histories and underlined cultural similarities between the two countries.<sup>5</sup>

Over the course of the 2000s, however, differences between the two countries began to emerge more prominently, overshadowing the positive similarities that had previously been highlighted. The economic integration of Russia into the growing European Union (EU) was beginning to become a distant dream and the democratization and formation of a Russian government structure designed after the Western European liberal democratic model proved to be more challenging than initially expected. As such, when diplomatic conflicts surrounding the distribution of Russian natural gas through pipelines running from former Soviet states to Western Europe increased and Russia began to destabilize its neighbouring states, namely Georgia, the once positive relationship between Germany and Russia began to wane. Moreover,

---

<sup>3</sup> Alexander Rahr, "Germany and Russia: A Special Relationship," *Washington Quarterly* 30, no. 2 (2007): 139.

<sup>4</sup> Helga Haftendorn, *Coming of Age: German Foreign Policy since 1945* (Oxford, UK: Rowman & Littlefield, 2006), 276-277.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*

concerns surrounding Russia's democratic capacity were raised when Vladimir Putin returned as Russian President in 2012. Finally, when Russia annexed Crimea in 2014 and destabilized Eastern Ukraine, Germany and the West had to accept that Russia would not be the post-Cold War ally that many had hoped for.

Germany, like its Western allies, was outspoken in condemning Russian actions and called for the release of Crimea and Eastern Ukraine from Russian control. While the opposition to the Russian annexation of Crimea was unanimous, Germany's policies toward Russia, also known as its *Russlandpolitik*, appeared to take a less coherent turn. While Germany's Chancellor, Angela Merkel, worked with France, Ukraine, and Russia to find a diplomatic solution that would ensure a sustaining ceasefire in eastern Ukraine through what would become known as the Minsk Agreement, different ministries within the German Federal Government handled the new geopolitical reality differently.<sup>6</sup> German Federal Minister of Defence (*Bundesministerin der Verteidigung*) Ursula von der Leyen approached the new reality from a point that more closely aligned with the statements made and actions taken by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) than by Angela Merkel. Evidently, von der Leyen not only pointed out Russia's infringement on international law, as did Merkel in her speech to the 2019 Munich Security Conference, but also explicitly framed it as "Russian aggression against Ukraine."<sup>7</sup> In addition to harsher condemnations, von der Leyen also more explicitly sided with NATO policies and statements, making it clear that Germany is a member of NATO and will always be on NATO's

---

<sup>6</sup> Bundesregierung, "Speech by the Federal Chancellor Dr Angela Merkel on 16 February 2019 at the 55<sup>th</sup> Munich Security Conference," *The Federal Government*, 16 February 2019.

<sup>7</sup> Bundesministerium der Verteidigung, "Keynote Speech by Federal Minister of Defence Dr Ursula von der Leyen Opening the 55<sup>th</sup> Munich Security Conference on 15 February 2019," *Bundesministerium der Verteidigung*, 15 February 2019, 3.

side. This commitment to NATO became especially clear through the Federal Ministry of Defence (*Bundesministerium der Verteidigung*)'s commitment to acting as one of the leading framework nations in NATO's Enhanced Forward Presence (EFP) in the Baltics. Through this commitment, German troops have been stationed in Lithuania's border region with Russia since January 2017, clearly signaling that Germany is committed to defending its NATO allies.

Alternatively, Sigmar Gabriel, who was the Vice-Chancellor and Federal Minister for Economic Affairs and Energy (*Bundesminister für Wirtschaft und Energie*) in 2014, openly opposed von der Leyen's proposal to act through NATO, stating that "[t]he impression must not be given that we're playing with military options, even in theoretical terms."<sup>8</sup> In 2017, Gabriel became Federal Minister of Foreign Affairs (*Bundesminister des Auswärtigen*) and suggested that sanctions against Russia should be lifted since the Russian government was complying with ceasefire agreements.<sup>9</sup> In contrast, Gabriel's successor, Heiko Maas, began following a less Russophile but also less clear line when he took over the office of the Minister of Foreign Affairs in March 2018. Maas describes himself as "a bit of a critic of Russia within the Federal Government."<sup>10</sup> Nevertheless, Germany's Foreign Ministers have been more diplomatic in their approach toward Russia and Europe's new geopolitical reality than Germany's Minister of Defence.

Finally, the Nord Stream 2 pipeline project has attracted considerable criticism. The pipeline project was announced in 2015 and, once constructed, will run in parallel with its first

---

<sup>8</sup> John Vinocur, "How Germany went wobbly on the West," *Politico*, 2 May 2019.

<sup>9</sup> Allison Williams and André Ballin, "Germany's foreign minister suggests lifting sanctions on Russia," *Handelsblatt*, 11 January 2018.

<sup>10</sup> Auswärtiges Amt, "Speech by Foreign Minister Heiko Maas at the New Year reception of the German Eastern Business Association (OAOEV)," *Federal Foreign Office*, 10 January 2019.

namesake through the Baltic Sea directly from Russia to Germany. While this pipeline will deliver gas to western Europe significantly faster than through the existing pipeline network running through Eastern Europe, numerous concerns were raised opposing the pipeline project. One major concern was that the pipeline would circumvent Eastern European states, including Ukraine, reducing their energy security by removing them from the stakeholder table.<sup>11</sup> In addition, this project was announced despite the EU's sanctions regime against Russia that were imposed in 2014.<sup>12</sup> Nevertheless, Germany's Ministers for Economic Affairs and Energy have supported the construction of the pipeline since its announcement one year after Russia's annexation of Crimea. More explicitly, Gabriel stated in an interview with German magazine *Der Spiegel* that the construction of the pipeline should go ahead because it is in accordance with European law and upholds the German economy's right to decide "whom it gets its gas from."<sup>13</sup> Gabriel's successor as Minister for Economic Affairs and Energy, Peter Altmaier, has continued to defend the construction of Nord Stream 2, arguing that even if the German Federal Government wanted to interfere, it would have no legal grounds to do so.<sup>14</sup> While this stance can be reconciled with the Federal Government's overall goals and interests and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs' *Russlandpolitik*, it is difficult to align it with Germany's commitment to NATO's EFP or the EU's sanctions regime against Russia.

---

<sup>11</sup> Adam N. Stulberg, "Out of Gas?: Russia, Ukraine, Europe, and the Changing Geopolitics of Natural Gas," *Problems of Post-Communism* 62, no. 2 (2015): 113.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid.

<sup>13</sup> Mathieu von Rohr and Britta Sandberg, "'The World Is Changing Dramatically,'" *Der Spiegel*, 24 September 2018.

<sup>14</sup> Klaus Stratmann, "Peter Altmaier: „Nord Stream 2 ist der falsche Prügelknabe“," *Handelsblatt*, 20 January 2019.

## 1.2. Research Question and Hypothesis

The existing literature often explains these divergences within Germany's *Russlandpolitik* by framing Germany's policies toward Russia as a dual-track policy.<sup>15</sup> While this dual-track policy may begin to describe the structure of Germany's *Russlandpolitik*, the explanation assumes that Germany's diverging policies toward Russia are intentional at worst and not analyzed at best. Moreover, a dual-track policy cannot explain the three distinct policy approaches Germany continues to take, as discussed above and evident through the actions taken by the Ministries of Defence, Foreign Affairs, and Economic Affairs and Energy. The understanding that Germany's *Russlandpolitik* is a dual-track policy is based on the widely accepted framework of the unitary rational actor model (RAM). The RAM originates in classical international relations literature and assumes that a state is an actor on the international stage that acts through rationally thought out decisions. This is to say that a state is able to weigh the positive and negative consequences of each possible policy option for each policy question before making a decision that is reflective of the state's government as a whole and is carried out uniformly across all government departments.<sup>16</sup> The benefit of this model, and the reason it is widely accepted and used, is its ability to determine what each actor's stance is on a specific country or policy issue within the international community.

A significant shortcoming of this model is that it assumes that the ideal policy-making process and environment are the norm and that other factors, such as an individual's beliefs or partisan convictions, do not play a role. Taking Germany's *Russlandpolitik* as an example, the

---

<sup>15</sup> Robin Allers, "The framework nation: can Germany lead on security?," *International Affairs* 92, no. 5 (2016): 1183.

<sup>16</sup> Graham Allison and Philip Zelikow, *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis* (New York, NY: Longman, 1999), 18.

German Federal Government has not published a clear, uniform *Russlandpolitik* that each ministry and executive actor within these government departments follows to produce a coherent policy toward Russia. Instead, different ministries and actors within these departments perceive Russia and corresponding German policy options through their own belief systems and act accordingly.

An alternative to the RAM that has the potential to explain this behaviour more adequately is the bureaucratic/governmental politics model as proposed by Graham Allison and Philip Zelikow's book *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis*. Within this model, Allison and Zelikow argue that each government department and executive actor is influenced by their institutional or personal history, belief system, and identity.<sup>17</sup> Therefore, this thesis will assess whether the RAM or the bureaucratic/governmental politics model more adequately describes the decision-making process, or processes, that result in Germany's *Russlandpolitik* since the annexation of Crimea in 2014. This research will help fill a gap within the literature on German-Russian relations by analyzing Germany's ministries' diverging behaviour. The question this thesis will answer is: *How can the nature and decision-making processes of Germany's Russlandpolitik, since the annexation of Crimea in 2014, be best explained?*

This thesis hypothesizes that the bureaucratic/governmental politics model more adequately describes the nature and decision-making processes of Germany's *Russlandpolitik* since the annexation of Crimea in 2014 than the RAM. The basis for this hypothesis is that, unlike the majority of the existing literature indicates, Germany does not run a dual-track policy that fits into the RAM, as this would require Germany to have a clear and non-contradictory

---

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., 255-257.

*Russlandpolitik* through which all policy decisions are made with one coherent strategic goal in mind. Instead, Germany's *Russlandpolitik* is more complex and does not reflect a clear, easily discernible, and non-contradictory strategic goal. Furthermore, each ministry and executive actor has been taking a different and individualized approach to operationalizing relations with Russia, which has become evident through the diverging actions surrounding the Ukraine Crisis, Germany's military presence in the Baltic, and the Nord Stream 2 pipeline project, as well as press releases, ministers' actions and speeches, and ministries' policy documents.

### 1.3. Research Gaps

This thesis will fill a significant research gap that exists within the literature surrounding Germany's foreign policy and Germany's *Russlandpolitik*. Unlike the existing literature, this thesis will assume that the RAM does not adequately represent German policy decisions vis-à-vis Russia. Beginning with the assumption that not all of Germany's Russia policies originate from a unified and strategic decision-maker, this thesis will take a different approach to analyzing Germany's Russia policies and the decision-making behind these policies than the existing literature.

Throughout the literature, authors have intrinsically assumed that the RAM explains German decision-making and have consequently limited themselves to analyzing different aspects of Germany's Russia policies through this lens. As a result of this limitation, certain characteristics or markers of Germany's foreign policy may have been missed. For example, Marco Siddi's article "German Foreign Policy towards Russia in the Aftermath the Ukraine Crisis: A New *Ostpolitik*?" and Stephen Szabo's article "Germany's Commercial Realism and the Russia Problem" focus on different fields of Germany's foreign and Russia policies, yet both authors take the RAM as their baseline for establishing their arguments. These two articles are representative

of the larger literature surrounding Germany's foreign policy and *Russlandpolitik* decision-making processes, as both unquestioningly base their arguments on the assumption that Germany is a unitary rational actor.

Even Tuomas Forsberg's well-known article "From *Ostpolitik* to 'frostpolitik'? Merkel, Putin and German foreign policy towards Russia," which attempts to redefine and explain Germany's decision-making processes vis-à-vis Russia, grounds its argument in the assumption that no matter what policy approach Germany takes, it originates from within the unitary actor mold. This thesis will help fill the void that exists outside of the assumption that Germany's foreign policy can be explained through the RAM and instead will analyze Germany's Russia policies by applying the bureaucratic/governmental politics model and the model's characteristics to the case studies analyzed in this thesis.

#### 1.4. Overview of the Thesis

This thesis can be divided into two parts. The first part includes chapters two, three, and four, and focuses on the theoretical framework used in this thesis. Part one will also provide a historical overview to help establish the second part of this thesis. Part two will present three case studies and how they relate to different ministries within the German Federal Government.

The chapter subsequent to this introduction, chapter two, will focus on the theoretical framework applied in this thesis and the methodology used to operationalize the theoretical framework. The chapter will also present a theoretical and contextual literature review. The theoretical framework of this thesis will explain and discuss crucial aspects of the rational actor and bureaucratic/governmental politics models. The chapter will then introduce this thesis' methodology, the sources that will be used to create the theoretical and methodological

frameworks, as well as possible limitations of this thesis. Finally, chapter two will review the existing theoretical and thematic literature to highlight gaps and explain how this thesis will contribute to the existing literature.

Chapter three, “History of the Federal Republic of Germany’s Federal Ministries,” provides a chronological discussion of the history of the Federal Republic of Germany and its system of governance. The chapter specifically focuses on the histories and origins of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Defence, and what would become the Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy, as these three ministries are associated to the three case studies in the second part of this thesis. The next chapter, titled “History of West German-Soviet and German-Russian Relations,” focuses on the relationship between Germany and Russia since 1949, to provide a foundation upon which the second part of this thesis will build regarding contemporary German-Russian relations and Germany’s Russia policies since 2014.

The second part of this thesis will consist of chapters five, six, and seven, which will present three case studies. The first case study, presented in chapter 5, focuses on the German Federal Ministry of Foreign Affairs (*Bundesministerium des Auswärtigen*) and how the ministry has dealt with the diplomatic negotiations and peace talks following the beginning of the Ukraine Crisis in 2014. Chapter six presents the next case study, which focuses on the German Federal Ministry of Defence (*Bundesministerium der Verteidigung*) and the leadership role the German military (*Bundeswehr*) has played in NATO’s EFP. The third and last case study is presented in chapter seven. This case study analyzes the role the German Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy (*Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie*), commonly referred to as BMWi, played in the negotiations surrounding the Nord Stream 2 pipeline project.

To ensure consistency, all three case studies will be analyzed the same way by using an identical structure and methodology for each of them. In each case study, the ministry associated with the case study will be analyzed first to highlight the inherent nature and characteristics of each ministry. Each chapter will then move on to focus on the ministerial leadership, namely the ministers, and how each of the ministers may have influenced their ministry. This is to say that individual attributes, experiences, personal convictions, and party affiliations will be taken into consideration in order to discern how each minister may have influenced their ministry. Each chapter will then present a case study and compare the nature of the ministry associated with each case study and the ministry's leadership with the actions that were taken pertaining to the case study. The concluding analysis for each chapter will then discern whether the bureaucratic/governmental politics model can more adequately describe Germany's Russia policies or whether the RAM better explains the behaviour surrounding the case study in question.

Chapter eight concludes this thesis. The chapter will revisit and summarize the preceding chapters to provide an overview and comparison of the three case studies and how they apply to the bureaucratic/governmental politics model. This chapter will also discuss concluding thoughts, explain how this thesis fits into the wider literature, and present the consequences of this thesis' research.

## Chapter 2: Theory, Methodology, and Literature Review

### 2.1. Introduction

This chapter will introduce the theoretical framework and methodology that will be used to answer the research question: *How can the nature and decision-making processes of Germany's Russlandpolitik, since the annexation of Crimea in 2014, be best explained?* This theoretical framework and methodology will also be used to test the hypothesis that the bureaucratic/governmental politics model more adequately describes the nature and decision-making processes of Germany's *Russlandpolitik* since the annexation of Crimea in 2014 than the rational actor model (RAM). The basis for this hypothesis is that, unlike the existing literature indicates, Germany does not run a dual-track policy that fits into the RAM, as it would require Germany to have a unified *Russlandpolitik*, but rather each ministry – or executive actor – takes a different approach to relations with Russia, which has become evident through press releases, ministers' actions and speeches, and ministries' policy documents. These differing and ministry-specific approaches to German-Russian relations have created a multifaceted relief of Germany's *Russlandpolitik* that possesses different priorities depending on each ministry's mandate and interests instead of one unified set of goals.

This chapter will introduce the theoretical framework of the bureaucratic/governmental politics model based on Allison and Zelikow's *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis*. This thesis will utilize Allison and Zelikow's bureaucratic/governmental politics model to test whether Germany's *Russlandpolitik* can be better explained with this model than with the RAM. This chapter will then turn to the methodology that will be used in this thesis. Each case study will be first analyzed through the RAM framework by analyzing existing literature before

applying the bureaucratic/governmental politics model. As such, this chapter will introduce and discuss the applicability of the bureaucratic/governmental politics model paradigm to test the above-mentioned hypothesis. Finally, this chapter will conduct a literature review of the existing RAM literature, how RAM has been applied to realism and liberalism, and how RAM compares to the bureaucratic/governmental politics model.

## 2.2. Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework for this thesis is based on the comparative theoretical evaluation presented by Allison and Zelikow's *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis*. The book challenges the commonly used RAM to explain strategic decision-making within the United States (US) Government during the Cuban Missile Crisis. The authors argue that taking a country as the "decisionmaker," as is common within the RAM, "obscures the persistently neglected fact [that] government" is "not one calculating individual but is rather a conglomerate of large organizations and political actors."<sup>1</sup> Allison and Zelikow's analysis begins with the unitary RAM as the first framework of analysis to explain US government decision-making before proposing two alternate frameworks of analysis. According to Allison and Zelikow, the RAM's key tenets are based on the assumption that a state acts with rationality and purpose.<sup>2</sup> Following this logic, rational decision- and policy-making involves a decision which "presupposes a decider and a choice among alternatives with reference to some goal" and a policy that "means the realization in a number of particular instances of some agent's objectives."<sup>3</sup> This is to say that the RAM assumes that each state has a reasonable decision-making body that weighs the "goals and

---

<sup>1</sup> Graham Allison and Philip Zelikow, *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis* (New York, NY: Longman, 1999), 3.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

objectives,” “alternatives,” and “consequences” before making a “choice.”<sup>4</sup> The result of this assumption is the appearance of each state acting with purpose and internal unity on the international stage. Consequently, the RAM is one of the most widely recognized decision-making models in international relations and provides the foundation for most international relations theories. This is because most states appear to act in a unified manner through carefully worded presidential and diplomatic statements. As a result, these acts represent a unified image of a country. Although some theorists may argue contrary to the assumption that the RAM acts as the foundation for numerous international relations theories, Allison and Zelikow provide a detailed discussion of how classical realism, neorealism, international institutionalism, and liberalism are based on the RAM as a core foundational argument.<sup>5</sup> Furthermore, the two authors argue that strategic studies within international relations, as was put forth by Thomas Schelling’s *Strategy of Conflict*, has acted as the source for this common assumption.<sup>6</sup> However, while Allison and Zelikow recognize that the RAM is a useful tool for analyzing decision-making processes and states’ behaviour within international relations, “a government is not an individual.”<sup>7</sup> Therefore, the authors present two alternate models in an attempt to more accurately explain the behaviour of states in international relations.

The first alternate model Allison and Zelikow propose is known as the organizational process model, or “Model II.” This model applies an institutional framework to comprehending decision-making processes within a state. This is to say that the rules, legislation, and mandates

---

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., 18.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., 26-40.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid., 40.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid., 143.

of individual government departments shape domestic and international coalition-building and decision-making processes vis-à-vis the state. Moreover, well established rules of procedure and patterns of operations lie at the core of the decision- and policy-making processes when analyzed through this lens.<sup>8</sup> Even though this model significantly expands the level of detail in the behavioural analysis of states, Allison and Zelikow argue that examining organizational behaviour is insufficient in adequately describing and analyzing the behaviour of states and governments, as it ignores the role leaders and other executive actors within government play.<sup>9</sup> This shortcoming is corrected in the next model: the bureaucratic/governmental politics model.

The correction of “Model II”’s shortcoming is presented by Allison and Zelikow in that “Model III” not only takes into consideration the role of certain ministries and departments but also attributes the characteristics of certain policies and ministerial approaches to the leadership’s individual personalities and set of beliefs. This concept is presented through a more sociological approach in that it describes international decision-making on a more granular level and focuses on individual actors within each government department. It assumes that individual actors within the government’s executive branch have the agency to persuade other individuals within its internal bureaucracy of specific policies. This would hold that participants would bargain not through consensus or long-established rules of conduct but rather according to processes and prerequisites provided to them by their own political and personal beliefs and how these are reflected within their specific roles within the government apparatus. These personal beliefs and experiences can include the individual’s upbringing, political affiliation, religious

---

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., 163-164.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., 255.

beliefs, past experiences, places they have lived, or familial connections, among others. Unlike the RAM, the bureaucratic/governmental politics model attempts to attribute more depth to the decision-making process that leads to states' actions on the international stage. As such, "the Governmental Politics Model sees no unitary actor but rather many actors as players: players who focus not on a single strategic issue but on many diverse intranational problems as well..."<sup>10</sup> In other words, the unitary state and decision maker as portrayed in the RAM is replaced by a plethora of ministries, departments, and individual actors that all have the potential to be pursuing their own interests and have different priorities.

Moreover, the bureaucratic/governmental policy model moves beyond "Model II" in that it takes into account actions of individuals and political influences on organizations as opposed to the organization's general rules of procedure. Therefore, Allison and Zelikow argue, "Model III" is the most elaborate and applicable model in explaining a country's decision- and policy-making processes.<sup>11</sup> As German foreign policy decision-making is frequently described as taking a dual-track approach to relations with Russia in an attempt to explain the different actions Germany has taken vis-à-vis Russia since the annexation of Crimea in 2014, the bureaucratic politics model may better explain Germany's *Russlandpolitik*. According to this model, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Defence, and the Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy would apply their own distinct guidelines when dealing Russia. Furthermore, key figures within these government departments have the agency to persuade individuals and branches within its internal bureaucracy and thus influence policies. Following the bureaucratic

---

<sup>10</sup> Ibid.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid., 255-257.

politics model, the processes and prerequisites provided to these actors by their own political system and departmental traditions shape Germany's foreign policy toward Russia in more diverse ways than the RAM would allow.

### 2.3. Methodology

As discussed above, the theoretical framework will be based on the RAM and the bureaucratic/governmental politics model. Therefore, the subsequent chapters of this thesis will be based on a comparative study of applying the RAM and the bureaucratic/governmental politics model to three case studies that each correspond with a ministry of the German Federal Government. The first case study (Chapter 5) will focus on the German Federal Ministry of Foreign Affairs (*Bundesministerium des Auswärtigen*). This chapter will include an analysis of policies concerning Russia that fall within the foreign affairs portfolio and will especially focus on the ministries' involvement with mediating the Ukraine Crisis through what is commonly known as the Minsk Accords. Chapter 6 will discuss the next ministry: the German Federal Ministry of Defence (*Bundesministerium der Verteidigung*). Similar to the foreign affairs case study, this chapter will provide an overview and analysis of all Russia policies within the *Bundesministerium der Verteidigung* and will then specifically focus on Germany's involvement in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)'s Enhanced Forward Presence (EFP) and Germany's leadership as a framework nation in Lithuania as part of the EFP. Finally, the third case study will focus on the German Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy (*Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie*). For this ministry, the analysis will predominantly focus on the Nord Stream 2 pipeline project. As the first case study focuses on diplomatic dialogue that is combined with economic sanctions, it inherently contradicts the second and third case studies, which show military force

and promote economic cooperation respectively. Moreover, Germany's repeated call to minimize the use of military force, or even the potential for portraying military force, in the Ukraine Crisis stands in stark contrast to its enthusiastic commitment to NATO's EFP. Finally, Germany's support for the Nord Stream 2 pipeline project appears to further contradict both Germany's involvement in mediating the Ukraine Crisis as well as the NATO military presence to which Germany contributes along the NATO-Russian border in the Baltic.

Each case study will be first explained through the lens of the RAM. To accomplish this, this thesis will analyze existing literature concerning each case study to determine how the RAM was used in explaining Germany's behaviour and decision- and policy-making processes for each policy and ministry. Each chapter will then turn toward analyzing the relevant ministries' behaviour and their Russia policies through the bureaucratic/governmental politics lens. This part is based on the governmental politics model paradigm as outlined by Allison and Zelikow. The paradigm is divided into six sections. While all sections provide great insight into the analysis, each chapter will predominantly focus on the first two sections and the one entitled "General Propositions." The remaining three sections provide important notes about the bureaucratic/governmental politics model but will not be directly utilized. The first section – the "Basic Unit of Analysis: Governmental Action as Political Resultant" – highlights the assumption that "decisions and actions of government" do not come from carefully deliberated and contemplated solutions but rather emerge from a web of "compromise, conflict, and confusion of officials with diverse interests and unequal influence."<sup>12</sup> Moreover, these results are inherently political since the bargaining takes place "along regularized channels among individual members

---

<sup>12</sup> Ibid., 294-295.

of the government.”<sup>13</sup> To determine whether the case studies meet these conditions, each case study chapter will discern the policy-making process in each ministry to identify these “regularized channels” among executive actors and between ministries and other governmental entities by analyzing primary documents, such as policy papers, ministerial publications, parliamentary transcripts, and speeches and interviews, as well as secondary documents including academic literature and think tank publications.

The second section introduces “Organizing Concepts” that outline factors crucial in applying the bureaucratic/governmental politics model to decision- and policy-making processes. The first subsection Allison and Zelikow present provides a list of relevant actor categories and their roles within the process.<sup>14</sup> The four predominant categories of actors, according to Allison and Zelikow are “Chiefs,” “Staffers,” “Indians,” and “Ad Hoc Players,” which represent executive actors like ministers, direct supporting staff to the executive actors, “political appointees and permanent government officials,” and other influencing actors, such as members of the press or interest groups, respectively.<sup>15</sup>

The next subsection highlights factors that shape the actors’ “perception, preferences, and stands on the issue at hand,” focusing predominantly on the perception of the issue, how it is framed by each actor’s government department, the actor’s goals and interests, and how the issue ranks in the list of issues each actor prioritizes.<sup>16</sup> This part predominantly focuses on the executive actors, namely the ministers, of each ministry and what their priorities and preferences

---

<sup>13</sup> Ibid., 295.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid., 296-298.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., 296.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid., 298-300.

are. An analysis of academic literature; biographies, such as Ulrike Demmer and Daniel Goffart's *Kanzlerin der Reserve: Der Aufstieg der Ursula von der Leyen*, Sigmar Gabriel and Richard Kiessler's *Zeitwende in der Weltpolitik: Mehr Verantwortung in ungewissen Zeiten*, and Torben Lütjen and Lars Geiges' *Frank-Walter Steinmeier: Die Biografie*; parliamentary transcripts; speeches; and interviews will identify preferences, priorities, and interests of each minister.

The next two subsections discuss the impact each actor has on the issue at hand and what the policy process for this specific issue looks like. This includes "action-channels," the rules surrounding the decision- and policy-making processes, and "action as a political resultant."<sup>17</sup> This part will utilize similar sources to the parts above but will focus on the mandate and powers each actor and ministry has to determine these action-channels.

The final sections of the paradigm further help understand the possible limitations of this framework of analysis. The "Dominant Inference Pattern" notes that while a certain actor or group of actors may achieve a certain policy outcome, it may have been caused in part by misunderstandings of other groups or failures of other policy options.<sup>18</sup> The next section, titled "General Propositions," identifies a plethora of factors that can influence the policy outcomes; "political resultants," intentions in contrast to actions, problems and possible solutions, diverse backgrounds of key actors and their positions, the influence of procedural matters, "international and intranational relations," differing perspectives depending on different actors' roles, "misexpectation" and miscommunication, reticence, and behaviour of actors in policy-making environments are all identified to contribute to the decision- and policy-making processes.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., 300-304.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., 304-305.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., 305-311.

Consequently, this thesis' case study analyses will incorporate and consider these factors in the creation of the three policies and ministries analyzed.

The next section focuses on "Specific Propositions" for decision-making in crisis scenarios. As this thesis focuses on policies deliberated in peace time and, at best, deal with an effectively frozen conflict, this section is inapplicable to this thesis. Finally, the last section discusses the question surrounding evidence, which is arguably the largest limitation to this thesis, since it is difficult, if not impossible, to obtain a detailed and objective account of a decision- or policy-making process. These organizing concepts are key markers to determine whether Germany's *Russlandpolitik* can be more adequately explained through the bureaucratic/governmental politics model than the RAM lens.

The information used to support the analysis of the above-outlined methodology will include primary sources, such as policy publications, open source ministerial publications and briefing notes, speeches and interviews given by executive actors in each ministry analyzed, and parliamentary transcripts. To enhance this selection of sources and to provide depth to the analysis, this thesis will also draw on secondary sources, such as academic publications, think tank publications, and German, English, French, and Russian language media sources.

A possible limitation with this methodological approach is the scarcity of objective insight into the process that leads to decisions and policies. This is to say that while certain aspects of the decision- and policy-making processes are accessible to the public through transcripts or media coverage, it may be difficult, if not impossible, to gain complete insight into understanding which motivations and interests drove the processes in these three government departments. To alleviate this challenge, this thesis will focus on politics relevant to the post-Crimean era

between 2014 and now, as this limits the analysis to a time period where certain principles and motivations are consistent and clear within the German Government, such as Germany's belief in the international legal order, a liberal economic system and free trade, and respecting states' sovereign integrity.

### 2.3.1. Operationalizing the Methodology

As the purpose of this thesis is to test whether Germany's Russia policies as carried out by the German Federal Ministries of Foreign Affairs, Defence, and Economic Affairs and Energy follow the RAM or whether the bureaucratic/governmental politics model more adequately explains Germany's behaviour, the two theories need to be tested. To test them, the three case studies in this thesis will establish baselines for each of the three ministries analyzed as case studies. The baselines will delineate each ministry's "normal" behaviour that would fall in line with the overarching *Russlandpolitik* of the German Federal Government, as well as identify the bureaucratic policy parameters of each ministry. Once these baselines are established, it will be easier to discern whether the ministries are behaving abnormally, meaning they have deviated from Germany's overarching *Russlandpolitik* and better fit into the bureaucratic/governmental politics model than the RAM.

There are several influencing factors that contribute to this baseline. One significant factor is the inherent nature of the three ministries, which are largely influenced through their histories. Consequently, historical influences, such as the creation of some ministries following the end of the Second World War and their establishment during the Cold War, have played a large part in determining the ministries' values, priorities, and behaviour. Another influencing factor concerns the leadership of each ministry. As the bureaucratic/governmental politics model argues that, unlike the RAM, there are numerous influences and actors that determine foreign

policy outcomes, the individual holding the ministerial position of each ministry and their political party affiliation need to contribute to the establishment of these baselines. Taking the minister's convictions and experiences, as well as their party affiliation, into consideration will help determine how each ministerial case study in the subsequent chapters fits into testing this thesis' hypothesis. This is to say that if a ministry has been under the leadership of one individual with belonging to the ruling party, one should expect that this ministry is more likely to have policies that align with the overall government Russia policies. Alternatively, if a ministry has had multiple individuals at its helm, some of which may represent different political parties, the ministry may have diverging policies toward Russia.

The final set of influencing factors concerns the most high-level considerations of a government. This is to say that the political party in power as well as the ruling coalition need to play into the establishment of baselines, as the government will have set out policy expectations that should be reflected within each ministry. This reflection should be evident in both the ministry's policies as well as the implementation of these policies. The second aspect of this set of influencing factors are the government's overall policy goals. While it is to be expected that all ministries are aligned with the Federal Government's overall goals, nuances in these policies, the rhetoric surrounding them, and their implementation might indicate a deviation from the RAM and support the bureaucratic/governmental politics model.

#### 2.4. Theoretical Literature Review

The literature surrounding the RAM is extensive as it has been applied to all major international relations theories. In comparison, the bureaucratic/governmental politics model's literature is more limited in scope and is less frequently applied to case studies and international

relations theories. This section will conduct a literature review of key publications with a specific focus on the publications Allison and Zelikow used in the construction of their arguments surrounding the RAM and the bureaucratic/governmental politics model. First, this section will focus on the literature surrounding strategic decision-making models to determine when and why the RAM or other models were utilized to analyze and explain decision- and policy-making processes. The section will then turn to works of realism and liberalism to discern which decision-making model has been used more frequently.

One key aspect of Allison and Zelikow's criticism of the RAM and their consequent presentation of two alternative decision-making models lies with the limited number of accepted actors on the international stage within the RAM. This is to say that there are actors interacting with each other, but this number is limited to one actor – or voice – per side. Thomas C. Schelling's *The Strategy of Conflict* supports this argument by discussing the strategy of actors involved with one another. Throughout the book Schelling presents various actors ranging from children fighting to states involved in conflicts to discuss strategy and rationality. Although Schelling does not directly associate this limited number of actors with rationality or rational actors, he nonetheless assumes throughout the book that there is only one actor on each side of a conflict arguing and strategizing, regardless of whether this actor is rational or irrational.<sup>20</sup> As a result, the analysis remains limited to the assumption that each actor must represent a different side.

---

<sup>20</sup> Thomas C. Schelling, *The Strategy of Conflict* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1960), 11.; *Ibid.*, 16-17.; *Ibid.*, 144-145.

In addition to the limited number of actors on each side of a conflict, Schelling, John C. Harsanyi, and Morton Deutsch, among others, also operated based on the assumption that each actor is aware of and is willing and able to contemplate all possible options before making a decision. While this contemplative period may seem necessary and obvious, as Harsanyi argues in his essay “Some Social-Science Implications of a New Approach to Game Theory” when talking about the rational and irrational choices when treating pneumonia, it may not always be a realistic expectation.<sup>21</sup> Similar to Harsanyi’s approach to rational choice, Deutsch’s paper “Bargaining, Threat, and Communication: Some Experimental Studies” continues with the assumption that the options are largely binary and can be easily distinguishable between good and bad, yes and no, effective and ineffective.<sup>22</sup> This limitation of choices in these analyses maintains the assumption that rational choice must be good without any need of qualifications, which ultimately transcends into the RAM.

Building on the assumption that there is one actor for each side of a conflict or argument, Bruce Bueno de Mesquita and David Lalman introduce this approach to different levels of decision-making in their book *War and Reason: Domestic and International Imperatives*. Even though Bueno de Mesquita and Lalman also recognize that states are unitary actors on the international stage and that decision makers are able to “assess the desirability of outcomes according to the various costs and benefits that the outcomes are anticipated to entail, their analysis provides a slightly more nuanced approach to explaining foreign policy decision-making

---

<sup>21</sup> John C. Harsanyi, “Some Social-Science Implications of a New Approach to Game Theory,” in *Strategic Interaction and Conflict: Original Papers and Discussion*, ed. Archibald (Berkeley, CA: Institute of International Studies, 1966), 1.

<sup>22</sup> Morton Deutsch, “Bargaining, Threat, and Communication: Some Experimental Studies,” in *Strategic Interaction and Conflict: Original Papers and Discussion*, ed. Archibald (Berkeley, CA: Institute of International Studies, 1966), 19-21.

processes.<sup>23</sup> Countering realist scholars, Bueno de Mesquita and Lalman approach the notion that each side is represented by one unitary actor each by presenting it in the form of a pyramid. This is to say that although states are represented by one voice on the international stage, this voice is created by an increasingly limited number of voices representing different aspects of policies as the policy moves up the ladder to be ultimately represented on the international stage.<sup>24</sup> However, this analysis still leaves little room for nuanced stakeholders and interests, as this decision-making process remains a binary question of rationality.

Providing further nuance, Gordon A. Craig and Alexander L. George discuss international negotiation processes in their book *Force and Statecraft: Diplomatic Problems of Our Time*. Unlike authors such as Schelling, Harsanyi, Deutsch, Bueno de Mesquita, or Lalman, Craig and George acknowledge that the choices, even of a rational actor, are non-binary and may include more options than the previously assumed good or bad options, as negotiating sides require “common interests and issues of conflict” in order to come to the table.<sup>25</sup> Nevertheless, while Craig and George present actors capable of compromising in order to proceed with negotiations, they assume that each negotiating party, namely states, are unitary rational actors when interacting with one another. Consequently, the authors presume that each state has one opinion, policy, and diplomatic toolbox on the international stage and do not account for the potential of varying interests, interpretations, and policy goals of different ministries or key actors within a specific state.

---

<sup>23</sup> Bruce Bueno de Mesquita and David Lalman, *War and Reason: Domestic and International Imperatives* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1992), 25.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, 26-27.

<sup>25</sup> Gordon A. Craig and Alexander L. George, *Force and Statecraft: Diplomatic Problems of Our Time* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1983), 157.

Throughout realist literature, the RAM and the assumption that states with unified policies are the only actors on the international stage prevail as the dominant baseline. Beginning with E. H. Carr's *The Twenty Year's Crisis*, Carr acknowledges that "the effective units of power" on the international stage are "nation-states."<sup>26</sup> Although Carr also recognizes that a new international order may bring about different power dynamics, he holds on to the argument that whatever the dominant "group unit" will be in such a new international order, these group units will remain the effective units of power that are able to interact and bargain with other group units.<sup>27</sup> As such, the number of actors representing a state or any other "group unit" remain the only acceptable actors on the international stage.

Going beyond the representation of group units on the international states, realist scholars criticized the growing influence of domestic politics on international and foreign policies. One such scholar was Hans Morgenthau, who regretted the increasing influence of actors not traditionally associated with foreign policy and international decision-making processes.<sup>28</sup> Although Morgenthau is frequently considered to be the theoretical father of contemporary forms of realism, he goes beyond the binary choices rational actors, in this case states, have in diplomacy and recognizes the compromises exist and are important if it means protecting a state's national security.<sup>29</sup> Nonetheless, Morgenthau sees the state as the only actor on the international stage and argues that governments should be the ones controlling policies,

---

<sup>26</sup> E. H. Carr, *The Twenty Years' Crisis 1919-1939: An Introduction to the Study of International Relations* (Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave, 2001), 209.

<sup>27</sup> Ibid.

<sup>28</sup> Bueno de Mesquita and Lalman, *War and Reason*, 27-28.; Hans J. Morgenthau, *Politics among Nations* (New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf, 1973), 530-531.

<sup>29</sup> Hans J. Morgenthau, *Politics among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace* (New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf, 1978), 554-555.

opinions, and interests in the interest of the state and what would ultimately become the stance that a state takes on the international stage.<sup>30</sup>

Though less explicit, Kenneth N. Waltz in *Man, the State and War: A Theoretical Analysis* assumes that states are the ultimate, and only, actors on the international stage. Even in discussions of liberalism, for example, does Waltz not even recognize that there may be other actors or influences on the international stage.<sup>31</sup> This reduces any possibility of acknowledging other influences and powers internationally and effectively eliminates the reader to even recognize that theories and models do recognize the role of other powers on the international stage. Furthermore, Waltz continues to place these foundational limitations throughout his book *Theory of International Politics*, and the inherent structure of Waltz's structural realism is based on states' interests within the international system, assuming that they are unitary entities.

Moving beyond structural realism, Robert O. Keohane's 1986 *Neorealism and its Critics* proposes a significantly more nuanced approach to understanding the international system, as Keohane introduces a level of bureaucratic politics into the otherwise realist interpretation of the global order.<sup>32</sup> As Keohane states, states as "principal actors in world politics [...] would remain the same, although more emphasis would be placed on nonstate actors, intergovernmental organizations, and transnational and transgovernmental relations."<sup>33</sup> This deviation from other realist paradigms is a considerable analytical shift. Nevertheless, this shift continues to fall short of explaining whether these actors are able or expected to act on behalf

---

<sup>30</sup> Morgenthau, *Politics among Nations* (1978), 558.

<sup>31</sup> Kenneth N. Waltz, *Man, the State and War: A Theoretical Analysis* (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2001), 95-104.

<sup>32</sup> Robert O. Keohane, "Theory of World Politics: Structural Realism and Beyond," in *Neorealism and its Critics*, ed. Keohane (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1986), 192.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, 193.

of one state or whether they should be limiting their international representation to their specific field of expertise. Furthermore, while multiple actors beyond the Westphalian state may be recognized actors on the international stage, Keohane does not discuss whether state actors speak with a unified voice or how one could account for variations or discrepancies of one state actor.

Moving beyond structural realist interpretations, Keohane proposes an interpretation of neoliberal institutionalism in *International Institutions and State Power: Essays in International Relations Theory*. Keohane's 1989 interpretation of neoliberal institutionalism argues that although the involvement of other actors within the international system, such as international and nongovernmental organizations, is worth analyzing, states remain the primary actors.<sup>34</sup> Keohane continues by listing the three forms of international institutions, which include "formal intergovernmental or cross-national nongovernmental organizations," "international regimes," and "conventions."<sup>35</sup> Although this expansion of recognized actors within the international system is beneficial to the analysis of international relations, this analytical approach continues to fall short of explaining Germany's behaviour through its *Russlandpolitik*. While Keohane's neoliberal institutionalism provides a compatible explanation and framework of analysis for Germany's behaviour within the international realm, it does not provide an adequate framework through which to analyse Germany's internal governmental behaviour that leads to its actions internationally.

---

<sup>34</sup> Robert O. Keohane, *International Institutions and State Power: Essays in International Relations Theory* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1989), 2.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, 3-4.

A similar shortfall exists with John M. Owen IV's 1997 book *Liberal Peace, Liberal War: American Politics and International Security*, as Owen recognizes the role of international organizations within the international system as important. Despite this recognition and the understanding that individuals can also be liberal and have opinions, Owen does not translate this to the internal processes that lead to states' specific behaviour.<sup>36</sup> Instead, Owen translates the liberal behaviour and expectations onto states when discussing the international system, effectively removing the possibility to account for individuals acting on the international stage. Moreover, the assumption that each state acts coherently to its previous policies removes any chance of a state producing diverging policies depending on intragovernmental bureaucracies.

In 2006, Morton H. Halperin and Priscilla A. Clapp disputed the RAM that was used, both explicitly and implicitly, in the literature discussed above. Instead, Halperin and Clapp used the bureaucratic politics model to analyze US decision-making processes and generalize their findings to apply to other states as well as international behaviour writ large. As such, interpersonal behaviour, such as friendships or rivalries, may influence decision-making and thus affect foreign policy decisions.<sup>37</sup> Furthermore, different states, governments, ministries, and individuals may prioritize different issues and thus focus on certain aspects more than others, further skewing the rational decision-making procedures expected in the RAM.<sup>38</sup> Finally, misunderstandings between individuals as well as governments may also skew decisions since not everyone is aware of all processes, opinions, and interests that led to the decisions that were made.<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> John M. Owen IV, *Liberal Peace, Liberal War: American Politics and International Security* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1997), 36-37.

<sup>37</sup> Morton H. Halperin and Priscilla A. Clapp, *Bureaucratic Politics and Foreign Policy* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 2006), 361.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, 362.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, 363.

Preceding Halperin and Clapp's argument was another analytical discussion of the bureaucratic politics model. It was conducted by Glenn H. Snyder and Paul Diesing in 1977 in *Conflict Among Nations: Bargaining, Decision Making, and System Structure in International Crises*. In their discussion of the bureaucratic politics model, Snyder and Diesing highlight the importance of recognizing that foreign policy decisions are the result of extensive and complex decision-making and bargaining practices that emanated through various government ministries and bureaucracies involving numerous actors.<sup>40</sup> The authors also emphasize that foreign policies are quite often a reflection of domestic coalitions backing these decisions and normally do not have unanimous domestic support but rather just a majority.<sup>41</sup> Moreover, unlike the RAM that would expect decision makers to weigh all options equally, the bureaucratic politics model and Snyder and Diesing recognize that excluding a policy option or point of view can be achieved "simply by not consulting someone."<sup>42</sup>

Zeev Maoz criticizes the bureaucratic politics model's nature in the 1990 book *National Choices and International Processes*. Using Bueno de Mesquita and J.D. Singer's article "Alliances, Capabilities, and War: A Review and Synthesis" as an analytical foundation, Maoz recognizes that the influence of domestic decision and policy makers is significant in foreign policy-making and international negotiations.<sup>43</sup> Moreover, Maoz argues that "one must explain how system structure and national attributes affect the perceptions, beliefs, and values of national decision makers."<sup>44</sup> Maoz continues, arguing that "one must explain how these perceptions, beliefs, and

---

<sup>40</sup> Glenn H. Snyder and Paul Diesing, *Conflict Among Nations: Bargaining, Decision Making, and System Structure in International Crises* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1977), 349.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, 349-350.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, 351.

<sup>43</sup> Zeev Maoz, *National Choices and International Processes* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 37.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*

values of national leaders “produce” the observed [...] behavior.”<sup>45</sup> Comparing the “analytic (rational) model of decision” to the bureaucratic politics model, Maoz recognizes that “[t]he treatment of groups as unitary actors can be very useful in policy analyses” but that these approaches “are overly simplistic in that they tend to obscure the effects of interpersonal interaction on the structure and outcomes of collective choice.”<sup>46</sup> Though Maoz appears to value the importance of such complexity, the author also argues that Allison’s bureaucratic politics model is not a “distinctly new explanation of how foreign policy decisions are really made.”<sup>47</sup> Instead, Maoz argues that Allison’ bureaucratic politics model is “an extension of the cybernetic model to the intraorganizational level and of the analytic model to the interorganizational level.”<sup>48</sup> The cybernetic model is based on two criticisms of the analytic/rational model. The first one is that the analytic/rational model expects decision and policy makers to have “computational and information processing skills which they do not possess in reality” and the second criticism focuses on the fact that outside of theoretical models, policy alternatives do not all appear simultaneously so each can be weighed against the other options that may appear over the course of a crisis, for example.<sup>49</sup> As such, Maoz’s assessment is that Allison’s bureaucratic politics model is not a radically new approach to interpreting decision-making processes but rather is a derivative of the cybernetic model that criticizes the unrealistic expectations of the RAM.

---

<sup>45</sup> Ibid., 37-38.

<sup>46</sup> Ibid., 169.

<sup>47</sup> Ibid., 216.

<sup>48</sup> Ibid.

<sup>49</sup> Ibid., 178-179.

The above-analyzed international relations literature constructs a diverse landscape that provides various explanations as to how states interact with one another on the international stage and who constitutes as an actor on that stage. While some authors, such as Keohane and Owen, go into detail and paint a picture that goes beyond the classic realist black-and-white image within the international system and recognize that there are nuances in states' international behaviour, the intrinsic assumption is that no matter the theoretical framework, each state acts in a unified manner based on the RAM. The realist literature consistently underlines the notion that rationality is inherent to a realist paradigm, which has consequently resulted in the majority of the literature discussing the RAM being realist in nature. Only a handful of authors recognized the importance of individual actors influencing a state's policies. One of the most notable ones is Zeev Maoz. Although Maoz recognizes the role of individuals, Maoz's text mostly provides a critique of Allison and Zelikow's bureaucratic/governmental politics model and situates it within the cybernetic model. The result of this is that it merely situates the model without providing a constructive new insight into it.

## 2.5. Literature Review of Germany's Foreign Policy and *Russlandpolitik*

This section will proceed to review the literature surrounding Germany's foreign policy and *Russlandpolitik* through four separate categories: German foreign policy toward Russia, Russo-German bilateral relations, Russian relations between the European Union (EU) and Germany, and finally Russo-German relations in the context of NATO. Finally, this section will discuss the limitations and shortfalls of the existing literature.

### 2.5.1. German Foreign Policy Toward Russia

Germany's foreign policy toward Russia has been continuously changing, with the two most significant catalysts to this change being Putin's re-election as president in 2012 and

Russia's involvement in the Ukraine crisis beginning in 2013. Tuomas Forsberg, Marco Siddi, and Jackson Janes recognize these events – albeit through different interpretations – as key points in Russo-German relations. As such, Forsberg introduces a theoretical framework to explain the change in German foreign policy that is in turn picked up by Siddi's analysis. Alternatively, Janes provides a different point of view by discussing German priorities after the 2013 federal election, predominantly focusing on German-US relations. Janes recognizes a change brought about by the Ukraine crisis. Finally, Stephen Szabo uses the theoretical approach of commercial realism in explaining Germany's foreign policies as a geo-economic power.

Tuomas Forsberg's article "From *Ostpolitik* to 'frostpolitik'? Merkel, Putin and German foreign policy towards Russia" critically assesses whether German foreign policy toward Russia has changed since the Russian annexation of Crimea as it has been made out to be by academic and media commentators. While Forsberg clearly presents the case for the Cold War approach of *Ostpolitik* no longer being applicable, the author also underlines the fact that the policy approaches taken during the 1990s and early 2000s no longer apply either. Instead, Forsberg assesses the developments within German foreign policy since the beginning of Merkel's chancellorship in 2005 until the writing of his article in 2016. The result of this analysis is that Germany's foreign policy change toward Russia can be best explained through a change in political and diplomatic interests rather than economic ones. Nevertheless, Germany's commitment to non-military involvement in Ukraine has remained unchanged.

Forsberg utilizes a variety of theoretical approaches to explain Germany's foreign policy change – or lack thereof. Charles Hermann's foreign policy change theory focuses on four change agents. These include changes driven by leadership, bureaucratic advocacy, domestic

restructuring, and external shock. As such, Forsberg argues that following Hermann's terminology, Germany's policy change was a "'program change', involving changes in the methods or means by which the goal or problem is addressed."<sup>50</sup> This is to say that the German foreign policy change can be placed on Hermann's scale between "adjustment" and "international orientation change."<sup>51</sup> Combining Hermann's four change categories with Kjell Goldmann's distinction between "external conditions," "learning based on negative feedback," and "changes in leadership and its composition," Forsberg attempts to explain Germany's foreign policy change through the three categories of "power politics, domestic politics and interaction dynamics."<sup>52</sup> As the realist explanation of power politics would have required Germany to become more conciliatory toward Russian actions and policies, Forsberg quickly rejects power politics as an explanation for Germany's foreign policy change.

Domestic politics – the second category – Forsberg also rejects, as Germany's ruling party throughout this change remained the Christian Democratic Union (CDU) and although the CDU's coalition partners changed, this change does not correspond with the foreign policy change. Civil society actors and, most notably, interest groups also cannot be attributed to the foreign policy change as interest groups and business lobbies ultimately supported Germany's sanctions against Russia, "albeit with a heavy heart."<sup>53</sup> Finally, German public opinion does not clearly change so that it could be the main driver behind Germany's foreign policy change. This is to say that the German public's support for sanctions only increased after the implementation of such sanctions,

---

<sup>50</sup> Tuomas Forsberg, "From *Ostpolitik* to 'frostpolitik'? Merkel, Putin and German foreign policy towards Russia," *International Affairs* 92, no. 1 (2016): 37.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, 38.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, 34.

yet half of those asked fell on either side of agreeing with the German Government in that sanctions were either too soft or too harsh.<sup>54</sup> Finally, the third category, focusing on the “dynamics of interaction between state leaders and foreign policy elites,” is most likely to explain Germany’s foreign policy change.<sup>55</sup> However, only insofar as Germany’s relationship with Russia began to deteriorate in 2012 when Putin returned to the Russian presidency after a four year hiatus, and Merkel and Frank-Walter Steinmeier’s disillusionment with Russia following the annexation of Crimea and Russia’s support of unmarked armed groups in eastern Ukraine.<sup>56</sup>

Forsberg agrees the most with David Welch’s theory of foreign policy change, which argues that foreign policy is less likely to change in “bureaucratic and democratic states such as Germany,” citing Germany’s *Ostpolitik* as evidence.<sup>57</sup> Welch’s theory further argues that foreign policy is most likely to change when previous policies have failed, which Forsberg interprets as the *Ostpolitik*’s failure in resolving the Ukrainian crisis. Unlike Hermann’s and Goldmann’s approaches, which identify aspects that did not change in accordance with Germany’s foreign policy but rather changed at random times, Forsberg’s theoretical interpretation of Germany’s foreign policy change most closely resembles that of Welch’s approach.

Similar to Forsberg’s discussion of the change in German foreign policy toward Russia since 2012, Marco Siddi’s article “German Foreign Policy towards Russia in the Aftermath of the Ukraine Crisis: A New *Ostpolitik*?” agrees with Forsberg’s conclusion that Germany’s change in foreign policy is, after all, largely a continuation of Germany’s existing *Ostpolitik* – albeit one

---

<sup>54</sup> Ibid., 39.

<sup>55</sup> Ibid.

<sup>56</sup> Ibid., 39-40.

<sup>57</sup> Ibid., 40.

adapted to a new security environment. Unlike Forsberg, however, Siddi does not focus on how the policies have changed and what caused Germany's foreign policy toward Russia to change, but rather what Germany's foreign policy toward Russia looks like following the Russian annexation of Crimea.

Although Siddi largely agrees with Forsberg and heavily relies on Forsberg's analysis and theoretical framework, Siddi does not explicitly discuss theoretical tenets of his argument. Instead, Siddi provides an insightful discussion into the nature of Germany's *Ostpolitik* and more general *Russlandpolitik*. As such, Siddi argues that Germany's *Ostpolitik* was never a standalone policy but rather has been accompanied and supported by a "rejection of war as a means of resolving disputes, respect for human rights, support for democratic principles, transatlanticism, multilateralism and European integration."<sup>58</sup> This combination and incorporation of values into Germany's foreign policy toward Russia can be seen as the origin of Germany's common dual-track approach to dealing with Russia. This is to say that while Germany engages in sanction regimes and openly condemns Russia, it nonetheless supports open dialogue and economic cooperation. While these two tracks generally appear to be irreconcilable, past German ministers have hoped that economic cooperation would have positive spillover effects into Russia regarding human rights and democratic values.<sup>59</sup> While this spillover effect never materialized, the complexity of Germany's *Russlandpolitik* and its connections to Germany's Basic Law (*Grundgesetz*) as well as to Germany's fundamental values has maintained Germany's dual-track approach relatively unchanging despite the drastically changed security environment.

---

<sup>58</sup> Marco Siddi, "German Foreign Policy towards Russia in the Aftermath of the Ukraine Crisis: A New *Ostpolitik*?" *Europe-Asia Studies* 68, no. 4 (2016): 666.

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*

Consequently, even though Siddi coins Germany's post-2014 *Russlandpolitik* a "new *Ostpolitik*," the author's assessment is more in line with a reorientation of the existing *Ostpolitik* away from predominantly economic approaches to a more balanced one that includes political, diplomatic, and cultural considerations.

One interesting aspect that Forsberg did not recognize but Siddi highlighted was the pressure exerted by the US on Germany in the direct aftermath of the Ukraine crisis to condemn Russian actions. While German politicians did not agree with Russian actions, Germany only condemned Russia reluctantly at first. This changed, according to Siddi, when the US reasoned with Germany, emphasizing Germany's *Westbindung* (adherence to the West) and membership in NATO.<sup>60</sup> This tension between *Westbindung* and *Ostpolitik* is described in more detail in Joyce Marie Mushaben's book *Becoming Madam Chancellor: Angela Merkel and the Berlin Republic*, which will be discussed in the next section. More directly related to Germany's foreign policy decisions and decision-making processes is Jackson Janes' discussion of the German Government's formulation of foreign policy following the 2013 German federal elections.

Jackson Janes' article "Merkel 3.0: German Foreign Policy in the Aftermath of the 2013 Bundestag Election" provides a normative assessment of the third government under the leadership of Angela Merkel. As the article was published in the fall of 2014, the majority of the article appears to have been written prior to Russia's annexation of Crimea. This becomes evident as the article focuses on the argument that Germany should take on a larger role concerning peace and security on the international stage. While the article predominantly focuses on the German bilateral relationship with the US, Janes nevertheless highlights common global interests

---

<sup>60</sup> Ibid., 668.

between Germany and Russia. Even though the article was written prior to the majority of the developments in Ukraine that introduced a new security environment in the Euro-Atlantic region, Janes' main policy suggestion is that Germany needs to play a larger role internationally. Although this proposal was made with the Arab Spring and NATO's involvement in Afghanistan in mind, it provides an interesting normative basis on which to judge Germany's involvement in the Ukraine crisis and its subsequent involvement in NATO's EFP, which arguably contradicts with Germany's previous foreign policy record.

Stephen Szabo presents an entirely different approach to explaining German foreign policy in his article "Germany's Commercial Realism and the Russia Problem." Using the theoretical framework of commercial realism, Szabo constructs Germany as a geo-economic power. Placing Germany as the antithesis to traditional military powers such as the US and Russia, Szabo argues that Germany's geo-economic approach is inherently post-Westphalian.<sup>61</sup> Since the creation of the Federal Republic of Germany after the end of the Second World War, Germany was able to focus on its economic development and over time, its economic influence played key roles in German reunification and Germany's development into Europe's economic powerhouse.<sup>62</sup> Although other authors have recognized that the German Government's attempt to change Russia's human rights record and democratize its political system through trade, Szabo argues that trade was given priority over concerns "such as the promotion of human rights and democracy."<sup>63</sup> The most significant difference between Szabo and the other authors presented in this section is that Szabo argues that Germany aims for a post-Westphalian system, which is

---

<sup>61</sup> Stephen F. Szabo, "Germany's Commercial Realism and the Russia Problem," *Survival* 56, no. 5 (2014): 123.

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*, 118.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*, 119.

“particularly apparent...because of the country’s aversion to the use of force.”<sup>64</sup> While the other authors do not directly discuss whether Germany believes in the Westphalian state system, Forsberg and Siddi emphasize the shift in Germany’s *Ostpolitik* from purely economic tactics to a more holistic approach.

Following the change in German foreign policy toward Russia beginning with the Ukraine crisis in 2014, Forsberg provides an effective and applicable theoretical framework to explain the change that has taken place since then. Siddi focuses on the developments within Germany’s *Russlandpolitik* since the annexation of Crimea and explains its current state, furthering Forsberg’s theory. Janes, in support of Siddi, highlights the importance of the German-US relationship and how it influences Germany’s foreign policy considerations toward Russia. Szabo’s article is the outlier in those analyzed. While Szabo does not directly recognize that the Ukraine crisis has caused German foreign policy to shift, his understanding and interpretation of realism is questionable in that it relies on an unpublished article and does not fit into the existing and commonly accepted theoretical frameworks utilized for the realist school of thought.

#### 2.5.2. German-Russian Bilateral Relations

The “special” relationship between Germany and Russia is especially evident when analyzing Russo-German bilateral relations. The distinctiveness of the Russo-German relationship is mostly explained through three lenses: the historic experiences shared by Germany and Russia dating back centuries; Germany’s role as the bridge between Russia and the West, especially the EU; and the personal relationship of Germany’s and Russia’s leaders, most notably German Chancellor Angela Merkel and Russian President Vladimir Putin. Steve Wood and Jennifer Yoder

---

<sup>64</sup> Ibid., 123.

take a historical perspective and assess the impact historic relations between Germany and Russia have on relations between the two countries in the twenty-first century. Alexander Rahr and Graham Timmins discuss the importance of Germany's role as the broker or bridge between the West and Russia. Finally, Randall Newnham and Joyce Marie Mushaben focus on the impact Merkel and Putin's personal relationship has on international relations, especially in the deterioration of relations beginning in 2012.

#### 2.5.2.1. German-Russian Bilateral Relations: Historic Factors

Steve Wood's article "Germany, Russia, Europe: Multilevel politics and the divergent resonance of "history"" assesses the Russo-German bilateral relationship from a predominantly historical perspective. Arguing that Russia was surprised to find a Germany after the end of the Cold War that had changed drastically since the Third Reich, initial diplomatic approaches fell on dead ears in Germany.<sup>65</sup> Nevertheless, Russia has singled out Germany as the spokesperson of western Europe and the EU as it is the largest economic power in the region. Wood presents Germany to be almost ambivalent toward Russia fostering relations with it while Russia is eager to maintain a working relationship with Germany. Despite this effort, however, Wood presents a significant difference between the two countries. While Germany is embracing diplomatic pragmatism while having aligned its values with its diplomatic goals and foreign policies, Russia focuses on the past and sees it as the contemporary continuation of the Russian Empire and the Soviet Union. This difference connects to the tension between Germany as a progressive pluralist society while Russian conservatism increasingly takes hold of the Russian government. Moreover, Wood frequently references realist thinkers throughout the article and shows how their theories

---

<sup>65</sup> Steve Wood, "Germany, Russia, Europe: Multilevel politics and the divergent resonance of "history"," *International Journal* 72, no. 3 (2017): 341.

would apply. Wood does not argue that their stances are the best ones for describing Russia's relationship with Germany, and consequently defies realist theories more than supports them.

Unlike Wood's general assessment of Russo-German relations since the end of the Cold War, Jennifer Yoder focuses on how the relationship between Germany and Russia was able to decline so significantly since 2012. Yoder argues that the positive relationship between Russia and Germany that was established during the 1990s and flourished during the time of Gerhard Schröder's chancellorship began to cool with Merkel's election as chancellor in 2005.<sup>66</sup> Consequently, Yoder argues that the relationship between Germany and Russia has changed because of different leaders and governments since the end of the Cold War, but also since Merkel's first government in 2005. Moreover, the relationship between the two countries has deteriorated due to Russia's return to the Soviet Union's understanding of status and power, which was in turn furthered by Putin's re-election in 2012 and the increasingly extreme Russian foreign policies.<sup>67</sup> Germany's soft power approach that heavily relies on civil society and the promotion of human rights is thus opposed by Russia's interpretation of power, namely its hard power approach that focuses on military strength and prestige on the international stage. As such, Germany's win-win approach and liberal institutionalism is countered by Russia's zero-sum interpretation of international relations and structural realism.<sup>68</sup> As a result of this opposing behaviour, Russia does not see Germany as a bridge to Europe but rather as a gateway for Russian resurgent power.<sup>69</sup>

---

<sup>66</sup> Jennifer A. Yoder, "From Amity to Enmity: German-Russian Relations in the Post Cold War Period," *German Politics and Society* 33, no. 3 (2015): 52.

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*, 62.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*, 63.

#### 2.5.2.2. German-Russian Bilateral Relations: Germany Bridging East-West

Focusing more on the policy aspects than theoretical interpretation of the relationship between Germany and Russia, Alexander Rahr's 2007 article "Germany and Russia: A Special Relationship" identifies two factors that lead to the relationship that developed between Germany and Russia after the end of the Cold War. The first factor is Germany and Russia's historic relationships ranging from the German and Russian Empires during the late nineteenth century to the enmity between the two countries during the second half of the Second World War and into the Cold War. As a result, Rahr argues, Germany and Russia continue to maintain a special interest in each other that is unparalleled to any other EU member state's relationship with Russia.<sup>70</sup> The second factor is Germany's orientation toward Russia within the EU. While the southern European members focus on their Mediterranean outlook and the Nordic countries also do not include Russia, Germany, according to Rahr, decided to focus on and draw in central and eastern Europe, including Russia.<sup>71</sup> As a result, Germany's special relationship with Russia was able to continue into the post-Cold War era and well into the twenty-first century.

Similar to Rahr's article, Graham Timmins' article "German-Russian Bilateral Relations and the EU Policy on Russia: Between Normalisation and the 'Multilateral Reflex'" was published before Putin's return to power in 2012 and the Russian annexation of Crimea in 2014. As a result, the deterioration of relations that occurred after these two events does not overshadow Timmins' discussion. Nevertheless, Timmins argues that despite the "special" qualities and character of German-Russian relations, they began to deteriorate around 2007 and 2008. Timmins attributes this deterioration to energy disputes with Ukraine and Belarus in 2006 and

---

<sup>70</sup> Alexander Rahr, "Germany and Russia: A Special Relationship," *Washington Quarterly* 30, no. 2 (2007): 139.

<sup>71</sup> *Ibid.*, 138.

2007 that saw reduced gas supplies to EU member states, as well as Merkel taking on the role as German chancellor.<sup>72</sup> Both Rahr and Timmins present a situation in which German-Russian relations began to deteriorate around 2007, yet channels of communication remained open and cooperative efforts continued. Similarly, both authors attribute this continued effort to work together to the historic relationship that Germany and Russia have.

#### 2.5.2.3. German-Russian Bilateral Relations: German and Russian Leadership

The relationship between Angela Merkel and Vladimir Putin is considered to be an influential factor of German-Russian relations. As such, Randall Newnham analyses the impact of the relationship between the post-Cold War German and Russian leaders' relationships on German-Russian relations in his article "Germany and Russia Since Reunification: Continuity, Change, and the Role of Leaders." Compared to the relationship between Putin and Merkel's predecessor Gerhard Schröder, the relationship between Merkel and Putin cooled German-Russian relations diplomatically. Nevertheless, Newnham argues that relations between Germany and Russia deepened under Merkel until 2012 and trade tripled during Merkel's first two terms.<sup>73</sup> Nonetheless, when Putin was re-elected in 2012 and the Ukraine crisis began in 2013, Merkel's open criticism of Russia and the ever-cooling personal ties between Merkel and Putin contributed to the cooling of Russo-German relations.<sup>74</sup>

Joyce Marie Mushaben also analyzes the Russo-German bilateral relationship through the relationship between Putin and Merkel in her book *Becoming Madam Chancellor: Angela Merkel*

---

<sup>72</sup> Graham Timmins, "German-Russian Bilateral Relations and the EU Policy on Russia: Between Normalisation and the 'Multilateral Reflex'," *Journal of Contemporary European Studies* 19, no. 2 (2011): 191.

<sup>73</sup> Randall Newnham, "Germany and Russia Since Reunification: Continuity, Change, and the Role of Leaders," *German Politics and Society* 35, no. 1 (2017): 53-54.

<sup>74</sup> *Ibid.*, 55.

*and the Berlin Republic*. Mushaben argues that the relationship between Merkel and Putin is crucial in understanding Russo-German relations. Beginning with the fact that both Merkel and Putin lived behind the Iron Curtain and spent the last five years of the Cold War in East Germany, Mushaben argues that Merkel understands Putin's attitude better than other western leaders. This assessment stands in contrast to Newnham's argument, which is that while both Merkel and Putin lived in East Germany, the lessons they learned from the fall of the Berlin Wall were vastly different. This is to say that Merkel experienced the fall of the wall as a lesson that freedom will always succeed, while Putin experienced the fall of the Berlin Wall as a state of anarchy purported by the West.<sup>75</sup> While Mushaben does not explicitly discuss the change in German foreign policy since the beginning of the Ukraine crisis, her analysis follows Forsberg's analytical approach of discussing power politics, domestic politics, and, most importantly, interaction dynamics between Merkel and Putin. Expanding on these dynamics, Mushaben presents the dichotomy of *Westbindung* (literally translates to "attachment to the West" and encompasses Germany's deep ties to western institutions and powers) and *Ostpolitik* as creating a very fine line that Germany, and specifically Merkel, needs to walk to maintain its position within the international system.<sup>76</sup> As a result, Mushaben introduces the "Merkel Method" to balance *Westbindung* and *Ostpolitik* by approaching all issues with rationality and ensuring that all possible outcomes are known before making a decision.<sup>77</sup> Ultimately, Mushaben positions Merkel and Putin within a soft power versus hard power debate in which Merkel pushes for détente and deterrence while Putin views

---

<sup>75</sup> Newnham, "Germany and Russia Since Reunification," 57.

<sup>76</sup> Joyce Marie Mushaben, *Becoming Madam Chancellor: Angela Merkel and the Berlin Republic* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 128.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*, 134.

international relations as a zero-sum game.<sup>78</sup> Using the analogy of the unstoppable force (Putin) against an immovable object (Merkel), Mushaben recognizes that the immovable needs to be held in place by strong forces, which she identifies as the EU and NATO.<sup>79</sup>

### 2.5.3. German-Russian Relations and NATO

Another important organization that influences Germany's foreign policies and international behaviour is NATO. As NATO's *raison d'être* includes defending and protecting its allies from Russia, the role of NATO in German-Russian relations is crucial. While the literature focusing on this aspect is limited, Robin Allers discusses Germany's role within NATO and touches on Germany's actions in NATO since the beginning of the Ukraine crisis in his article "The framework nation: can Germany lead on security?."

Focusing on the role Germany played following the beginning of the Ukraine crisis, Allers highlights Germany's role as the diplomatic broker on behalf of NATO and its staunch opposition for NATO to physically intervene in Ukraine.<sup>80</sup> In addition to these diplomatic efforts, "German decision-makers felt the need to prove Berlin's reliability as a European power" and consequently promoted its Framework Nation Concept to strengthen cohesion within NATO and joined the Readiness Action Plan as a framework nation.<sup>81</sup> As a consequence of these actions, "Germany had become a key player in the West's military response to Russian assertiveness."<sup>82</sup> Despite the energy with which Germany approached its commitment to NATO, Allers notes that various

---

<sup>78</sup> Mushaben, *Becoming Madam Chancellor*, 151.

<sup>79</sup> *Ibid.*, 152.

<sup>80</sup> Robin Allers, "The framework nation: can Germany lead on security?," *International Affairs* 92, no. 5 (2016): 1179.

<sup>81</sup> *Ibid.*, 1180.; *Ibid.*, 1182.

<sup>82</sup> *Ibid.*, 1182.

eastern European NATO members remained skeptical about Germany's commitment to defending its allies due to its continuing dual-track policy toward Russia.<sup>83</sup>

Although Allers provides important insight into how Germany acts within NATO vis-à-vis Russia, the available literature on the topic is very limited and does not directly address how Germany's membership within NATO influences its relationship with Russia.

#### *2.5.4. Shortcomings of the Existing Literature*

There are a number of significant gaps within the literature surrounding German-Russian relations and how they are influenced by Germany's membership in the EU and NATO. The majority of the literature focuses on either German-Russian bilateral relations without significant consideration of Germany's role within NATO or the EU, or the relationship between EU and Russia is the focus of discussion. As shown above in the selected literature, the articles discussing EU-Russia relations rarely if at all mention Germany even though in the literature on German foreign policy and German-Russian relations, Germany is frequently mentioned in relation to the EU and how Germany's role and dual-track approach to dealing with Russia is crucial in influencing EU-Russian relations. An even more significant gap in the literature surrounds Germany's role within NATO and how this influences German-Russian relations as well as NATO's relations with Russia. Even though NATO is the main actor that stands in strategic and military opposition to Russia, little attention is paid to specific member states' roles in this rapport beyond the role of the US. As a result, existing analyses that discuss the role of Germany and its traditional dual-track approach to relations with Russia within the context of NATO are very limited.

---

<sup>83</sup> Ibid., 1183.

Finally, there are few theoretical frameworks that have been applied to this field of study. Aside from Forsberg's extensive discussion on various theoretical frameworks and numerous authors providing proof of how German-Russian relations cannot be explained through realist frameworks, most authors refrained from applying theoretical approaches.

## 2.6. Conclusion

This chapter introduced the theoretical framework and methodology this thesis will use as well as the theoretical and case-specific literature reviews on which this thesis is based. Following Allison and Zelikow's *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis*, this thesis will challenge the RAM in interpreting and explaining Germany's decision- and policy-making processes vis-à-vis Russia. This thesis will utilize Allison and Zelikow's "Model III," the bureaucratic/governmental politics model to test whether Germany's *Russlandpolitik* can be better explained with this model than with the RAM. To test this hypothesis, this thesis will conduct three case studies, focusing on the Federal Ministry of Foreign Affairs and their role in mediating the Ukraine Crisis in Chapter 5, the German Federal Ministry of Defence and Germany's involvement in NATO's EFP in Chapter 6, and the Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy and its support of the Nord Stream 2 pipeline project in Chapter 7. In each chapter analyzing one of the three case studies, baselines for the ministry in question will be established in order to determine whether the RAM or bureaucratic/governmental politics model more aptly apply to the ministry and case study. Following the establishment of these baselines, each case study will first be analyzed through the RAM lens through what the existing literature has determined explains Germany's behaviour in these three situations. Each chapter will then turn to analyzing each case study through the lens of the bureaucratic/governmental politics model.

This analysis will be conducted by adapting Allison and Zelikow's "governmental politics model paradigm." This part of each chapter will draw on primary and secondary sources, such as government publications, parliamentary transcripts, key actor's speeches, think tank publications, and academic literature.

Following the introduction of the theoretical framework and methodology, this chapter conducted a literature analysis of the existing theoretical literature surrounding the RAM, how the RAM is used as a foundation in realism and liberalism, and how the RAM compares to the bureaucratic/governmental politics model, to provide an understanding of the ubiquity of the RAM in international relations analyses. The literature review then turned to an analysis of the existing literature surrounding Germany's foreign policy and *Russlandpolitik*. Through this analysis, this chapter concluded that the existing literature, albeit diverse in arguments, consistently bases its argument on the assumption that the RAM is the basis for Germany's foreign policies and *Russlandpolitik*.

## Chapter 3: History of the Federal Republic of Germany's Federal Ministries

### 3.1. Introduction

The contemporary history of Germany is important to understand when discussing the nature and behaviour of the German Federal Government's ministries, as it has significantly influenced the Federal Republic of Germany's governmental and ministerial structure. As such, this chapter will discuss the history of the governance of the Federal Republic Germany, or more commonly referred to as West Germany, since its creation in 1949 and key events and factors that influenced Germany's Federal Government. This chapter will discuss West Germany's history and is split into two parts. The first part will focus on the history of West Germany from 1949 until 1990. This section will include West Germany's history from its creation after the end of the Second World War and throughout the Cold War. While East Germany's actions would ultimately influence some policy aspects of the post-unification German Federal Government, this analysis predominantly focuses on West Germany's history and politics during the Cold War, as East Germany was absorbed into the Federal Republic of Germany; West Germany's alliances and international agreements prevailed after reunification; and notable policy developments, such as West Germany's *Ostpolitik*, became the basis for post-Cold War German-Russian relations and Germany's *Russlandpolitik*. The second section will discuss the history of Germany from the reunification of East and West Germany in 1990 until the present day. Each section of this chapter will provide an overview of key events that took place during the Cold War and post-Cold War periods respectively. The sections will then focus on the history of (West) Germany's governmental structure and key events that influenced the three ministries that will be analyzed during chapters five, six, and seven of this thesis. The ministries include the German Federal

Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the German Federal Ministry of Defence, and the German Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy.

### 3.2. 1949 to 1990

The Federal Republic of Germany was formed on 23 May 1949 following the end of the Second World War. After the defeat of Nazi Germany by the Allies, Germany was split into four sectors, with each being controlled by one of the victorious powers. As the ideological differences between communism, as promoted by the Soviet Union, and capitalism, promoted by the other three powers, became more evident and their relationship grew increasingly antagonistic, the establishment of a unified post-war Germany turned out to be a pipe dream. Instead, the German territory was split into different sectors; one with a Soviet-socialist paradigm and one with a liberal democratic set of values that would be allied with the West. The Federal Republic of Germany grew out of the three western zones, which had received a federal structure from the US, United Kingdom, and France. Since Berlin, the traditional German capital, was located far in East Germany and had been blockaded by Soviet forces in 1948 and 1949 during the Berlin Blockade, establishing West Germany's capital in Berlin was out of the question. Instead, the city of Bonn was chosen to become the home of the new West German Government and on 15 September 1949, Konrad Adenauer of the Christian Democratic Union (CDU) became the Federal Republic of Germany's first Chancellor. The CDU would establish itself as one of the two *Volksparteien* (people's parties), denoting that it is one of the two large political parties that represent the majority of the West German people. The other *Volkspartei* is the Social Democratic Party (SPD), which considers itself to be centre-left within the political spectrum. Although the Allied powers maintained a military and governing presence in West Germany,

distrust persisted among other European states that Germany may resurge. Attributing the distrust to its historic relationship with Germany, France was especially concerned about the consolidation of German power.<sup>1</sup>

Although France's concerns were historically well-founded, the 1948 Soviet blockade of West Berlin were testament to an increasingly aggressive Soviet Union and raised concerns about the continuing collaborative existence of the Second World War- era Allies.<sup>2</sup> In Bonn, Adenauer became increasingly concerned about the ongoing Soviet militarization of East Germany. This in turn brought forth the question whether West Germany would be able to protect itself from a possible Soviet act of aggression.<sup>3</sup> Consequently, official talks of West German rearmament and integration into western European and transatlantic defence structures began in 1951.<sup>4</sup> In 1955, this reintegration finally became reality when West Germany accepted the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)'s invitation to enter the accession processes and thus became fully integrated into the transatlantic defence structures that would significantly shape West Germany's foreign and defence policies until the present day.

Also in the early 1950s, West Germany became a founding member of the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC), which came into force in 1952. The ECSC was formed by six western and southern European states and it would fundamentally shape West German economic affairs by increasing the economic interdependence of the key coal and steel sectors of, most notably, West Germany and France. Over the course of the next forty years, this community evolved into

---

<sup>1</sup> Helga Haftendorn, "Germany's accession to NATO: 50 years on," *NATO Review*, 2005.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

what is now the European Union (EU) and signifies the pinnacle of European integration. Though European integration began most notably through economic integration, political and ideological integration followed shortly thereafter and has become increasingly evident over the decades.

Along with the EU and NATO, the United Nations (UN) is the third organization that has played a crucial role in the post-Second World War development of Germany and its governmental structure. In 1952, West Germany joined the UN as an observer state. Twenty-one years later, West Germany, along with East Germany, were admitted as full member states through Security Council resolution 335 on 18 September 1973. Beginning with West Germany's observer status within the UN signified two significant aspects of the post-Second World War Germany. The first was West Germany's commitment to international cooperation, and the second aspect was the emphasis on finding diplomatic solutions to international problems.<sup>5</sup> Germany's membership in these three organizations – NATO, the EU, and the UN – played key roles in West Germany's re-creation on the international stage during the Cold War era.

### *3.2.1. West German Governmental Structure*

Following the end of the Second World War, Germany's government institutions became disintegrated with Germany's unconditional surrender in 1945. During the remainder of the 1940s, Germany was divided into four occupational zones that each implemented their own type of regimes overseen by each corresponding occupational power. Toward the end of the 1940s and into the 1950s, the British, American, and French zones joined together to become the Federal Republic of Germany in 1949. The creation of the Federal Republic of Germany signaled the beginning of the, albeit slow, return of German autonomy and sovereignty. Since German

---

<sup>5</sup> Helga Haftendorn, *Coming of Age: German Foreign Policy since 1945* (Oxford, UK: Rowman & Littlefield, 2006), 31.

governmental institutions were disbanded in 1945, however, the institutions of the Federal Republic of Germany were mostly created out of entities created by the occupational powers. This was done for both practical and ideological reasons.<sup>6</sup> The practical reason was that the occupational departments already existed and reduced the need to establish completely new entities. Moreover, the occupational powers were able to maintain some control of these entities even after the West German Federal Government took them over since the occupying powers had created these bodies in the first place. The ideological background to the adaptation of post-war occupying government departments was that pre-war German Government departments were created during the German Reich or during the Third Reich, neither of which reflected the principles upon which the Federal Republic of Germany's *Grundgesetz* (Basic Law) was founded.

The creation of West German Government departments was controversial within West Germany as well as within the international community. While some departments received less attention due to their inherent benign nature, other departments' creation and subsequent existence were questioned and investigated extensively. Most notably, West Germany's ministries of foreign affairs and defence were scrutinized heavily, as these two departments had the potential to give West Germany the powers to return to one of its previous, less favourable identities. To prevent this from happening, the West German military was heavily restricted in numbers when it was created in 1956 and founding documents made it inherently clear that it would be unacceptable for any West German Government entity to return to its pre-war behaviour or standards.<sup>7</sup> The same applied to the West German ministries of foreign and

---

<sup>6</sup> Ibid., 13-17.

<sup>7</sup> Chris Bowlby, "Germany: Reluctant military giant?," *BBC News*, 12 June 2017.

economic affairs, which were at first restricted from engaging internationally as well as re-establishing certain industries producing dual-use goods respectively.<sup>8</sup> Nonetheless, over the course of the Cold War, the new governmental structure was able to establish itself within West Germany and internationally as a reliable and reputable government.<sup>9</sup>

As West Germany began to establish a post-Second World War, Cold War identity that was based on fundamental rights and freedoms, a liberal democratic system, and free trade, a noticeable remnant of Nazi Germany was West Germany's bureaucrats. During the reconstruction process of West Germany's government, an obvious need for public servants arose who would be able to staff these ministries. Since knowledge of policy and governance processes were required in those positions, a large number of post-war West German servants had been trained and worked under the Nazi regime during the Third Reich.<sup>10</sup> However, this fact was overshadowed by West Germany's reconstruction efforts and its *Wirtschaftswunder* (economic miracle) until the late 1960s. 1968 was the year where this tolerance changed. Known as the "68er", university students began to protest the existing *status quo* and demanded social change. The protests resulted numerous older public servants being replaced by new ones, more scrutiny as to who fills which positions within the West German Government and more public participation in the decision-making process. The protests also helped the feminist movement to move ahead, aligning with West Germany's sexual revolution and the emergence of more easily accessible contraceptives. Furthermore, during the late 1960s, the first protests surrounding the

---

<sup>8</sup> Thomas Maulucci, *Adenauer's Foreign Policy: West German Diplomacy in the Shadow of the Third Reich* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2012), 93.

<sup>9</sup> Wilhelm G. Grewe, *Deutsche Außenpolitik der Nachkriegszeit* (Stuttgart, DE: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1960), 101.

<sup>10</sup> Jeremy Leaman, *The Political Economy of West Germany, 1945-1985: An Introduction* (Basingstoke, UK: Macmillan Press, 1988), 32.

use of nuclear power emerged in West Germany and was, unprecedentedly, led by women and university students.<sup>11</sup> Finally, the West German population experienced the effects of domestic terrorism beginning in the late 1960s until the 1980s through the *Rote Armee Fraktion* (Red Army Faction), which was a left leaning terrorist group that killed over thirty people during the 1970s and 80s.<sup>12</sup> These factors tied into the considerable cultural and societal shift within West Germany that has affected German society and government until the present day.

### 3.2.2. West German Governmental Structure: Foreign Affairs

Following the end of the Second World War, Germany was under control of the four victorious powers and did thus not possess its own sovereignty. A consequence of this state of being was that any foreign relations were handled by the four occupying powers.<sup>13</sup> Even when the Federal Republic was formed in 1949, the first democratically elected West German Government was omitted from naming a foreign minister who could represent Germany internationally.<sup>14</sup> In March 1951, the occupation statute was revised and handed legislative control over to the West German Government. Through this handover, the West German Government gained control over its relations with other states and international actors and consequently created its first post-war Foreign Office, which would ultimately become the German Federal Ministry of Foreign Affairs.<sup>15</sup>

Nevertheless, some aspects of West Germany's future foreign policy were beginning to take shape as early as September 1949, when Chancellor Adenauer stated that "Franco-German

---

<sup>11</sup> Joachim Radkau, "Eine kurze Geschichte der deutschen Antiatomkraftbewegung," *Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung*, 10 November 2011.

<sup>12</sup> "Who were Germany's Red Army Faction militants?," *BBC News*, 19 January 2016.

<sup>13</sup> Haftendorn, *Coming of Age*, 13-16.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, 19.

antagonism that had dominated European politics for centuries and led to several wars, to destruction and spilt blood” would finally have to be overcome.<sup>16</sup> As a result, good and close relations with West Germany’s western European neighbours was a key aspect of a robust foreign policy that would take shape once West Germany regained its sovereignty. These western tendencies of the newly formed Federal Republic were further enhanced by West Germany’s membership in NATO and thus its transatlantic partnerships with the United States (US) and Canada. This key pillar of West German foreign policy was joined by West Germany’s commitment to create its foreign policy in line with Article 2 of the UN Charter, which requires members to renounce the use of force and to thus pursue German reunification by peaceful means only.<sup>17</sup>

Furthermore, West Germany wanted to ensure that it was the authority recognized to be acting on behalf of the German people and thus refused to recognize the existence of a second German state in the form of the German Democratic Republic (GDR). The GDR, also commonly known as East Germany, was the continuation of the Soviet occupied sector. The corresponding behaviour to this foreign policy pillar was rather drastic. The free trade agreement between East and West Germany was described in the Federal Republic as a free trade agreement between the two currencies that existed in Germany (the West and East German Marks).<sup>18</sup> In other words, West Germany attempted to circumvent its formal recognition of East Germany by creating intra-German agreements. This policy pillar also resulted in the West German parliament passing the requirement that if a state within the international system recognized the GDR as a sovereign

---

<sup>16</sup> Ibid., 17.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., 31.

<sup>18</sup> Leaman, *The Political Economy of West Germany, 1945-1985*, 102.

state, West Germany would end all diplomatic relations with that country, which happened with Yugoslavia in 1958.<sup>19</sup> This behaviour would become known as the “Hallstein Doctrine,” which was named after Walter Hallstein, who was a West German politician.

The Federal Republic of Germany maintained these strictly western tendencies until the creation of its *Ostpolitik* (eastern policies) in 1969. This *Ostpolitik* began to open diplomatic and communication channels between West Germany and members from the Eastern Bloc with the goal to begin normalizing relations across the Iron Curtain. By that time, West Germany had established itself as a committed western ally, firmly entrenched in western European and transatlantic alliances and organizations. Furthermore, the emerging political generation was increasingly willing to open channels to the Eastern Bloc, with the Soviet Union at its forefront. As a result, the concept of *Annäherung durch Verflechtung* (rapprochement through interlocking) became the dominant theme that gave way to Germany’s *Ostpolitik*.<sup>20</sup> These developments saw a reversal of the Hallstein Doctrine, as development aid began to be distributed regardless of the receiving country’s relations with East Germany. The developments and importance of the *Ostpolitik* will be discussed in more detail in chapter four of this thesis, since that chapter will focus on West German-Soviet and German-Russian relations.

### 3.2.3. West German Governmental Structure: Defence

The West German Federal Ministry of Defence (*Bundesministerium der Verteidigung*) was founded on 7 June 1955.<sup>21</sup> Following the deterioration of East-West relations during the late

---

<sup>19</sup> Haftendorn, *Coming of Age*, 39.

<sup>20</sup> Marco Siddi, “German Foreign Policy towards Russia in the Aftermath of the Ukraine Crisis: A New *Ostpolitik*?” *Europe-Asia Studies* 68, no. 4 (2016): 666.

<sup>21</sup> Bundesministerium der Verteidigung, “Geschichte des Verteidigungsministeriums,” *Bundesministerium der Verteidigung*.

1940s and throughout the 1950, a growing number of international voices began calling for the creation of a West German defence force to support its western allies. Under Chancellor Adenauer, the West German Government began drafting plans in collaboration with the US, the United Kingdom, and France to establish a West German military presence.<sup>22</sup> The 1954 Paris Agreements became the hallmark documents that opened the door for West Germany to create a ministry of defence, a military, and to join NATO.<sup>23</sup> Shortly after the creation of the Federal Ministry of Defence, West Germany established its army on 12 November 1955. Since 1 April 1956, West Germany's military has been called the *Bundeswehr*.<sup>24</sup>

Although the *Bundeswehr* started out as a volunteer force, recruitment became mandatory half a year after its inception in order to meet West Germany's new defence needs.<sup>25</sup> As such, West Germany was allowed to recruit up to 6,000 men into the *Bundeswehr*'s volunteer force and draft recruits beyond that number.<sup>26</sup> During this time, West Germany's military efforts were not only carefully watched internationally but were also scrutinized by large parts of the West German population. Having suffered the consequences of the Second World War and the immediate post-war period, many Germans were not fond of the idea that West Germany would have a military so soon after the disintegration of the Nazi regime.<sup>27</sup> Moreover, due to practical constraints, large parts of West Germany's military leadership was staffed by individuals who had formerly served under Adolf Hitler. When Adenauer was asked about these staffing decisions, he bluntly stated "that NATO would probably not accept 18-year-old boys" as West Germany's new

---

<sup>22</sup> Ibid.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid.

<sup>24</sup> Bundeswehr, "Die Geschichte der Bundeswehr," *Bundeswehr*, 2019.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid.

<sup>26</sup> Siegfried Mann, *Das Bundesministerium der Verteidigung* (Bonn, DE: Boldt Verlag, 1971), 33.

<sup>27</sup> Martin Falbisoner, "Gründung der Bundeswehr," *Konrad Adenauer Stiftung*.

military leadership and that Adenauer therefore had to make the compromise of reinstating certain senior military leaders in order to create an effective military.<sup>28</sup> However, despite these practical aspects, the newly formed *Bundeswehr* was created as a defence force based on the concept of “Staatsbürger in Uniform” (citizens in uniform) as its ideological foundation.<sup>29</sup> Moreover, unlike previous versions of a German military – most notably those of the earlier twentieth century – the concept of the “Innere Führung” (inner guidance) became the core of the new West German military and was responsible for ensuring the adherence of the *Bundeswehr* to the West German constitution and its values. This inner guidance was also designed to limit the orders soldiers could carry out and explicitly forbade the carrying out of illegal orders.<sup>30</sup> Furthermore, this notion of citizens in uniform rejected the image of a soldier required to unquestioningly follow the state and its leadership by giving the members of the *Bundeswehr* the right to vote and freedom of expression, effectively guaranteeing every West German citizen, soldier or not, all constitutional rights as found in the West German *Grundgesetz* (Basic Law).<sup>31</sup>

As the Cold War progressed and West Germany became an increasingly integral part of the western European and transatlantic security structures and frameworks, the *Bundeswehr* reached 390,000 members in 1962 and continued to move closer toward its goal of 500,000 soldiers over the next two decades.<sup>32</sup> By the end of the Cold War, the *Bundeswehr* encompassed 495,000 soldiers, with a potential to expand to 1.2 million members through the inclusion of

---

<sup>28</sup> Haftendorn, “Germany’s accession to NATO.”

<sup>29</sup> Bundesministerium der Verteidigung, “Geschichte,” *Bundesministerium der Verteidigung*.

<sup>30</sup> Bundeswehr, “Armee im Kalten Krieg,” *Bundeswehr*, 2015.

<sup>31</sup> Ibid.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid.

reservists in the case of an emergency.<sup>33</sup> All of these troops were not only intended to defend Germany's territory but also played an integral part of Germany's contribution and commitment to NATO and the defence of other members of the transatlantic Alliance. With this rearmament and considerable growth, the Federal Ministry of Defence grew accordingly. By the end of the Cold War, the Federal Ministry of Defence had established itself as an effective body that oversaw the *Bundeswehr* and fostered the convergence of civilian and military priorities and ensured that the West German military remained responsible to the elected government and the West German people. As well, the Federal Ministry of Defence became the key coordinator of Germany's NATO membership.

#### 3.2.4. *West German Governmental Structure: Economic Affairs*

The aftermath of the Second World War left West Germany with a significantly reduced industrial infrastructure and a non-existent economy. In addition to the post-war state of West Germany, over 11.5 million ethnic Germans who had left their homes both voluntarily and involuntarily in eastern Europe arrived in the two Germanies, two thirds of which settled in the western regions.<sup>34</sup> As Germany was divided into four occupied sectors during the four years following the end of the Second World War in 1945, each sector was treated differently in terms of receiving foreign aid to re-establish its industries and economy. However, since the United Kingdom and France were themselves struggling to re-establish their economies and industries, the US became the leader in supporting western Europe financially. This US support included helping the three western sectors in Germany regain a source of income and its infrastructure.

---

<sup>33</sup> Ibid.

<sup>34</sup> Bernard Wasserstein, *Barbarism and Civilization: A History of Europe in Our Time* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2007), 418.

This reconstruction was most notably organized through the European Recovery Program that was launched by the US in 1947 and would become known as the Marshall Plan.<sup>35</sup> Between 1948 and 1952, various European states received a total of thirteen billion dollars through this program. Although the United Kingdom and France were the largest two beneficiaries, West Germany received enough to restart and guide its economic re-establishment.<sup>36</sup> Combined with the sweeping currency reforms in 1948, West Germany was beginning to re-establish a functioning economy and was able to alleviate the hunger that had plagued large parts of the West German population since the winter of 1946/1947.<sup>37</sup>

Simultaneously, Jean Monnet, who was in charge of restoring France's post-war economy, began drafting a plan in early 1950 that would bind European economies, most notably those of France and West Germany, closer together. The motivation behind this undertaking was to increase economic interdependence in Europe to the point that states would not want to go to war with one another as their economies and industries would be too heavily integrated with one another. Monnet gained the support from French foreign minister Robert Schumann and the plan of a European economic alliance was published by the French government in 9 May 1950.<sup>38</sup> The plan was welcomed as a constructive proposal to ameliorate Franco-German relations and served as a plan to help six western European states begin to integrate politically and economically. After extensive negotiations, the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) was

---

<sup>35</sup> Ibid., 424-425.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid.

<sup>37</sup> Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie, "Wohlstand für alle: 1945-1966," *Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie*, 2019.

<sup>38</sup> Constantin Chira-Pascanut, "A Short History of the European Union: From Rome to Lisbon," in *European Union Governance and Policy Making: A Canadian Perspective*, ed. Brunet-Jailly, Hurrelmann, and Verdun (Toronto, ON: Toronto University Press, 2018), 24-25.

signed into existence in 1951 and integrated the coal and steel industries of France, West Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, and Italy.<sup>39</sup>

The governance of the West German economy in the immediate aftermath of the Second World War was provided by the occupying powers in each of the four sectors. Beginning in September 1946, however, the three western sectors agreed to create overarching governance bodies that employed West Germans to help with certain policy concerns. Catering to economic concerns, the first entity established was the *Verwaltungsamt für Wirtschaft* (Administrative Office for the Economy) and was co-located with the British economic body overseeing the West German economy and industries.<sup>40</sup> In March 1948, Ludwig Erhard, a member of the CDU, was elected to become the first *Direktor der Verwaltung für Wirtschaft des Vereinigten Wirtschaftsgebietes* (Director of the Economic Administration of the United Economic Area).<sup>41</sup> Erhard's vision of "Wohlstand für alle" (prosperity for all) became the guiding principle of West Germany's approach to the creation of a social market economy, which would remain the guiding principle of West Germany's economy until the modern day.<sup>42</sup>

This ideology was strengthened by what would become known as the *Wirtschaftswunder* (economic miracle). Between 1951 and 1960, the West German gross national product grew on average by 8.9 percent each year and the real per capita national product grew by more than double the rate than it did in the United Kingdom and US during the same time.<sup>43</sup> A major contributor to West Germany's economic growth during the 1950s was its increasing integration

---

<sup>39</sup> Ibid., 25.

<sup>40</sup> Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie, "Die Geschichte des Bundesministeriums für Wirtschaft und Energie," *Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie*, 2019.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid.

<sup>42</sup> Ibid.

<sup>43</sup> Leaman, *The Political Economy of West Germany, 1945-1985*, 107.

with western European and transatlantic alliances and partnerships. Although domestic demand, driven by the continuing need to rebuild post-war cities and households, was an important part in West Germany's economic growth, the most significant driver of West German economic growth was its export driven economy, which predominantly consisted of finished goods.<sup>44</sup>

This economic growth persisted throughout the 1960s and into the beginning of the 1970s. In 1973, however, the oil crisis caused an unprecedented increase of the price of oil that temporarily brought a halt to West Germany's economic growth.<sup>45</sup> As the West German economy stagnated in 1974 and 1975, the focus under the leadership of Social Democratic Chancellor Willy Brandt shifted from reconstruction and economic growth following the end of the Second World War to a heavier focus on a social market economy that aimed to improve the standard of living and the quality of life of the West German population. The results of this ideological shift were an increased focus on social programs and protecting the environment – both urban and rural – and a correspondingly weaker emphasis on economic growth and promoting the expansion of West German industry.<sup>46</sup> Following this economic and consequently political upheaval, the remainder of the 1970s and 1980s was spent finding a balance between economic growth and industrial expansion on one end and social welfare and environmental protections on the other. Moreover, West Germany continued to balance international trade with countries on both sides of the Iron Curtain while maintaining clear diplomatic goals of German reunification.

---

<sup>44</sup> Ibid., 107-108.

<sup>45</sup> Ibid. 202-203.

<sup>46</sup> Ibid., 214-215.

### 3.3. 1990 to 2019

The fall of the Berlin Wall in November 1989 and the end of the Cold War signified the beginning of a new era in West Germany. Most notably, East and West Germany were reunified on 3 October 1990, with the East German *Länder* (states) joining the Federal Republic of Germany. During the year leading up to the fall of the Wall in November, East German policies aimed at restricting cross-border movement and migration began to be loosened, as the East German economy continued its downward spiral. Growing disillusion among the East German population and Mikhail Gorbachev's program of *glasnost* and *perestroika* soon began the East German Government to recognize its need for change. Although the East German Government did not expect these changes to result in the disintegration of the East German state, it emboldened East Germans to demand more freedoms.<sup>47</sup> As a result, the Berlin Wall crumbled on 9 November 1989 and reopened the possibility of a reunified Germany.

This dream of reunification was rekindled and soon became reality, with the five East German *Länder* and East Berlin formally joining the Federal Republic of Germany on 3 October 1990. The peaceful unification of the two Germanies was celebrated across Germany but also brought forward several complicated political intricacies. In addition to the remnants of a crumbled socialist economy needing to be integrated into a thriving capitalist free market system, East Germany had been part of the Warsaw Pact, the eastern military alliance that had been created by the Soviet Union to counterbalance NATO. Since Federal Republic of Germany had been a member of NATO since 1955 and East Germany joined the Federal Republic, East Germany withdrew from the Warsaw Pact in late September 1990, mere days before German

---

<sup>47</sup> Haftendorn, *Coming of Age*, 276-277.

reunification, in order to avoid being a member of NATO and the Warsaw Pact simultaneously.<sup>48</sup> This shift in membership signaled the beginning of even larger changes that would unfold over the next 18 months. The final act that ended the Cold War was the disintegration of the Soviet Union in December 1991, by which time the former East German states had already begun to westernize and adapt to their new political and economic systems.

### 3.3.1. German Governmental Structure

Germany's governmental structure following the end of the Cold War and the reunification of the two Germanies changed little compared to that of the Federal Republic of Germany during the Cold War. Following German reunification, the former East German states joined the Federal Republic and adapted its governance structure. As a result, the Federal Republic grew and along with it grew the size of the German Federal Government. With this growth, the economic, militaristic, and social integration of the former East German governance system was a "herculean task" that remains unparalleled.<sup>49</sup> Nevertheless, the Cold War origins of the former West German ministries and structures remained in place.

One notable change following German reunification was that intra-German relations were no longer housed within the Federal Ministry for Intra-German Relations (*Bundesministerium für innerdeutsche Beziehungen*) but rather were managed through various other ministries focused on coordinating intra-German governance. Economically, transitioning from a planned economy to a market-based one posed a number of challenges for the reunified Germany.<sup>50</sup> Nevertheless, the German economy continued to grow and expand its export market,

---

<sup>48</sup> North Atlantic Treaty Organization, "The fall of the Wall: Berlin: German Reunification," *NATO*.

<sup>49</sup> Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie, "Aus zwei wird eins: 1990 bis heute," *Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie*, 2019.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*

in part due to the recently opened-up countries of the former Eastern Bloc. Trade agreements were sought with former Soviet and Soviet satellite states in an effort to support the integration of East Germany into the Federal Republic, as well as to establish positive relationships with formerly adversarial states.<sup>51</sup>

Finally, the two primary challenges for the Ministry of Defence were to integrate an entirely separate military that formerly belonged to East Germany and was constructed on an authoritarian basis. Moreover, the Ministry of Defence needed to adapt to a drastically changed strategic environment following the disintegration of the Soviet Union. Not only did the East German military have a ministry that required integration but soldiers from the East German army, navy, and air force were left without a country to serve. As a result, thousands of soldiers needed to be integrated into a military that itself was in the process of redefining itself. Since the *Bundeswehr* was created during the Cold War with the purpose of protecting Germany and its NATO allies from a Cold War that might become hot, the immediate threat around which the *Bundeswehr* was constructed had disappeared and had already left the German Government with a surplus of soldiers and military capabilities. Nevertheless, the Federal Ministry of Defence remained bound to its democratic principles and committed to NATO. And with these principles in mind, it evolved into a western military of the post-Cold War era.

The post-Cold War structure of the Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy (BMWi) evolved in several ways. In addition to numerous name changes that added various departments, such as technology at one point and energy during another, to the economic affairs section, the BMWi had also different ministers belonging to different political parties. During the

---

<sup>51</sup> Haftendorn, *Coming of Age*, 293-294.

1990s, the ministry what would eventually become the BMWi was overseen by several ministers belonging to the Free Democratic Party, which emphasises free trade and is the most libertarian of Germany's mainstream parties. During Gerhard Schröder's tenure, Werner Müller, who was not a member of the *Bundestag*, oversaw the ministry from 1998 to 2002 and was then run by Schröder's own Social Democrats. Under Chancellor Angela Merkel, beginning in 2005, power returned to the Free Democrats as well as the Christian Democrats, Merkel's own party. During Merkel's third tenure as Chancellor, the German Government was ruled by what was known as the Grand Coalition consisting of the SPD and the CDU, which saw the BMWi transferred back to Social Democratic control, before returning to Christian Democratic control under Peter Altmaier in 2018. The two other ministers before Altmaier that were in charge of the BMWi since 2014 were Sigmar Gabriel (SPD) from December 2013 to January 2017 and Brigitte Zypries (SPD) from January 2017 to March 2018.

During the 1990s, the German Foreign Ministry was governed by the Free Democrats, Germany's libertarian party. When Schröder became Chancellor in 1998, the ministry switched hands and was run by the Green Party throughout the duration of both of Schröder's tenures until 2005. When Merkel became Chancellor that year, the ministry switched hands and the Social Democrats gained control of the ministry. The Social Democrats have since maintained control of the ministry other than from 2009 to 2013 when the Free Democrats filled the ministerial position. Since 2014, Frank-Walter Steinmeier, Sigmar Gabriel, and Heiko Maas, governing from December 2013 to January 2017, January 2017 to March 2018, and from March 2018 onward respectively, have been in charge of the German Foreign Ministry.

The Federal Ministry of Defence is the only ministry that did not see a change in minister and party from 2014 on until July 2019. Ursula von der Leyen, member of the CDU, held the position of Minister of Defence from December 2013 until 17 July 2019. As a result of this constant, German defence policies are least likely to have changed between 2013 and 2019, providing the clearest baseline for the three ministries analyzed in this thesis. In addition to the fact that the Ministry of Defence can act as the baseline case study in this thesis due to it having the same Minister of Defence during the time period analyzed, it is also worth noting the importance of coalition building within German politics. Since the Federal Republic's inception in 1949, only one government ruled without a coalition partner, which was from 1957 to 1961. Since then, every government was formed with at least two parties at the helm.<sup>52</sup> As a result of these coalitions, the assignment of cabinet positions to parties of the governing coalition is closely watched and can have significant consequences for the governing mandate. For example, the assignment of the position of the Minister of Foreign Affairs to the CDU's coalition partner, the SPD, while the CDU fills the position of the Minister of Defence can have the implication that vis-à-vis Russia, diplomatic affairs are more lenient toward Russia, as the SPD has the reputation of being more open to Russia than the CDU, while matters of defence and Germany's membership in NATO are represented by the party that has historically been more in favour of the transatlantic Alliance.

### 3.4. Conclusion

The end of the Second World War and the end of the Cold War are two international developments that played a key role in shaping the government and governmental structure of

---

<sup>52</sup> David Martin, "A history of Germany's coalition governments," *Deutsche Welle*, 15 December 2017.

the Federal Republic of Germany. As a result, Germany's federal ministries were created after 1949 to serve to West Germany's Cold War needs. Over the course of the Cold War, West Germany's ministries developed and began to expand beyond direct Cold War connections. Nevertheless, the basis of most of Germany's federal ministries was grounded in an intrinsically western, Cold War ideology. The West German Federal Ministries of Defence, Foreign Affairs, and Economic Affairs are especially grounded in the Cold War virtues that had determined trade, diplomatic ties, and defence for almost half a century.

As the Cold War ended and Germany was reunified, the purpose of some of Germany's federal ministries was put into jeopardy due to their Cold War nature. Most notably, the Ministry of Defence and the *Bundeswehr* were required to determine new priorities as their main strategic focus, the Soviet Union, had disintegrated. Alternatively, Germany was able to establish new diplomatic and economic relations with countries formerly considered to be off limits, as the Iron Curtain had been lifted. These developments promoted the evolution of Germany's federal ministries, as many aspects of the ministries' foundations had changed drastically and some even disappeared following the end of the Cold War and the collapse of the Soviet Union.

## Chapter 4: History of West German-Soviet and German-Russian Relations

### 4.1. Introduction

Relations between West Germany and the Soviet Union and later between Germany and Russia is rich in complexity. Throughout history, Germany and Russia, as well as their predecessors, have had their politics, militaries, and people closely intertwined. This close relationship ranged from trade and close cultural connections to territory between Germany's and Russia's core lands changing hands between the two actors repeatedly. It is important to note, however, that this close relationship between Germany and Russia has often been adversarial in nature and stoked numerous armed conflicts, most notably the amplification of the Second World War following Hitler's disregard of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact. Due to the complex nature of this bilateral relationship, this chapter will discuss key events that influenced West German-Soviet and German-Russian relations to understand the influence this relationship has had on Germany's governmental structure and its *Russlandpolitik*.

As both Germany and Russia have existed in various territorial constructs over the course of this past century, this chapter is split into two separate time periods. The first section will encompass the time since the creation of the Federal Republic of Germany (West Germany) in 1949 and will cover West German-Soviet relations until the end of the Cold War in 1990 and the disintegration of the Soviet Union in 1991. The second section of this chapter will focus on German-Russian relations beginning with the reunification of Germany in 1990 and the disintegration of the Soviet Union and emergence of the Russian Federation in 1991. Each of these sections will introduce and discuss key events and policy decisions that contributed to the formation and evolution of West German-Soviet and later German-Russian relations. Key events

in these sections include Germany's adoption of its *Ostpolitik* (eastern policy) in 1969, the disintegration of the Soviet Union in 1991, the gas wars during the 2000s, and the Russian annexation of Crimea in 2014, among others.

## 4.2. 1949 to 1990/1991

### 4.2.1. German-Soviet Relations

The Soviet Union played a crucial part in Germany's immediate and longer-term post-war development. As one of the four victors, the Soviet Union controlled the eastern sector of Germany, with the area later becoming the German Democratic Republic (GDR), or more commonly known as East Germany. As a result, Soviet forces were stationed throughout eastern Germany and Soviet rule was established in the Soviet sector. Moreover, as West Germany became increasingly capitalist and integrated with western Europe and North America, East Germany joined the growing number of eastern European and central Asian states that would become the communist bloc. These ideological divides between the East and West further solidified as relations between the Soviet Union and the West deteriorated into the Cold War.

As the Korean War erupted in 1950, the West began to recognize the certitude of the Soviet threat. Though West Germany and western Europe was located at the opposite end of the Soviet Union from where the Korean War was taking place, discussions surrounding West Germany's rearmament were revived among the western allies as well as within West Germany itself.<sup>1</sup> The notions of self-defence rekindled the effort to re-establish a military among German politicians and what would become the German Government and western Europe and the North

---

<sup>1</sup> Siegfried Mann, *Das Bundesministerium der Verteidigung* (Bonn, DE: Boldt Verlag, 1971), 30.

Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) recognized that if Germany were to become part of its alliance system, it would need to be able to contribute militarily, albeit in a limited fashion.<sup>2</sup>

On 15 January 1955, the Soviet Union presented a declaration that aimed to normalize relations between the Soviet Union and West Germany.<sup>3</sup> Even though the declaration was accompanied by a number of conditions that urged West Germany not to ratify the Paris Accords, which aimed to delineate the status of West Germany, to help the normalization of relations between the Soviet Union and West Germany, the declaration was a significant step in moving beyond the Second World War.<sup>4</sup> Unlike France, the United Kingdom, and the US, who had officially ended their state of war with Germany in 1951, the Soviet Union, along with other eastern European states, upheld their state of war with Germany until the end of January 1955.<sup>5</sup> Recognizing that the “preservation and strengthening of peace in Europe depends to a decisive degree on the existence of good relations between the Soviet and Germany peoples,” the Soviet Government presented a note to the West German Government that invited Konrad Adenauer, West German Chancellor at the time, to Moscow to finalize the normalization of relations.<sup>6</sup> This note set off an exchange of notes between the West German and Soviet governments through their respective embassies in Paris and amounted to the meeting between Adenauer and Bulganin in Moscow in September 1955 that formally established diplomatic, cultural, and economic relations between the Soviet Union and West Germany.<sup>7</sup> This meeting was significant

---

<sup>2</sup> Wilhelm G. Grewe, *Deutsche Außenpolitik der Nachkriegszeit* (Stuttgart, DE: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1960), 101-103.

<sup>3</sup> *Germany and Eastern Europe since 1945: From the Potsdam Agreement to Chancellor Brandt's "Ostpolitik"* (New York, NY: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1973), 108.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, 110.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, 111.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 112-114.

because it signified the final end of the state of war that the Soviet Union had declared on Germany and allowed West Germany to open diplomatic channels with the Soviet Union. The normalization of relations furthermore provided West Germany with a crucial building bloc in establishing itself as a sovereign and respectable actor on the international stage. In addition to these advancements, this meeting surrounding the normalization of relations between West Germany and the Soviet Union acted as the recognition of West Germany as its own entity in the eyes of the Soviet Union, despite the existence of East Germany, which had effectively become a Soviet satellite state.

In September 1955, Adenauer traveled to the Soviet Union to engage in discussions with his Soviet counterparts with the goal of establishing diplomatic relations between the two states. A major requirement from the West German side for establishing these relations was the release of German prisoners of war that continued to be held captive across the Soviet Union.<sup>8</sup> Although Bulganin was at first unwilling to consider West Germany's condition, he eventually agreed to repatriate German prisoners of war in order to help normalize West German-Soviet relations.<sup>9</sup> Shortly after a relatively successful West German visit to the Soviet Union, representatives of the GDR were also invited to the Soviet Union to normalize their relationship and to establish diplomatic relations between the two countries, as the Soviet Union now officially considered the GDR as a sovereign state.<sup>10</sup> The consequence of this meeting was that West Germany began to make a point to end diplomatic relations with any country that also recognized the GDR as a

---

<sup>8</sup> Helga Haftendorn, *Coming of Age: German Foreign Policy since 1945* (Oxford, UK: Rowman & Littlefield, 2006), 38.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid.

German state. Germany upheld this behaviour until 1969 and the creation of its *Ostpolitik* (translates to eastern policy and encompasses West Germany's policies toward countries in the eastern bloc beginning in 1969).

#### 4.2.2. German-Soviet Relations: *Ostpolitik*

Beginning in the mid-1960s, the political climate in West Germany began to shift away from the staunch anti-communist position the West German Government had assumed under Chancellor Adenauer. Although the German Governments, most notably their Chancellors, opposed any rapprochement between West Germany and the Soviet Union, then Foreign Minister Willy Brandt began to advocate for a *détente* and a new *Ostpolitik* in the late 1960s and leading up to the German federal election in 1969.<sup>11</sup> When Brandt became Chancellor of a left-leaning coalition in 1969, the creation of a new *Ostpolitik* became inevitable.

It is worth noting that this policy shift within the West German Government took place on the heels of the international political climate changing through the experiences of the Berlin Blockade and Cuban Missile crises, the conclusion of a series of arms reduction treaties between the United States (US) and the Soviet Union, and US President Richard Nixon's emphasis of prioritizing *détente*.<sup>12</sup> As such, the "bridge" that should be built between the West and the Soviet Union, as was argued by US President Lyndon B. Johnson in 1966, exerted the necessary pressure on West Germany to begin pursuing negotiations with the Soviet Union and various other states in the Eastern Bloc to ease the tensions between the two sides and to help with the global *détente* efforts.<sup>13</sup> Interestingly, the construction of the Berlin Wall, which began in 1962, did not inhibit

---

<sup>11</sup> Ibid., 161.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid., 160.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid., 157.

West Germany from engaging in talks with the Soviet Union, but rather it somewhat helped delineate the separation of the two Germanies.

Although West Germany's new *Ostpolitik* was highly contentious within the opposition as well as large parts of the West German public, Brandt's government staunchly pursued negotiations with the Soviet Union regardless of popular opposition. The negotiations that ultimately led to the Moscow Treaty with the Soviet Union and the Warsaw and Prague Treaties with Poland and Czechoslovakia respectively, considerably normalized relations between West Germany and some of its most important eastern neighbours. Moreover, the treaties clarified various uncertainties surrounding post-war boundaries and required all parties to agree to resolve all current and future disputes without the use of military force. Finally, the treaties helped normalize relations between the two Germanies without West Germany fully recognizing East Germany as a sovereign state but rather as an entity additional to the Federal Republic that exists among the German nation. Despite West Germany refusing to recognize East Germany as its own sovereign entity, which had initially been a Soviet requirement for normalizing relations between the two states, the Soviet Union was willing to accept the new negotiations and calm tensions between the Federal Republic and the Eastern Bloc.<sup>14</sup> As time progressed, West Germany underwent another federal election in 1972, which effectively acted as a plebiscite on accepting its *Ostpolitik*. As Willy Brandt emerged victoriously, it was clear that the West German public was ready to normalize relations with the Soviet Union and focus on cultural and economic exchanges in addition to calming military relations – or rather tensions – between the two sides.

---

<sup>14</sup> Avril Pittman, *From Ostpolitik to Reunification: West German-Soviet Political Relations since 1972* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 9-10.

Helmut Schmidt became West Germany's Chancellor in 1974 and approached relations with the Soviet Union from a more economically pragmatic and less ideological perspective. The result of this change in West German leadership was that the relationship between the West German and Soviet leaders changed from one of friendship to a well-oiled working relationship, fueled by the *Ostpolitik* developing into the *realistische Entspannungspolitik* (realistic *détente* policy).<sup>15</sup> This evolution in the West German-Soviet relationship can be attributed to the change in the West German Government with Schmidt coming to power but also the maturation of the West German-Soviet post-war relationship. Nevertheless, despite Schmidt's less idealistic and ideological approach to the *Ostpolitik*, West Germany became and remained the largest western trading partner with the Soviet Union.<sup>16</sup>

Further *détente* efforts began in 1973 when countries of eastern and western Europe and North America came together in Helsinki for the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. The goal of this conference was to foster dialogue between the two sides and to help ease tensions during the Cold War.<sup>17</sup> The success of this conference became codified in 1975 through the Helsinki Accords and the conference evolved into the Organization of Security and Cooperation in Europe, or more commonly known as the OSCE. Through efforts such as the OSCE, West Germany's *Ostpolitik*, and through, albeit limited, trade and cultural exchanges, tensions between the two sides of the Iron Curtain were effectively reduced and consequently also ameliorated relations between West Germany and the Soviet Union.

---

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., 138.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid., 140.

<sup>17</sup> Bernard Wasserstein, *Barbarism and Civilization: A History of Europe in Our Time* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2007), 610-611.

### 4.3. 1990/1991 to 2019

The fall of the Berlin Wall in November 1989 signified the end of two Cold War Germanies. During the year leading up to the fall of the Wall in November, East German policies aimed at restricting cross-border movement and migration began to be loosened, as the East German economy continued its downward spiral. Growing disillusion among the East German population and Mikhail Gorbachev's program of *glasnost* and *perestroika* soon began to pressure the East German Government to recognize its need for change. Although the East German Government did not expect these changes to result in the disintegration of the East German state, it emboldened East Germans to demand more freedoms. As a result, the Berlin Wall crumbled on 9 November 1989 and reopened the possibility of a reunified Germany.

This dream of reunification was rekindled and soon became reality, with the five East German *Länder* and East Berlin formally joining the Federal Republic of Germany on 3 October 1990. The peaceful unification of the two Germanies was celebrated across Germany but also brought forward several complicated political intricacies. In addition to the remnants of a crumbled socialist economy needing to be integrated into a thriving capitalist free market system, East Germany had been part of the Warsaw Pact, the eastern military alliance that had been created to counterbalance NATO. Since Federal Republic of Germany had been a member of NATO since 1955 and East Germany joined the Federal Republic, East Germany withdrew from the Warsaw Pact in late September 1990, mere days before German reunification, in order to avoid being a member of NATO and the Warsaw Pact simultaneously.<sup>18</sup> This shift in membership signaled the beginning of even larger changes that would unfold over the next 18 months. The

---

<sup>18</sup> North Atlantic Treaty Organization, "The fall of the Wall: Berlin: German Reunification," *NATO*.

final act that ended the Cold War was the disintegration of the Soviet Union in December 1991, by which time the former East German states had already begun to westernize and adapt to their new political and economic systems.

#### *4.3.1. German-Russian Relations*

##### *4.3.1.1. German-Russian Relations: Two new countries – the 1990s*

Since modern day Germany's origins are deeply rooted in a Cold War context, the end of the Cold War presented itself as a catalyst for Germany to reconsider some of its policies concerning defence, foreign affairs, and economic affairs and trade. Helmut Kohl, the German Chancellor that led Germany through the end of the Cold War, is largely seen as one of the main architects of post-Cold War reunified Germany. Kohl also played a key role in establishing post-Cold War German-Russian relations. Kohl's tenure as German Chancellor lasted from 1982 until 1998, covering the last eight years of the Cold War and a divided Germany and the first eight years of a reunified Germany in the post-Cold War era. As a result, the continuity of Kohl's position as the head of the German Government gave him the opportunity to actively help reunify Germany and shape German-Russian relations during the 1990s.

The reunification of Germany and the disintegration of the Soviet Union signified the beginning of a new era in international relations and specifically in the relationship between Germany and Russia. As Germany continued to be busy with integrating East Germany politically, economically, socially, and militarily, the disintegration of the Soviet Union and the lifting of the Iron Curtain overall required Germany to establish and rebuild over 20 different bilateral and multilateral relationships. Since the Iron Curtain was lifted and the clear separation between Eastern and Western Europe was eliminated, the main approach was to establish these new post-Cold War relationships with as clean a slate as possible. As a result of this approach, German-

Soviet relations during the 1990s were predominantly centred on cooperation and increasing interdependence. Cultural exchanges and economic programs were aimed at bringing the two countries closer together. The disintegration of the Soviet Union and the reunification of the two Germanies brought about a wave of optimism within western governments, including Germany's, that relations between the East and the West may fully thaw and ring in a new era of interdependence, collaboration, and friendship.

A significant international effort that was undertaken by European states to help welcome Russia into the European family was the European Union (EU)'s Partnership and Cooperation Agreement (PCA) that came into force in 1997. The PCA was seen as the pinnacle of post-Cold War negotiations between members of the EU and Russia as they were the conclusion of successful negotiations between the parties to establish a positive, collaborative, and productive relationship moving forward into the twenty-first century.<sup>19</sup>

The enthusiasm with which this agreement was negotiated continued through the better part of the 1990s, however, when war broke out in the Balkans, the relationship between Russia and the West began to become strained. During the Bosnian War from 1992 to 1995, the West, through NATO, intervened in Bosnia in an attempt to curb the ethnic cleansing and unrest. Russia supported these efforts and joined into a coalition with other intervening actors in an attempt to maintain peace.<sup>20</sup> While this cooperation was largely successful, the NATO-led bombing campaign over Kosovo in 1999 came to Russia as a shock.<sup>21</sup> Whereas during the Bosnian War,

---

<sup>19</sup> European External Action Service, "The European Union and the Russian Federation," *European Union External Action*, 2019.

<sup>20</sup> Robert F. Baumann, George W. Gawrych, and Walter E. Kretchik, *Armed Peacekeepers in Bosnia* (Fort Leavenworth, KS: Combat Studies Institute Press, 2004), 75.

<sup>21</sup> Andrei P. Tsygankov, "The final triumph of the Pax Americana? Western intervention in Yugoslavia and Russia's debate on the post-Cold War order," *Communist and Post-Communist Studies* 34, no. 2 (2001): 140.

Russian peacekeepers were under US command during the United Nations (UN) peacekeeping efforts, and although Russia recognized the importance of supporting popular western arguments to avoid alienating itself on the international stage, Russia did not join NATO in their efforts.<sup>22</sup> Instead, Russian leadership vehemently opposed NATO's plans and decided to take a different path by preparing for a possible escalation of unrest independently.<sup>23</sup> These events caused Russia to distance itself from NATO and its objectives, causing disillusionment on both sides. These developments proved to foreshadow what would develop into an era of relations with Russia that would increasingly focus on each other's differences instead of similarities.

#### 4.3.1.2. German-Russian Relations: The 2000s

With the end of the 1990s, Boris Yeltsin's time as Russian President also came to an end. Vladimir Putin became President of the Russian Federation on 1 January 2000 and effectively rang in a new era. Although the German-Russian relationship during the early 2000s was largely a continuation of positive engagements bilaterally and through the PCA, these relations took place under different leadership. In 1998, Gerhard Schröder became Kohl's successor. As a member of the Social Democratic Party (SPD), Schröder stepped into his party's footsteps through an inherently positive attitude toward Russia. In addition to very friendly relations forming between the German and Russian governments during that time, Schröder and Putin established a personal friendship that has lasted into the present.

#### 4.3.1.3. German-Russian Relations: The Gas Wars

Despite the friendly relationship between Schröder and Putin, differences between Germany and Russia became increasingly noticeable. This became especially noticeable

---

<sup>22</sup> Ibid.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid., 140-141.

beginning in 2005 when Schröder lost the German federal election to Angela Merkel, who had grown up in East Germany and was significantly more wary of Russian intentions. Furthermore, Merkel's election coincided with the year when the first gas dispute between Ukraine and Russia emerged. This dispute, which would become known as part of the gas wars, would grow to affect numerous eastern and central European states over the next few years.

The first notable occurrence of these gas wars began in 2005 over failing gas price negotiations between Russia and Ukraine. When Ukraine and Russia did not come to a conclusion at the end of 2005, Gazprom, a state-owned Russian gas company, began to reduce its gas supply to Ukraine on 1 January 2006. Over the next four days, Ukraine was left without gas.<sup>24</sup> Though other states that received gas through the pipeline in question were not intended to be affected by this dispute also registered a cessation in gas supply for numerous days in the middle of winter.<sup>25</sup> On 4 January 2006, an agreement between Ukraine and Russia was reached that restored Gazprom's gas supply to Ukraine and the rest of Europe, yet seeds of distrust had been sewn.

Over the course of the next two years, uncertainty remained over new and outstanding grievances. As 2009 began to approach, Ukraine and Russia could once more not agree on the upcoming year's gas pricing. Then, on 1 January 2009, gas exports from Russia to Ukraine were completely halted, sending a ripple effect throughout eastern and central Europe. Negotiations began soon after the gas supply was halted but lasted twenty days. As numerous eastern and

---

<sup>24</sup> Katarzyna Wolczuk, "Managing the flows of gas and rules: Ukraine between the EU and Russia," *Eurasian Geography and Economic* 57, no. 1 (2016): 122.; Joyce Marie Mushaben, *Becoming Madam Chancellor: Angela Merkel and the Berlin Republic* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 143.

<sup>25</sup> Adam N. Stulberg, "Out of Gas?: Russia, Ukraine, Europe, and the Changing Geopolitics of Natural Gas," *Problems of Post-Communism* 62, no. 2 (2015): 113.; Mushaben, *Becoming Madam Chancellor*, 143.

central European states were left without gas once more in the middle of winter for almost three weeks, it became increasingly obvious that alternative sources of energy would need to be found and that dependence on Russia may not be inherently beneficial.

In addition to the gas wars that brought uncertainty to Europe during the 2000s, two other events began to impact German-Russian relations. The first one out of the two was the 2008 war in Georgia. According to Russia, the Russian occupation of the two Georgian regions of Abkhazia and South Ossetia was to support the two regions in their efforts of realizing their right to self-determination.<sup>26</sup> Alternatively, Germany, along with other members of the West, perceived the Russian military intervention as a show of force to destabilize Georgia and deter it from its efforts to become more closely allied with members of the EU and NATO, both of whom were already treating relations with Georgia with caution.<sup>27</sup> This accusation was made in light of the fact that the Russian occupation of the two Georgian border regions effectively reduced Georgia's chance of joining the EU or NATO to zero, since both organizations require all members and those wanting to apply to have clear borders with no border disputes or contested regions.<sup>28</sup>

The second event that worsened relations between Russia and Germany was Putin's return as President in 2012. Following the disintegration of the Soviet Union in 1991, the new Russian constitution had set a presidential term limit of two terms in order to help foster democratic processes and to help prevent the Russian Federation from returning to its non-democratic origins within the Soviet Union. As a result of this statute, Putin did not run for re-

---

<sup>26</sup> Mikhail Filippov, "Diversionary Role of the Georgia-Russia Conflict: International Constraints and Domestic Appeal," *Europe-Asia Studies* 61, no. 10 (2009): 1838.

<sup>27</sup> Sebastian Mayer, "The EU and NATO in Georgia: complementary and overlapping security strategies in a precarious environment," *European Security* 26, no. 3 (2017): 438-439.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*

election as President in 2008 as he had already completed two presidential terms. Instead, Dmitry Medvedev was elected President in 2008, while Putin became Russian Prime Minister. When the next Russian federal elections took place in 2012, it became clear that the democratic development of Russia was at risk if Putin were to become President once more. Consequently, when it was announced that Putin had won the federal election and would once again become President, Merkel voiced her concerns.<sup>29</sup> These two developments, the 2008 war in Georgia and Putin's re-election as President in 2012, signified two major developments that led to the increasingly rapid deterioration of relations between Germany and Russia.

#### 4.3.1.4. German-Russian Relations: Crimea & the Ukraine Crisis

The final and most impactful event that negatively impacted German-Russian relations was Russia's annexation of Crimea and its occupation of eastern Ukrainian regions in 2014. The developments unfolded in late February 2014 and resulted in the infringement upon Ukrainian sovereignty and Russian enforced rule over the Crimean Peninsula. As these actions went directly against the rules based international liberal order, Chancellor Merkel described Putin as one "out of touch with reality" while urging Putin to withdraw his forces and actors from Crimea.<sup>30</sup> As Germany fully support an international order based on rules and international law, Russia's actions in Crimea and eastern Ukraine went directly against Germany's intrinsic values. Consequently, the EU implemented economic sanctions against Russia as a means to coerce Russia into withdrawing from eastern Ukraine and Crimea.<sup>31</sup> Moreover, the Group of Eight (G8), which was a loose alliance of eight economically powerful countries, canceled its upcoming G8

---

<sup>29</sup> Mushaben, *Becoming Madam Chancellor*, 137.

<sup>30</sup> Ian Traynor and Patrick Wintour, "Ukraine crisis: Vladimir Putin has lost the plot, says German chancellor," *The Guardian*, 2014.

<sup>31</sup> European Union, "EU sanctions against Russia over Ukraine crisis," *European Union Newsroom*.

meeting which was set to be held in Sochi, Russia in June 2014. This cancellation coincided with the remaining seven G8 members deciding to expel Russia from the alliance to become the Group of Seven (G7).<sup>32</sup> These events were the final blow to the post-Cold War relations between Germany and Russia and introduced a new era of German-Russian relations. These events will be looked at more closely in the next chapter.

#### 4.4. Conclusion

The relationship between West Germany and the Soviet Union and, following the end of the Cold War, the relationship between Germany and Russia has been one closely intertwined with larger geopolitical developments since 1949. In addition to this complex and intertwined relationship, these bilateral relationships and domestic political decisions in the Federal Republic of Germany also affected and influenced international relations during the Cold War and post-Cold War environment. One of the most notable domestic developments within West Germany that affected West German-Soviet, as well as international, relations was the creation of West Germany's *Ostpolitik* in the late 1960s and throughout the 1970s. The policies included under the *Ostpolitik* helped normalize relations beyond what Konrad Adenauer had achieved in the 1950s through his first visit to Moscow and West Germany's first formal visit and representation in the Soviet Union. In addition to the significant impact of the *Ostpolitik* within Cold War international relations, the creation of West Germany's *Ostpolitik* also signified a cultural and societal shift within West Germany as the domestic focus shifted away from purely economic growth to improving West Germans' quality of life, the state of the environment, and the growing equality of men and women, as discussed in Chapter 3.

---

<sup>32</sup> Zeke J. Miller, "World Leaders Cancel G-8 Summit in Russia After Ukraine Crisis," *Time*, 2014.

Following the end of the Cold War, both West Germany and the Soviet Union underwent significant changes as both countries' territories and systems changed dramatically; the two Germanies were reunified and the Soviet Union disintegrated. The post-Cold War relationship between Germany and Russia had the potential to be drafted from the ground up. As a result, efforts between Germany and Russia directly, as well as through the EU, aimed to create greater interdependence between the two countries in order to make it more difficult for the two sides to grow apart as drastically again as they had during the Cold War. Though these efforts were largely successful during the 1990s and early 2000s, events such as the gas wars in the 2000s and Russia's invasion of northern regions of Georgia soured relations between Russia and the West. When Putin was re-elected as President in 2012 after a four-year hiatus as Prime Minister, German Chancellor Angela Merkel began to raise concerns that the relationship between Germany and Russia might deteriorate. The final blow to the deterioration of relations between Germany and Russia, however, was Russia's annexation of Crimea and destabilization of eastern Ukraine.

## Chapter 5: The German Federal Ministry of Foreign Affairs

### 5.1. Introduction

The international relations of the Federal Republic of Germany are extensive and multifaceted. Although numerous ministries at both the federal and state-levels engage internationally, the Federal Ministry of Foreign Affairs is the main international actor of the Federal Republic of Germany. Also known as the *Auswärtiges Amt*, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is the government department responsible for promoting bilateral relations with other states around the world, facilitating multilateral relations through regional and international organizations, as well as maintaining embassies, consulates, and missions abroad. As such, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs plays a key role in Germany's relations with Russia as well as maintaining and operationalizing Germany's *Russlandpolitik*, or "Russia policies." Through its mandate, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs has worked closely with the Chancellery and the Chancellor in negotiating various ceasefire agreements during the Ukraine crisis. While multiple meetings were held between the heads of the respective governments, the Ministers of Foreign Affairs from the countries involved in the diplomatic talks surrounding the Ukraine crisis, namely Germany, France, Russia, and Ukraine, also actively engaged with one another. As such, there is the chance for a certain amount of discrepancy between the Chancellor's behaviour, approaches, and goals to dealing with the Ukraine crisis and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs' actions in the diplomatic process.

This chapter will focus on the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, how it relates to the German Federal Government as a whole, and how the Ministry dealt with the Ukraine Crisis beginning in early 2014 until July 2019. The chapter will first provide an overview of the Federal Ministry of

Foreign Affairs in order to understand the history and nature of the ministry. The chapter will then introduce and assess the leadership of the Ministry during the Ukraine crisis, focusing on the three Ministers of Foreign Affairs during the time: Frank-Walter Steinmeier, Sigmar Gabriel, and Heiko Maas. Following the assessment of the three ministers, the chapter will discuss key events of the Ukraine crisis and how Germany reacted to Russian actions and how both German actors, specifically the German Federal Government as a whole and the German Ministry of Foreign Affairs in particular, responded. Finally, this chapter will analyze Germany's actions relating to the Ukraine crisis through the lens of the rational actor model (RAM) and subsequently through the lens of the bureaucratic/governmental politics model in order to determine the model that more adequately describes the German Federal Ministry of Foreign Affairs' approach and response to the Ukraine crisis.

## 5.2. Overview of the Ministry

The German Ministry of Foreign Affairs plays an integral part in the German Federal Government. Its historical significance as well as its continuing importance today make the Ministry of Foreign Affairs a key player within the German governmental structure. Following the end of the Second World War and the unconditional surrender of the Nazi regime, the four occupying powers rendered all of Germany's diplomatic and international relations null and void.<sup>1</sup> Despite this termination of foreign relations, international relationships continued to play a role and, over the next four years, the Allies were in charge of Germany's relations on the international stage. However, when the division of Germany into East and West Germany

---

<sup>1</sup> Thomas Maulucci, *Adenauer's Foreign Policy: West German Diplomacy in the Shadow of the Third Reich* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2012), 41.

solidified in the late 1940s, different sets of international relations became evident in the Soviet-controlled East Germany and the Western-oriented West Germany.

This divergence in international priorities and relations continued when the French-, British-, and American-controlled zones joined together to become the Federal Republic of Germany, more commonly known as West Germany. Although West Germans were able to elect their first post-war chancellor in 1949, the three Allies maintained control of Germany's foreign relations through the Allied High Commission.<sup>2</sup> The newly elected West German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer did not have much control over the decision of who controlled German foreign relations. Accordingly, he soon came to realize that establishing a governance structure, re-establishing industries, and engaging in trade with neighbouring countries was difficult without control over West German foreign relations.<sup>3</sup> As the Federal Government under Adenauer began to solidify and streamline its control over West Germany, it became increasingly clear that West Germany could not fulfil the Allies' expectations of West Germany contributing to West European and transatlantic alliances and commitments without autonomy over its own foreign relations. Consequently, control over West Germany's foreign relations were handed over to the Federal Government in March 1951. Thus, West Germany was able to create its own foreign office and embark on the road to increased autonomy.<sup>4</sup>

As West Germany regained autonomy in 1954 through the Paris Accords and created the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (*Auswärtiges Amt*) in 1955, West Germany established itself as a member of the international community that adhered to international agreements and

---

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 92.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 92-93.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 93.

organizations.<sup>5</sup> Because of this inherently liberal perception of international affairs, West Germany not only established new relationships with its neighbours, most notably France, but this perception also supported West Germany's membership in the newly formed European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC). In addition to economic cooperation, military considerations also played into West Germany's post-war entrance on the international stage. The Western European Union (WEU) emerged out of the Brussels Treaty and included West Germany and Italy as members to help the two former adversaries join the West European and transatlantic communities.<sup>6</sup>

Over the next three decades, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs worked to establish West Germany as a reliable member of the international community by joining the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the UN, and by signing several international treaties and conventions. These efforts established West Germany within the international system and made it a significant contributor to the international community and multilateral efforts and organizations. These relationships, which were built upon and are heavily grounded in the international order, persisted throughout the Cold War and helped West Germany to maintain its footing within the international system. This multilateral foundation continues to influence Germany's priorities and especially Germany's foreign policy priorities. Consequently, this multilateral foundation and unquestioning support of the international legal order can be found in the German Ministry of Foreign Affairs' five foundational principles.

---

<sup>5</sup> Wilhelm G. Grewe, *Deutsche Außenpolitik der Nachkriegszeit* (Stuttgart, DE: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1960), 101.

<sup>6</sup> Western European Union, "Western European Union – Union de l'Europe Occidentale," *Western European Union*.

Germany's Ministry of Foreign Affairs today is based on five foundational principles that shape Germany's foreign policy priorities and are designed to strengthen the Ministry's mandate. As these principles are based off of Germany's *Grundgesetz* (Basic Law), membership within the EU, and long-term international commitments, these principles are independent of the ruling government of the day. The first foundational principle is to support the European Union (EU) and by virtue of that, European integration. Since Germany is a committed member of the EU, EU priorities and supporting the continuing integration of the Union is crucial to Germany's foreign policy priorities.<sup>7</sup> This support for the EU can be traced back to Germany's commitments and forms the basis for re-emergence following the end of the Second World War and the creation of the Federal Republic of Germany. As discussed above, concerns surrounding a resurgence of Nazi tendencies in Germany during the late 1940s and 1950s were countered by involving Germany in regional organizations, alliances, and commitments to increase interdependence and to structure post-war western Europe as a collaborative and cooperative environment instead of a competitive one, as had historically been the norm. Therefore, Germany's commitment to the prosperity, integration, and presence of the EU is deeply embedded within the Federal Republic of Germany's history.

The next foundational principle for Germany's foreign policy is Germany's transatlantic partnership.<sup>8</sup> Within this principle, two relationships specifically stand out: the bilateral relationship with the United States (US) and Germany's membership in NATO. Germany's Ministry of Foreign Affairs recognizes that the transatlantic relationship with the US is based on

---

<sup>7</sup> Auswärtiges Amt, "Grundprinzipien deutscher Außenpolitik," *Auswärtiges Amt*, 9 October 2019.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*

“historical experiences and common values, like democracy, freedom, and the rule of law.”<sup>9</sup> Growing out of these historical experiences is also Germany’s commitment to its membership within NATO. These commitments emerged in the decade following the end of the Second World War and the post-war reconstruction that was largely funded by the US through the Marshall Fund. As such, while Germany is not directly indebted to the US, the American-centric reconstruction during the 1940s and 1950s, coupled with US soft power, “societal, political, and economic” convergence, supports this close bilateral relationship.<sup>10</sup> Leaning on Germany’s value of international cooperation and partnerships in tackling existing and emerging global issues, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs espouses that through its transatlantic cooperation with the US, there is enough weight internationally to tackle a multitude of issues, such as terrorism, climate change, poverty, and epidemics.<sup>11</sup>

The third foundational principle of Germany’s foreign policy focuses on Germany’s involvement in the field of international peace and security. In being an active player in this field, Germany channels its engagement through multilateral organizations, such as the UN, the EU, NATO, the OSCE, the Group of Seven (G7), and the Group of 20 (G20).<sup>12</sup> A significant aspect of Germany’s policy within this principle is its *Friedenspolitik* (Policy of Peace). Although Germany engages militarily through multilateral agreements and organizations, seeking diplomatic solutions to issues and conflicts is highlighted as the preferable and prevalent option to

---

<sup>9</sup> Translated by the author from “...historischen Erfahrungen und gemeinsamen Werten wie Demokratie, Freiheit und Rechtsstaatlichkeit.” in Auswärtiges Amt, “Grundprinzipien deutscher Außenpolitik,” *Auswärtiges Amt*, 9 October 2019.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid.

<sup>11</sup> Auswärtiges Amt, “Die transatlantischen Beziehungen,” *Auswärtiges Amt*.

<sup>12</sup> Auswärtiges Amt, “Grundprinzipien deutscher Außenpolitik,” *Auswärtiges Amt*, 9 October 2019.

maintaining international peace and security.<sup>13</sup> Furthermore, the principle includes Germany's focus on the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, disarmament, peacekeeping, and humanitarian relief. Although many of these tasks can be achieved militarily, Germany prides itself in working to achieve all peace and security priorities through civilian support, cooperation, and diplomacy.<sup>14</sup>

Closely tied to the principle of peace and security is Germany's foreign policy's fourth principle: democracy, rule of law, and human rights. Not only does Germany support these three concepts out of its own convictions but also because it is in Germany's national interest to support the formation of an international community that is based on these three concepts.<sup>15</sup> Moreover, Germany itself has these three concepts anchored in its constitution, the *Grundgesetz* (Basic Law). Like the other principles, this principle has also clearly developed out of the effort that was put into shaping the Federal Republic of Germany following the end of the Second World War and the global experiences of the international community and the German people during the time of the Third Reich. Consequently, Germany clearly declares that human rights, the rule of law, and democracy are crucial to a peaceful and cooperative global environment.

The final principle upon which German foreign policy is built is its support for a multilateral international order. This principle ties the preceding four principles together, as Germany avoids unilateral and military actions as much as possible. Within this principle, Germany points toward achieving fair and sustainable globalization in order to achieve

---

<sup>13</sup> Ibid.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid.

international peace and security.<sup>16</sup> From a practical perspective, this requires – and explains – Germany’s unequivocal involvement in and support for international and regional organizations, such as the UN, NATO, the OSCE, the G7, the G20, and the EU. Germany’s absolute support for multilateralism is at the core of Germany’s foreign policy and is reflective of the Federal Republic of Germany’s history and experiences since its creation in 1949. This foundational pillar of supporting a multilateral international order is flanked by Germany’s two other pillars influencing foreign relations. The first one is *Außenwirtschaftspolitik* (Foreign Economic Policy), which supports Germany’s export-focused economy. The other pillar is Germany’s *Auswärtige Kultur- und Bildungspolitik* (Foreign Culture and Education Policies), which underlines Germany’s cooperative, non-military, and normative foreign policy and thus represents the inherent nature of Germany’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

### 5.3. Ministerial Leadership

The German Federal Foreign Ministry is led by the Federal Minister of Foreign Affairs, also known as the *Bundesminister des Auswärtigen*. Even though the majority of the Ministry is made up of non-partisan public servants, the Minister plays a crucial role in determining the priorities and goals of the Ministry. As such, it is imperative to understand the partisan interests of each minister, the ruling government’s overall goals, as well as the personal convictions and history of each minister. To understand the behaviour of the Federal Ministry of Foreign Affairs during this chapter’s case study of the Ukraine Crisis, this section will focus on the three Ministers of Foreign Affairs since Russia’s annexation of Crimea in early 2014.

---

<sup>16</sup> Ibid.

The first of the three ministers that served between 2014 and 2019 is Frank-Walter Steinmeier. Steinmeier was appointed Federal Minister of Foreign Affairs in December 2013 and served in that role until 27 January 2017. In September 2013, the most recent federal elections changed Angela Merkel's Christian Democratic Union (CDU)'s coalition partner from the libertarian Free Democratic Party to the Social Democratic Party (SPD). As a result of this new coalition, the position of the Federal Minister of Foreign Affairs was to be filled by the CDU's coalition partner, the SPD. Through this coalition agreement, Steinmeier, the former Head of the German Chancellery, was appointed Federal Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Steinmeier's former position as Head of the German Chancellery is important to examine, as it provides insight into Steinmeier's positions on Germany's foreign policy as well as his position on Russia specifically. Before joining federal politics, Steinmeier worked on the state level in the German state of Lower Saxony. When Gerhard Schröder, however, was elected Chancellor in 1998, Steinmeier, who had been working for Schröder since 1991, was promoted to join the Federal Government as Head of the German Chancellery.<sup>17</sup> The working relationship between Steinmeier and Schröder was so close that, to this day, some see Steinmeier as "Schröders Mann" (Schröder's man or "right hand").<sup>18</sup> While close relationships and mentorships are common in political careers, this relationship was specifically significant as it relates to relations with Russia. Both Schröder and Steinmeier were members of the SPD, which has historically been more open to relations with Russia than the rival CDU. Although the SPD's reputation is that it can at times be a Russophile, Schröder's individual relationship with Russia

---

<sup>17</sup> Torben Lütjen and Lars Geiges, *Frank-Walter Steinmeier: Die Biografie* (Freiburg, DE: Verlag Herder, 2017), 38-40.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, 37.

and Russia's president Vladimir Putin is exceptional. While Steinmeier's stance toward Russia is not as overtly supportive as that of Schröder, Steinmeier nevertheless promoted the notion of "Wandel durch Verflechtung" (change through interdependency).<sup>19</sup> This concept is an adaptation of the concept "Wandel durch Annäherung" (change through rapprochement), which was coined and used during the early years of West Germany's *Ostpolitik* in the late 1960s and early 1970s.<sup>20</sup> Although this approach was already difficult to achieve and not entirely favoured by Angela Merkel, who was chancellor the first time Steinmeier was Minister of Foreign Affairs from 2005 to 2009, the approach became even more complicated during Steinmeier's second term as Minister of Foreign Affairs that began in December 2013.

When Steinmeier began his second term as Minister of Foreign Affairs, his goal was to return Germany's foreign policy from an observatory role to a more active one on the world stage.<sup>21</sup> Having already identified in his first speech to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in December 2013 that Ukraine and Russia posed a region for potential conflict, Steinmeier's call for a more active role on the international stage effectively foreshadowed what would unfold over the course of his tenure. The growing crises, dubbed as "hot spots" by Steinmeier, gave him the nickname of *Bundeskrisenminister*, which translates to Federal Crisis Minister.<sup>22</sup> This nickname effectively underlined Steinmeier's plan to take a more active approach to international relations and Germany's foreign policy.

---

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., 118.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid., 200-202.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid., 205.

Beginning with the Maidan protests in December 2013, Steinmeier highlighted the decreasing distance between Germany and crises around the world as a growing cause for concern in his speech at the 2014 Munich Security Conference.<sup>23</sup> Then, when clashes on the Maidan grew increasingly violent, Steinmeier, along with his Polish and French counterparts as part of the Weimar Triangle, traveled to Kiev on 20 February 2014 to meet with Ukrainian president Victor Yanukovich, Ukrainian opposition leader Vitali Klitchko, and a Russian diplomatic representative to negotiate a solution to the protests and to ensure a transition agreement until new elections could take place.<sup>24</sup> Following thirty hours of negotiations, an agreement was signed by those in the room as well as representatives of the Maidan Protests, outlining a five point plan that included promised a ceasefire, the participation of members of the opposition in government, and new elections.<sup>25</sup> This diplomatic feat, however, did not last long and shortly thereafter, following the ousting of President Yanukovich from office, Russian-speaking individuals equipped with military hardware appeared on the Crimean Peninsula.

Over the course of the next two years, from 2014 to 2016, Steinmeier played an important role in organizing and participating in numerous diplomatic attempts to resolve the Ukraine crisis, most namely through the Minsk Accords and Minsk II. While working on these agreements, Steinmeier also continued to emphasize to Germany's allies within the EU and NATO that harsher actions against Russia, such as supplying Ukraine with weapons could not be the solution. Consequently, *The New York Times* dubbed Steinmeier "a Man in the Middle" who was trying to

---

<sup>23</sup> Auswärtiges Amt, "Rede von Außenminister Frank-Walter Steinmeier anlässlich der 50. Münchner Sicherheitskonferenz," *Auswärtiges Amt*, 1 February 2014.

<sup>24</sup> Lütjen and Geiges, *Frank-Walter Steinmeier*, 207-208.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*

balance Western interests, the prevalence of international law, and open channels of communication with Russia.<sup>26</sup>

This reputation remained the most applicable summary of Steinmeier's actions and behaviour during his tenure as Minister of Foreign Affairs. During the early days of the Ukraine Crisis, Steinmeier at first opposed imposing economic sanctions on Russia, as Steinmeier saw the potential of an economically collapsed Russia as a further destabilizing force in Eastern Europe.<sup>27</sup> Eventually, Steinmeier changed his mind on sanctions and argued for carefully planned and targeted sanctions. While Steinmeier supported sanctions, however, he publicly opposed NATO drills conducted in Eastern Europe in the summer of 2016, arguing that these military exercises were too provoking and thus counterproductive to German and European peace efforts with Russia.<sup>28</sup>

From a bureaucratic and procedural perspective, Torben Lütjen and Lars Geiges argue that within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs under Steinmeier's second tenure from 2013 to 2017, there were no noteworthy discrepancies within different branches or between various levels of the Ministry.<sup>29</sup> This can be attributed to two dominant factors. The first one is that the Secretary of State responsible for relations with Russia was a friend and had a good working relationship with the Secretary of State responsible for the Middle East and Syria and Chancellor Merkel's advisor on foreign and security policies. As such, Steinmeier enjoyed a supportive network of bureaucrats within his ministry. The second factor is the fact that Merkel gave Steinmeier a

---

<sup>26</sup> Alison Smale, "Germany's Foreign Minister, a Man in the Middle," *The New York Times*, 19 November 2014.

<sup>27</sup> Lütjen and Geiges, *Frank-Walter Steinmeier*, 211.

<sup>28</sup> "German Foreign Minister Frank-Walter Steinmeier Criticizes NATO Military Drills in East Europe and European Union Sanctions on Russia," *The Ukraine Crisis Timeline, Center for Strategic & International Studies*, 19 July 2016.

<sup>29</sup> Lütjen and Geiges, *Frank-Walter Steinmeier*, 214-215.

significant amount of freedom in his decision-making, which greatly facilitated a clear and streamlined string of policy decisions. The German magazine *Spiegel Online* went so far as to call Steinmeier Merkel's ancillary chancellor (*Nebenzkanzler*).<sup>30</sup>

Taking over the role of Minister of Foreign Affairs on 27 January 2017 was Sigmar Gabriel. Also a member of the SPD, Gabriel served as head of the SPD during Steinmeier's tenure as Minister of Foreign Affairs. Following a shuffle in Merkel's cabinet, Gabriel took over Steinmeier's position as Steinmeier was confirmed as the Federal President of Germany. A dedicated social democrat, Gabriel took on the role of Minister of Foreign Affairs with the understanding that Germany needed to be more active internationally while maintaining social democratic values, such as the notions of *Friedenspolitik* (Peace policy) and *Entwicklungspolitik* (Development policy), instead of focusing on more conservative notions, such as defence.<sup>31</sup> This became especially noticeable when Gabriel opposed the notion that Germany should increase its defence spending to at least two percent of Germany's gross domestic product. Moreover, Gabriel argued that Germany needed to stop withdrawing from international affairs because of its history but rather that Germany had a responsibility, because of Germany's history, to get involved to actively help other countries develop and resolve international conflicts through diplomatic support.<sup>32</sup> Based on these arguments, Gabriel's approach to Germany's foreign policy built upon his predecessor's understanding that Germany needed to play an active foreign policy role on the international stage. Nevertheless, Gabriel expected this cultural change to take place within

---

<sup>30</sup> Severin Weiland and Phillip Wittrock, "Der Nebenzkanzler," *Spiegel Online*, 19 November 2014.

<sup>31</sup> Sigmar Gabriel, *Zeitwende in der Weltpolitik: Mehr Verantwortung in ungewissen Zeiten* (Freiburg, DE: Verlag Herder, 2018), 259-261.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, 259.

European constraints in the sense that no matter how active German foreign policy might become, it needed to remain integral to European priorities and support continued European integration, effectively preventing Germany from standing out as holding disproportionate amounts of power or responsibility.<sup>33</sup>

Gabriel's understanding of Germany's *Russlandpolitik*, especially given Russia's increasingly aggressive behaviour in Eastern Europe, was reflective of the social democratic *Ostpolitik* that was introduced during the late 1960s and early 1970s, which effectively thawed diplomatic relations between West Germany and the Eastern Bloc, namely the Soviet Union. This is to say that Gabriel presented the current situation in Europe and relations between the West and Russia as one quite similar to that at the height of the Cold War. Consequently, strengthening and stabilizing relations with Russia, like relations with the Soviet Union through West Germany's *Ostpolitik* during the Cold War, was a process that required many small steps and achievements.<sup>34</sup> As such, Gabriel rejected the notion of taking drastic actions against Russia as it was important to find a balance between allying oneself with Russia and closing all channels of communication with the country.

After only 14 months in the office of the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Sigmar Gabriel was succeeded by Heiko Maas on 14 March 2018. Due to internal tensions within the SPD, Gabriel was not nominated for another cabinet position and he consequently decided to leave politics soon thereafter.<sup>35</sup> Also a member of the SPD, Maas had previously served as Federal Minister of

---

<sup>33</sup> Jamie Gaskarth and Kai Oppermann, "Clashing Traditions: German Foreign Policy in a New Era," *International Studies Perspectives* (2019): 7.

<sup>34</sup> Gabriel, *Zeitwende in der Weltpolitik*, 126-127.

<sup>35</sup> Martin Greive and Dietmar Neuerer, "Heiko Maas to be foreign minister as Gabriel loses job," *Handelsblatt*, 8 March 2018.

Justice and Consumer Protection in Merkel's government since 2013. Originally from the German state of Saarland, Maas was a member of Saarland's *Landtag* (State Legislative Assembly) from 1994 until 2013.<sup>36</sup> During this time, he served as Member of the Assembly, Secretary of State, led the SPD as the party's opposition leader, acted as Vice Premier, and ultimately held numerous ministerial positions at the state level before joining the Federal Government in the 2013 election.<sup>37</sup> Although Maas experienced numerous defeats throughout his political career, he has always managed to turn these defeats to his advantage, which gave him the reputation of being optimistic yet outspoken about his portfolios and values.<sup>38</sup>

A much-discussed concern when Maas took over the foreign affairs portfolio within the German Federal Government was his reputation for being outspoken and his Twitter presence, which had been built on his outspokenness.<sup>39</sup> However, these concerns were largely proven wrong when Maas assumed his position as new Minister of Foreign Affairs. While Maas remains outspoken, the topics and perspectives he chooses to drive forward and highlight consistently align with the Germany's Federal Ministry of Foreign Affairs' five pillars. This is to say that when Maas chooses to be outspoken, it is because he emphasizes the importance of multilateralism, the importance of continuing EU integration, or the value of NATO.<sup>40</sup> This behaviour also extends to bilateral meetings between Maas and his counterparts. Regarding his activities surrounding the Ukraine crisis specifically, Maas focuses on collaboration and diplomatic actions to help ease the crisis in eastern Ukraine by collaborating with the Ukrainian government and its President,

---

<sup>36</sup> Auswärtiges Amt, Deutsche Botschaft Maskat, "The German Foreign Minister," *German Embassy Muscat*.

<sup>37</sup> Ibid.

<sup>38</sup> Marcel Fürstenau, "Heiko Maas: Who is Germany's new foreign minister?," *Deutsche Welle*, 9 March 2018.

<sup>39</sup> Ibid.

<sup>40</sup> "Germany's Merkel, Maas defend NATO after Macron's rebuke," *Deutsche Welle*, 10 November 2019.

Volodymyr Zelensky, while continuously focusing on and being outspoken about key factors that would help ease the suffering, such as disengagement and ensuring safe passage across frontlines.<sup>41</sup>

#### 5.4. Case Study: Ukraine Peace Process

In late February 2014, “little green men” began appearing across the Ukrainian peninsula of Crimea and thus marked the beginning of the Russian annexation of Crimea.<sup>42</sup> These developments took place shortly after the end of the violence of the Maidan protests, which occurred when anti-government protesters were met by the violent opposition of Ukrainian police and government forces. The “little green men,” equipped with Russian army fatigues and armed with Russian weapons, began seizing strategically important structures across the Crimean Peninsula with a considerable level of professionalism.<sup>43</sup> Less than a month later, on 16 March 2014, Crimean officials held a referendum that gave the Crimean voters the option to either join Russia or to gain greater autonomy from Kiev. The large voter turnout overwhelmingly supported Crimea’s accession to the Russian Federation, which it then did two days later on 18 March 2014. This move has been called unconstitutional, illegal, and staged by critics, specifically NATO members.<sup>44</sup>

Shortly after the seizure of key strategic assets and locations in Crimea by Russian actors, the eastern Ukrainian regions of Donetsk and Luhansk, also commonly known as the Donbass, were seized by Russian-backed rebels and descended into unrest that has been likened to a civil

---

<sup>41</sup> Auswärtiges Amt, “Potential for momentum on the conflict in eastern Ukraine,” *Federal Foreign Office*, 19 November 2019.

<sup>42</sup> Steven Pifer, “Five years after Crimea’s illegal annexation, the issue is no closer to resolution,” *Brookings*, 18 March 2019.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*

war. While Crimea was *de facto* annexed by Russia and the peninsula has been relatively safe and peaceful, the Donbass experienced the opposite. Since spring 2014, fighting between Russian-backed rebel groups and Ukrainian government forces has been ongoing and, though casualties have been relatively low, unrest-related deaths continue to occur. The state of violence in the Donbass has been consistent during the analyzed period in this thesis, which ranges from early 2014 and the beginning of the unrests in eastern Ukraine and Crimea until July 2019 when the German Federal Minister of Defence changed from Ursula von der Leyen to Annegret Kramp-Karrenbauer. In contrast, although there were some skirmishes in Crimea, the annexation of the peninsula remained relatively peaceful, due to Russian control, compared to the regions of Donetsk and Luhansk, other than isolated incidents, such as the standoff in the Sea of Azov in October 2018.

Germany's reaction to the events that began taking place in eastern Ukraine and Crimea was clear from the beginning. Germany declared Russia's behaviour unacceptable and in clear violation of international law, noting that "the permanent attempts to harm the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine and to destabilize the country" had shown that Russia did not use the opportunity to help promote stability in the region but rather nurture uncertainty.<sup>45</sup> However, despite various violations of international law and the clear disregard of the local population's interests and rights, Germany, along with its Western allies, was unable to call Russia's actions and the developments in Crimea and the Donbass an act of aggression. Consequently, the initial reactions from Germany and those of its allies were verbal condemnations.

---

<sup>45</sup> Bundesregierung, "Bundesregierung verurteilt Referendum," *Die Bundesregierung*, 18 March 2014.

Following these verbal condemnations and over the course of the first few weeks following the initial seizure of Ukrainian territory, economic sanctions were presented by the EU with the aim to financially and economically punish Russia and to use it as a bargaining mechanism with Russia to support Ukraine's reclamation of its Eastern territories. Implementing these sanctions, however, proved to be more contested than was initially expected when Merkel promoted the use of sanctions while Steinmeier took a more cautious approach.<sup>46</sup> During the Europe-wide as well as pan-German debate on whether to implement economic sanctions, Minister of Foreign Affairs Steinmeier at first opposed the imposition of economic sanctions as he was concerned that it could potentially worsen the already strained relationship with Russia. Trying to strike a balance and fulfill its historical role of bridging the gap between East, namely Russia, and the West, Steinmeier at first argued that imposing sanctions on Russia would be counterproductive and could destabilize the channels of communication between Russia and Germany as well as between Russia and the West.

The arguments opposing the implementation of sanctions continued throughout Steinmeier's tenure and extended into Gabriel's time as Minister of Foreign Affairs.<sup>47</sup> Gabriel went so far as to publicly contemplate loosening Germany's sanctions as imposed through the EU sanctions regime against Russia, citing concerns that the sanctions could reduce or even close channels of communication and diplomacy.<sup>48</sup> Though the EU's sanctions against Russia ultimately did not destabilize or close channels of communication between Russia and the West, five years after the sanctions were implemented, they have not had their intended effect.

---

<sup>46</sup> "Steinmeier appelliert an Vernunft, Merkel gibt sich hart," *Handelsblatt*, 19 December 2014.

<sup>47</sup> Ibid.

<sup>48</sup> Severin Weiland, "Ärger um Gabriels Alleingang," *Spiegel Online*, 18 February 2018.

Throughout their tenures as Minister of Foreign Affairs, both Steinmeier and Gabriel were wary of the sanctions and publicly raised concerns surrounding the impact these sanctions might have on Germany's economy and its relationship with Russia. Alternatively, Heiko Maas, most recent Minister of Foreign Affairs has taken a stance that has been more in line with the German Federal Government's opinion about the sanctions. Unlike his predecessors, Maas supports the continuation of the sanctions unless Russia meets certain criteria and more cooperation from Russia.<sup>49</sup>

In addition to the economic sanctions coordinated through the EU, Germany, along with France, Ukraine, and Russia engaged in quadrilateral talks in an attempt to solve the Ukraine Crisis diplomatically. Through this format, the four countries, as represented by the German Chancellor and the French, Ukrainian, and Russian Presidents, renegotiated the Minsk Accords to try to revive the Minsk Protocol and Memorandum, or more commonly known as Minsk-1. The "Package of measures for the Implementation of the Minsk Agreements" was the agreement that was signed by members of the Trilateral Contact Group, which includes Ukraine, Russia, and the OSCE, as well as the Donetsk and Luhansk People's Republics.<sup>50</sup> As all parties to this agreement agreed to do their part to help resolve the crisis, the OSCE became the designated observer of the cease fire between Ukraine, Russia, and various rebel factions.<sup>51</sup> However, the OSCE observer mission was only able to do exactly as its title states: observe. While the OSCE

---

<sup>49</sup> "Außenminister Maas in Russland: Keine Aufweichungen der Sanktionen," *ZDF*, 22 August 2019.

<sup>50</sup> "Everything you wanted to know about the Minsk peace deal, but were afraid to ask," *Euromaidan Press*.

<sup>51</sup> John Irish and Andrea Shalal, "Powers push for ceasefire, weapons withdrawal in eastern Ukraine," *Reuters*, 18 February 2017.

mission continues its work diligently, listing and publishing accounts and lists of where shots were fired and the casualties that occurred on specific days, it has been unable to enforce a ceasefire.

As matters progressed slowly, Russian president Vladimir Putin suggested the use of United Nations (UN) peacekeepers to help keep the OSCE observers safe. This suggestion was welcomed by Germany and the West, however, the West and Russia had different intentions and goals for the potential UN peacekeeping mission. While Ukraine and the West would have supported peacekeepers along the border between Russia and Ukraine, Russian President Vladimir Putin favoured the idea of stationing peacekeepers along Ukraine's inner borders between its easternmost regions of Donetsk and Luhansk and the rest of Ukraine. These different intentions for the use of UN peacekeepers reflected deeply different interpretations of the conflict in eastern Ukraine – Russia understanding that the rebels in eastern Ukraine as being oppressed and prevented from enacting their right to self-determination by the Ukrainian government and Ukraine and the West understanding that the rebels in eastern Ukraine to be Russian backed and wanting to prevent Russia from further supporting these rebels and consequently jeopardizing Ukraine's sovereign integrity. These vastly different intentions for a potential UN peacekeeping mission in eastern Ukraine prevented this idea from moving forward.

### 5.5. Concluding Analysis

The RAM assumes that the government of a state is a unified actor that makes rational choices and is able to consider all possible solutions to a problem before making a policy decision.<sup>52</sup> As will be done in this chapter as well as the two subsequent ones, one German federal ministry is compared in its behaviour and policy actions to the German Federal Government as a

---

<sup>52</sup> Graham Allison and Philip Zelikow, *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis* (New York, NY: Longman, 1999), 3.

whole in order to determine whether the policies and actions align and thus indicate that Germany's *Russlandpolitik* adheres to the RAM. This chapter analyzed the German Federal Ministry of Foreign Affairs and its behaviour during the Ukraine crisis. If Germany would fit into the RAM in this case, the policies as carried out by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs would need to align with the Federal Government's overarching priorities regarding relations with Russia, Ukraine, and Germany's allies. Moreover, the policies would need to remain the same, or at least be consistent with government priorities, over the course of different individuals' tenures as Minister of Foreign Affairs since, as the RAM presumes, a state's government is inherently unified and makes rational and consistent choices. This continuity across Ministers would remain even if the Ministers were to publicly disagree with the Federal Government's overarching decisions since Germany embraces the freedom of speech and fostering an open, frank, and productive political discourse with the public.

Taking these basic tenets of the RAM into consideration, the German Federal Government's response to Russia's annexation of Crimea and the continuing unrest in eastern Ukraine was of condemnation and the emphasis of the international legal order, which had been inherently undermined by Russia's actions against Ukraine's sovereignty and territorial integrity. While this announcement was made by Merkel and not attributed to any specific federal ministry, the inherent belief, support of, and dedication to the international legal order and multilateral agreements are also two of the five foundational pillars of the Federal Ministry of Foreign Affairs. As such, the inherent nature of the ministry is largely represented by the Federal Government's official reaction to the Ukraine crisis.

However, there is one significant aspect that conflicts with these beliefs. Since the Minister of Foreign Affairs is Germany's highest ranking diplomat and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs houses Germany's diplomatic corps and is tasked with ensuring diplomatic relations with states around the world, condemning a state of misconduct poses the risk of jeopardizing relations with said state. Consequently, Germany's condemnation of Russia's actions in Ukraine came with the risk of deteriorating relations with Russia. In addition to the public condemnation, the German Federal Government's support of sanctions against Russia in response to its actions in Crimea and eastern Ukraine helped deteriorate relations to the point that Steinmeier and Gabriel, both in the capacities of Minister of Foreign Affairs, publicly criticized the German Federal Government's decision to implement and then maintain sanctions against Russia. While Steinmeier criticized and opposed the implementation of sanctions, Gabriel went so far as to call out the government publicly for maintaining sanctions and Gabriel even contemplated of lifting sanctions despite little to no progress in the Ukraine peace process.

Alternatively, the third Minister of Foreign Affairs during the time period analyzed has not taken as critical a stance as his two predecessors. Instead, Maas supports the sanctions and has publicly stated that he would expect significant progress in the peace negotiations for him to consider lifting some or all of the sanctions. While this behaviour is arguably a little less in line with the German Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Germany's highest diplomatic body, as it threatens to undercut diplomatic relations and channels of communication with a country, it is more in line with the Federal Government's overarching stance and strategy regarding Russia. Moreover, the Minsk Peace Process, namely Minsk-2, can be considered the diplomatic counterbalance to the

economic sanctions, since this process is of diplomatic nature and promotes communication and diplomacy in resolving the situation in eastern Ukraine.

Comparing this analysis to the bureaucratic/governmental politics model, the threshold of the Federal Ministry of Foreign Affairs acting out policies or acting on decisions contrary to the German Federal Government's strategies and stances has not been met. While there were significant disagreements between the Federal Government and the Ministers of Foreign Affairs, the Ministers ultimately complied with the Federal Government's priorities and decisions. The Ministers did work to influence the Federal Government's responses and policies toward Russia, they did not act contrary to the Federal Government and thus did not cross the threshold of rejecting the RAM. Even though the different Ministers of Foreign Affairs had different opinions and took different stances on matters, such as the economic sanctions against Russia, they all prioritized Germany's and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs' intrinsic values to carry out economic sanctions as well as help further Minsk-2. As a result, Germany has been able to be a rational actor on the international stage without showing a disconnect between the Federal Government and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs beyond what is expected of a liberal democracy that fosters open political discourse.

## Chapter 6: The German Federal Ministry of Defence

### 6.1. Introduction

Germany's national defence is coordinated through the *Bundesministerium der Verteidigung* (Federal Ministry of Defence). The Ministry of Defence is mandated to coordinate and oversee the *Bundeswehr*, which is the German armed forces, and is the main government body within the German Federal Government to ensure peace. As such, the Ministry of Defence also plays a crucial role in maintaining and enhancing Germany's international relations, as well as to uphold international partnerships. One of the most important multilateral alliances of which Germany is a part of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Founded in 1949, NATO grew out of concerns about an increasingly hostile Soviet Union and Eastern Bloc during the Cold War. Though the Cold War and the Soviet Union are of the past, NATO's mandate of collective defence remains relevant today, especially with a resurgent Russia and increasingly hostile actions. Recently, NATO created the Enhanced Forward Presence (EFP), which positioned NATO troops in close proximity to the Russian border in Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Poland. As Germany is the lead nation for the NATO troops stationed in Lithuania, Germany's Ministry of Defence is closely linked to the German Federal Government's *Russlandpolitik* (Russia policies), as it is the main federal department that plays a role in NATO and is involved in the EFP. Through this leadership role, Germany's actions are highlighted on the international stage, as Germany takes a clear stance siding with NATO and against Russia while also balancing its *Russlandpolitik*, which is often seen to be trying to bridge the gap between Russia and the West.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Alexander Rahr, "Germany and Russia: A Special Relationship," *Washington Quarterly* 30, no. 2 (2007): 138-139.

As such, this chapter will focus on the Ministry of Defence, how it relates to the German Federal Government as a whole, and what role the ministry plays in NATO's EFP. This chapter will first introduce the German Federal Ministry of Defence, highlighting the history, nature, and characteristics of the government department. The chapter will then introduce and assess the leadership of the ministry during the period that this thesis analyzes, which is early 2014 until July 2019. Unlike the preceding chapter, where the Ministry of Foreign Affairs had three Ministers of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Defence only had one Minister of Defence during the period analyzed, Ursula von der Leyen. This thesis' analytical period ends when von der Leyen stepped down and was succeeded by Annegret Kramp-Karrenbauer in July 2019. The intention of ending the analytical period with this ministerial handover is to allow for one ministry in this thesis to act as a constant, assuming that this would be the case with only one minister being in charge of the entire analytical period. Following the analysis of von der Leyen's role as Minister of Defence, this chapter will discuss key aspects of Germany's involvement and leadership role in NATO's EFP and the actions the Ministry of Defence has taken and how they align with Germany's overarching *Russlandpolitik*. Finally, the chapter will turn to analyzing Germany's actions relating to NATO's EFP through the lens of the rational actor model (RAM) and subsequently through the lens of the bureaucratic/governmental politics model in order to determine which model more adequately describes the German Federal Ministry of Defence's leadership role and contribution to NATO's EFP.

## 6.2. Overview of the Ministry

The German Ministry of Defence plays a historically challenging role within the German Federal Government. Following the end of the Second World War, the German Government

along with its ministries was dissolved in its entirety as part of Germany's unconditional surrender in 1945. One of the institutions dissolved was Germany's Ministry of Defence and the *Wehrmacht*, which was Germany's military during the Second World War. As Germany's military was one of the main culprits in the Second World War, the once proud military with its Prussian roots was dissolved in its entirety. This dissolution came with the four occupying powers taking control of Germany and its affairs until the powers were able to establish a post-war government and governmental structure.

Nevertheless, only five years later, in October 1950, the Federal Republic of Germany's first chancellor, Konrad Adenauer, tasked Theodor Blank with the rearmament and reconstruction of a German military. This decision to rearm West Germany came about following the conclusion made by the US, the United Kingdom, and France that the Cold War arms race and an increasingly hostile Soviet Union made Europe increasingly volatile.<sup>2</sup> As such, West Germany created a new military, the *Bundeswehr*, during the first half of the 1950s and the corresponding Ministry of Defence was created on 7 June 1955 in order to help support its new western European allies.<sup>3</sup>

The creation of the *Bundeswehr* was a contentious issue both abroad as well as among the German public itself. The occupying powers at first vehemently opposed a German rearmament for fear of a resurging German power. Furthermore, painful memories of a powerful and at times almighty military that wreaked havoc in the Second World War led the West German population to desire a fresh face and new start in the post-war era. Nevertheless, during the late

---

<sup>2</sup> Bundesministerium der Verteidigung, "Geschichte des Verteidigungsministeriums," *Bundesministerium der Verteidigung*.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

1940s and early 1950s, the Cold War began to take shape and led the occupying powers to begin considering possible benefits of a West German military that could help defend the western European continent from the Eastern Bloc and help support and strengthen collective western European and transatlantic defence cooperation. As a result of these new geopolitical and geostrategic realities, West Germany created an army in the fall of 1955 and founded the *Bundeswehr* on 1 April 1956.<sup>4</sup>

The *Bundeswehr*, unlike Germany's previous militaries, operated on a principle new to Germans. The notion of soldiers being "Staatsbürger in Uniform" (citizens in uniform) was a significant development that changed the legal status of soldiers. Whereas before, individuals who joined the military in Germany gave up certain rights and freedoms, the concept "Staatsbürger in Uniform" allowed soldiers to maintain their right to vote and emphasized that the citizen came before the soldier. Moreover, the *Bundeswehr* and its soldiers were expected to be able to defend West Germany's territory and not assume the characteristics of an expeditionary force.<sup>5</sup> This concept was created out of and aligned itself with the new *Grundgesetz* (Basic Law), which has been acting as the Federal Republic's constitution since 1949.<sup>6</sup> This significant change in military culture and legal landscape created a new environment in which West Germany's military was founded and grew. Furthermore, the United Kingdom, US, and France agreed to and ultimately promoted the creation of the *Bundeswehr* so that West Germany

---

<sup>4</sup> Bundeswehr, "Die Geschichte der Bundeswehr," *Bundeswehr*, 2019.

<sup>5</sup> Chris Bowlby, "Germany: Reluctant military giant?," *BBC News*, 12 June 2017.

<sup>6</sup> Bundesministerium der Verteidigung, "Geschichte," *Bundesministerium der Verteidigung*.; Bundeswehr, "Armee im Kalten Krieg," *Bundeswehr*, 2015.

could help strengthen western European and transatlantic military alliances and contribute to the defence of western Europe.

As the post-war reconstruction of western Europe was still ongoing when the *Bundeswehr* and the Ministry of Defence were created, France and the United Kingdom lobbied to create a West German military that was deeply embedded in and intertwined with defence alliances and the transatlantic defence community. The first of these organizations was the Western European Union (WEU). The WEU was created through the Brussels Treaty in 1948, which was signed by Belgium, France, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom, in an attempt to curb the Soviet Union's growing influence in Central Europe.<sup>7</sup> In addition to the WEU being a first step toward European integration, the WEU also sought to intertwine the signatories' militaries so that they could coordinate their defence through increased interoperability. Shortly after the creation of the WEU, the United States (US) and Canada joined the negotiating table and all signed the Washington Treaty, creating NATO.<sup>8</sup> In 1954, West Germany signed the Brussels Treaty and its membership in the WEU was formalized later that year through the Paris Agreements. Less than a year later, West Germany also signed the Washington Treaty and joined NATO. Although a European army never came to fruition, West Germany's accession to the WEU and NATO solidified its commitment to western Europe and its transatlantic allies.

Despite these commitments and memberships, West Germany's military remained legally restricted in terms of funding, soldiers, and military hardware. As a result, the *Bundeswehr* started out as a volunteer force with a limit of 6,000 soldiers.<sup>9</sup> Even though six months after the

---

<sup>7</sup> Western European Union, "Western European Union – Union de l'Europe Occidentale," *Western European Union*.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid.

<sup>9</sup> Siegfried Mann, *Das Bundesministerium der Verteidigung* (Bonn, DE: Boldt Verlag, 1971), 33.

*Bundeswehr*'s inception the Ministry of Defence imposed conscription on military aged men, the *Bundeswehr* remained limited in size despite a growing Soviet threat.<sup>10</sup> While the legal limitations were a significant factor in maintaining the *Bundeswehr* at a relatively small size, another factor was that the West German public felt uneasy about the creation of another military and the drafting of a new generation of Germans.<sup>11</sup> The distrust of and opposition to a German military among the West German public amounted to hostility shown toward individuals in uniform when they were out in public, as Sophia Besch describes when she explained that "If you were a soldier [in Germany] you could not really ride a train in your uniform. You'd be approached by passengers calling you a 'murderer'."<sup>12</sup>

Nevertheless, despite the distrust and public opposition, the Cold War and US-Soviet arms race continued to destabilize the European continent and, as a result, West Germany supported its western allies by building up a military adequate for defending western Europe. As a result, the membership of the *Bundeswehr* grew to 390,000 soldiers in 1962 and almost reached its goal of 500,000 soldiers by the end of the Cold War, as the membership peaked at 495,000 soldiers.<sup>13</sup> In addition to the 495,000 strong regular forces, the Ministry of Defence could have drawn on an additional 1.2 million reservists.<sup>14</sup> However, when the Cold War ended and Germany reunified in 1990 following the fall of the Berlin Wall, the perceived need for a military declined rapidly. Due to this perceived peace, Germany's collective wariness of its own military led to the reduction of the defence budget as well as its military size following the end of the Cold War. This perceived

---

<sup>10</sup> Ibid.

<sup>11</sup> Martin Falbisoner, "Gründung der Bundeswehr," *Konrad Adenauer Stiftung*.

<sup>12</sup> Bowlby, "Germany."

<sup>13</sup> Bundeswehr, "Armee im Kalten Krieg," *Bundeswehr*, 2015.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid.

peace, which can be attributed to Francis Fukuyama's *The End of History*, brought about the suspension of compulsory military service in 2010.<sup>15</sup> By 2010, twenty years after German reunification and the end of the Cold War, Germany's military had 240,000 and aimed to reduce it to 163,500 soldiers following the end of conscription.<sup>16</sup>

While Germany suspended conscription in 2010, this action was not the only one that was unprecedented. The defence reforms that the German Government undertook and which suspended conscription also allowed for the deployable force of the German military to expand from 7,000 to 14,000 soldiers.<sup>17</sup> In other words, while Germany reduced its overall number of soldiers, it doubled the size of its expeditionary force, something that had originally been restricted by the *Grundgesetz* (Basic Law), as it only allowed for the territorial defence of West Germany. Nonetheless, the territorial limitation had been increasingly loosened since the end of the Cold War, considering Germany had already begun to participate in "out of area" operations as early as 1991 during the first Gulf War.<sup>18</sup> In July 1992, Germany contributed to enforcing the United Nations (UN) imposed weapons embargo against former Yugoslavia, and in 1992 to 1993, German military capabilities were deployed to Kenya, Somalia, Cambodia, Croatia, and Italy.<sup>19</sup> It is important to note that this expansion of operations beyond Germany's territory following the end of the Cold War was exclusively aligned with NATO and UN peacekeeping mandates. Thus, over the course of the 1990s, Germany's defence focus shifted from territorial defence against the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact to peacekeeping missions and humanitarian support.

---

<sup>15</sup> Kate Connolly, "Germany to abolish compulsory military service," *The Guardian*, 22 November 2010.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid.

<sup>18</sup> Holger Herwig, "Aggression Contained? The Federal Republic of Germany and International Security," *Final Report, NATO Research Fellowship*, 1998, 3.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., 3-4.

Moving into the twenty-first century, the nature of this peacekeeping work shifted. Following the terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001, Germany committed to its first significant military operation outside of Europe. Following the UN Security Council resolution 1386 from 20 December 2001, Germany significantly contributed to the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Afghanistan.<sup>20</sup> Although the peacekeeping operation was at first intended to be six months in length, it turned out to last significantly longer than the UN had anticipated. In 2014, ISAF's mandate came to an end and was succeeded by the NATO-led Resolute Support Mission. Through the Resolute Support Mission, Germany is the framework nation leading the Train, Advise and Assist Command North and continues to be the second largest troop contributor to the mission, with 1,300 German soldiers stationed in Afghanistan as of October 2019.<sup>21</sup> This long-term commitment by the German Government and the *Bundeswehr* is unprecedented and clearly shows a shift in the German Government's and population's attitude toward its military. Although there continues to be some unease toward Germany using its military internationally, there is enough support for the ongoing commitment in Afghanistan.

Reflective of these developments are the values and priorities highlighted by the Ministry of the Defence for itself and the *Bundeswehr*. The overarching priorities of the German Ministry of Defence are multilateral collaboration anchored in its membership with the UN, NATO, the OSCE, and the EU.<sup>22</sup> Moreover, as a *Parlamentsarmee* (the term "parliamentary army" is used as the *Bundeswehr* may only engage in armed conflict if the *Bundestag* (German parliament)

---

<sup>20</sup> Bundeswehr, "Afghanistan – ISAF (International Security Assistance Force)," *Bundeswehr*.

<sup>21</sup> Bundeswehr, "Die Bundeswehr in Afghanistan – Resolute Support," *Bundeswehr*.; North Atlantic Treaty Organization, "Resolute Support Mission (RSM): Key Facts and Figures," *NATO*, October 2019.

<sup>22</sup> Bundesministerium der Verteidigung, "Multinationale Zusammenarbeit," *Bundesministerium der Verteidigung*.

instructs it to do so), the Ministry of Defence instructs the *Bundeswehr* to base all its actions of Germany's fundamental values, which are democracy, freedom, peace, and human dignity.<sup>23</sup> These foundational priorities and values, which are also reflected in Germany's *Grundgesetz* and international commitments, provide the guidance in determining in which missions Germany will participate and how it will contribute to them. Consequently, these values make up the first of four priority areas for the *Bundeswehr* as presented by the Ministry of Defence.

The second priority area that the Ministry of Defence highlights focuses on peacekeeping and Germany's commitments to UN, NATO, and OSCE peacekeeping missions. Within the peacekeeping priority, the Ministry of Defence specifically highlights various aspects that must be included in Germany's peacekeeping missions. As peacekeeping missions are generally of a multilateral nature, the Ministry of Defence advocates for an integrated approach that focuses on interoperability and achieving holistic results, including "political, diplomatic, economic, development, and military measures" to maintain peace.<sup>24</sup> In addition to the comprehensive approach to peacekeeping, the Ministry of Defence emphasizes the importance of training local forces and ensuring arms control as two key aspects to German peacekeeping efforts.<sup>25</sup> Finally, Germany commits to adhering to International Humanitarian Law (IHL) by ratifying agreements and integrating IHL into Germany's domestic laws.

Cyber security is the third and newest priority highlighted by the Ministry of Defence. As cyber space becomes an increasingly critical infrastructure due to its integral role in areas such

---

<sup>23</sup> Translated by the author from "Demokratie, Freiheit, Frieden und Menschenwürde." in Bundesministerium der Verteidigung, "Verteidigung," *Bundesministerium der Verteidigung*.

<sup>24</sup> Translated by the author from "Ein umfassender Ansatz beinhaltet daher politische, diplomatische, wirtschaftliche, entwicklungspolitische und militärische Maßnahmen, die zur Krisenbewältigung eingesetzt werden." in Bundesministerium der Verteidigung, "Friedenssicherung," *Bundesministerium der Verteidigung*.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid.

as communications and logistics, the Ministry of Defence highlights this priority. Its importance is further underlined by the fact that cyber and information systems (*Cyber und Informationsraum (CIS)*) recently became Germany's sixth branch of the *Bundeswehr*.<sup>26</sup> An interesting aspect about the Ministry of Defence highlighting this branch of the *Bundeswehr* is that it is effectively arms free and lacks physical violence, reflecting the Federal Republic's aversion to physical armed conflict and the use of traditional military power.

The fourth and final priority as presented by the Ministry of Defence is Germany's security policy and emerging threats that are encompassed by it. The Ministry recognizes that the changing global security environment has added a number of threats to the conventional threats, such as transnational terrorism, intrastate conflicts, fragile states, climate change, and humanitarian catastrophes, such as uncontrolled and irregular migration.<sup>27</sup> As such, the Ministry of Defence has recognized that the security environment has changed fundamentally and Germany needs to adapt in order to be able to remain a valuable international partner and to keep the country safe. The Ministry of Defence highlights that it is important to be proactive in creating and carrying out Germany's security policy by combating threats where they arise by fostering a holistic approach involving military and civilian actors.<sup>28</sup> Moreover, the Ministry of Defence underlines its approach to its activities by stating that "security policy is peacekeeping."<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> Bundesministerium der Verteidigung, "Cybersicherheit," *Bundesministerium der Verteidigung*.

<sup>27</sup> Bundesministerium der Verteidigung, "Sicherheitspolitik," *Bundesministerium der Verteidigung*.

<sup>28</sup> Translated by the author from "Eine nachhaltige Sicherheitspolitik ist zudem vorausschauend: Sie bekämpft Bedrohungen dort, wo sie entstehen. [...] Als Grundlage hierfür dient stets das Konzept des Vernetzten Ansatzes: Militärische und zivile Akteure arbeiten Hand in Hand für Frieden und Stabilität." in *Ibid*.

<sup>29</sup> Translated by the author from "Sicherheitspolitik ist Friedenspolitik." in Bundesministerium der Verteidigung, "Sicherheitspolitik," *Bundesministerium der Verteidigung*.

The foundational security and defence document of the federal government is the white paper (*Weißbuch*) that was published in 2016. In it, the German Government lays out its strategic values, as well as existing and potential future threats. According to the *Weißbuch*, Germany's security and defence policy is based on Germany's values as represented by the *Grundgesetz* (Basic Law), such as human dignity, democracy, and the rule of law, and the adherence to European law as well as human rights and international humanitarian law in order to maintain universal human rights and peace.<sup>30</sup> Moreover, Germany's strategic interests are summarized as follows: protecting German citizens and Germany's sovereignty; protecting the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Germany's allies; maintaining the rules based international order on the basis of international law; ensuring the wealth and prosperity of Germany's citizens through free global trade; promoting the responsible use of limited resources; increasing European integration; and strengthening the transatlantic partnership.<sup>31</sup>

Following the interests and priorities, the *Weißbuch* discusses numerous challenges to Germany's priorities and interests. One of these challenges is the fact that the "Rules-Based Euro-Atlantic Order of Peace and Stability [has been] Called into Question."<sup>32</sup> In this section of the paper, Germany outlines the role NATO and the European Union (EU) have played in Europe in the post-Cold War era and how Russia's activities in Ukraine have jeopardized the stability that had been agreed upon through the OSCE, of which Russia is a member. The *Weißbuch* argues that instead of respecting the existing multilateral and cooperative order in Europe, Russia is

---

<sup>30</sup> Bundesministerium der Verteidigung, *Weißbuch 2016 zur Sicherheitspolitik und zur Zukunft der Bundeswehr* (Berlin, DE: Bundesministerium der Verteidigung, 2016), 24.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, 24-25.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, 31.

trying to create a new order in which Russia plays a role separate from that of Europe.<sup>33</sup> Germany clearly rejects any notion of accepting a new order, however, the *Weißbuch* also recognizes that ensuring peace, cooperation, and partnership in Europe is difficult, if not impossible, to achieve without involving Russia in this process.<sup>34</sup> As such, the *Weißbuch* concludes, solving the Ukraine crisis and improving relations with Russia will only be achieved through strict adherence to the existing international rules-based order and not through the creation of a new one.<sup>35</sup>

The second foundational document of Germany's defence priorities is the document *Konzeption der Bundeswehr*. This document acts as the umbrella document of the military defence of Germany.<sup>36</sup> In the document, Germany emphasizes that its close alliance and security and defence cooperation with the EU and NATO are the centre point of its defence planning and missions.<sup>37</sup> It is clear that Germany's priorities are that of collective defence and close international and regional cooperation on ensuring the security and safety of Germany's population as well as that of its allies. In relation to the EU, the document presents the EU initiatives Co-ordinated Annual Review on Defence, Permanent Structured Cooperation, and the European Defence Fund as three key projects through which Germany channels and coordinate defence priorities.<sup>38</sup> Furthermore, Germany utilizes the NATO Defence Planning Process and the EU Capability Development Mechanism as ways to plan its national defence as well as security policies.<sup>39</sup> Finally, with collective defence at its core, Germany is closely aligned with EU and

---

<sup>33</sup> Ibid., 31-32.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid., 32.

<sup>35</sup> Ibid.

<sup>36</sup> Bundesministerium der Verteidigung, *Konzeption der Bundeswehr* (Berlin, DE: Bundesministerium der Verteidigung, 2018), 4.

<sup>37</sup> Ibid., 7.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid., 8.

<sup>39</sup> Ibid.

NATO priorities through programs such as the Enhanced NATO Response Force, the Very High Readiness Joint Task Force, the EFP, and the EU Battle Groups and perceives these commitments as crucial to maintaining peace and security in Europe and across the Atlantic.<sup>40</sup> Through these defence cooperative measures, Germany's military and security policies support and reinforce Germany's presentation as a country that fully adheres to and support the international legal order, the international system, and international law.

### 6.3. Ministerial Leadership

The German Federal Ministry of Defence and the *Bundeswehr*, in peace time, are led by the Federal Minister of Defence. Unlike the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which is made up of politicians as its highest leadership and public servants filling the remainder of the ministry's ranks, the Ministry of Defence includes three distinct groups. The highest leadership, like the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and parliamentary secretaries of state (*Parlamentarische Staatssekretäre*), is mostly staffed by elected politicians. The remainder of the positions within the Ministry of Defence, however, are staffed by civilian public servants and members of the *Bundeswehr*. While neither the civilian nor military personnel are elected, they are nevertheless distinct groups with their own interests and priorities. As such, it is important to understand the partisan interests, personal convictions, and history of the elected Minister of Defence in order to compare and contrast it with the public servants' priorities as well as the military staff's interests and goals. To understand the behaviour of the Federal Ministry of Defence, this section will focus on the Minister of Defence since Russia's annexation of Crimea in early 2014 and will

---

<sup>40</sup> Ibid., 24.

analyze the Ministry and Minister of Defence's behaviour surrounding Germany's commitment and contribution to NATO's EFP.

Since 2005, when Merkel first became Chancellor, the Minister of Defence has been a member of Merkel's party – the Christian Democratic Union (CDU). Unlike the CDU's coalition partner, the Social Democratic Party (SPD), which largely favours diplomatic action and mediation over the use of military force, the CDU has historically been more favourable of the *Bundeswehr*. Nevertheless, Germany's "fear of its own strength" has severely limited any expansion of the *Bundeswehr's* capabilities and operations.<sup>41</sup> In other words, even though the CDU may be more open to the use of military force and Germany's engagement in armed conflict and military peacekeeping operations, the party's willingness to support German involvement remains limited due to Germany's history.

From 2013 until July 2019, the Ministry of Defence only had one Minister of Defence: Ursula von der Leyen. A member of Angela Merkel's CDU, von der Leyen was first elected to serve as a *Bundestagsabgeordnete* (German Member of Parliament) in 2005 when Merkel was elected Chancellor. As the longest standing member of Merkel's cabinet, von der Leyen was first appointed Minister of Family Affairs and Youth and served in this position from 2005 to 2009. In 2009, she changed mandates and served as Minister of Labour and Social Affairs until she was appointed Germany's first female Minister of Defence in 2013. Von der Leyen's appointment as Minister of Defence was unprecedented, as no woman had been appointed to the position in

---

<sup>41</sup> Ulrike Demmer and Daniel Gofart, *Kanzlerin der Reserve: Der Aufstieg der Ursula von der Leyen* (Berlin, DE: Berlin, 2015), 179.

Germany before and she had no military background.<sup>42</sup> While von der Leyen experienced push back from within her own party as well as parts of the German population, she assumed the position of Minister of Defence and held it for almost six years until July 2019.

Although von der Leyen openly had opposed some of Merkel's policies in the years leading up to 2013 and successfully agreed to compromises with the Chancellor, rumours began to circulate whether von der Leyen was being groomed to eventually take Merkel's place or whether she was becoming too difficult to deal with.<sup>43</sup> When it was announced that von der Leyen was set to take over the Ministry of Defence, these two rumours surfaced again, as the role of the Minister of Defence had become a difficult and at times divisive role. Von der Leyen's two predecessors, Karl-Theodor Freiherr zu Guttenberg and Thomas de Maizière, had only served for two years each from 2009 to 2011 and 2011 to 2013 respectively, and were each dismissed following scandals.<sup>44</sup> As such, Germany closely watched von der Leyen's appointment as the first female Minister of Defence and the new person in this position following the difficult tenures of her predecessors.

Unlike her predecessors, however, von der Leyen had the advantage of being a female Minister of Defence in Germany was unprecedented and she thus used this opportunity to set a new tone and to reignite the debate of topics that had previously been unwelcome within Germany's political realm. Two aspects were the main topics covered in the media and discussed extensively. The first one was von der Leyen's goal to make the *Bundeswehr* a more attractive

---

<sup>42</sup> Soraya Sarhaddi Nelson, "Germany's New Defense Minister: More Peacekeeping Missions Welcome," *NPR*, 1 February 2014.

<sup>43</sup> Philip Oltermann, "Ursula von der Leyen appointed as Germany's first female defence minister," *The Guardian*, 15 December 2013.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*

employer by making the jobs friendlier for parents by helping them navigate parental leave.<sup>45</sup> The other topic was that von der Leyen reintroduced the discussion surrounding Germany's military *raison d'être*. While this topic has been recognized as something important to discuss by preceding Ministers of Defence, it was never discussed extensively in the *Bundestag* as well as publicly.<sup>46</sup> As von der Leyen was an unexpected candidate as Minister of Defence, she was able to start the debate by announcing that she would like to see the German military be more engaged internationally, supporting Germany's allies, and contributing to international peacekeeping missions.<sup>47</sup> Furthermore, von der Leyen favoured the long-standing proposal to integrate national militaries from across the EU into a standing European army to promote territorial defence across the EU.<sup>48</sup>

#### 6.4. Case Study: NATO's Enhanced Forward Presence

The Enhanced Forward Presence, or EFP, was created to enhance NATO's deterrence measures along the eastern periphery of NATO territory. The EFP was created through Article 40 of the Warsaw Communiqué, which was the concluding document of the 2016 NATO summit held in Warsaw. As the tactics of armed conflict have changed since the Cold War, most notably from a predominant nuclear threat to a hybrid one, maintaining an effective deterrence strategy against Russia had moved to the top of NATO's agenda.<sup>49</sup> As such, the Alliance members decided to create the EFP, which places NATO troops "in Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Poland to unambiguously demonstrate, as part of [NATO's] overall posture, Allies' solidarity,

---

<sup>45</sup> "Von der Leyen will familienfreundliche Bundeswehr," *Zeit Online*, 14 January 2014.

<sup>46</sup> "Von der Leyen will Bundeswehr verstärkt im Ausland einsetzen," *Spiegel Online*, 26 January 2014.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>49</sup> Martin Zapfe, "Deterrence from the Ground Up: Understanding NATO's Enhanced Forward Presence," *Survival* 59, no. 3 (2017): 147.

determination, and ability to act by triggering an immediate Allied response to any aggression.”<sup>50</sup>

The creation of four battalion-sized battlegroups in each Baltic country and Poland is made up of numerous NATO members’ militaries and led by Canada, Germany, the United Kingdom, and the US.<sup>51</sup> On 27 January 2017, the German Minister of Defence issued the order of the day announcing that Germany will lead the EFP in Lithuania beginning in February of that year.<sup>52</sup> Since then, around 1,000 troops from various NATO member states have been stationed in the Baltics and Poland to add an extra deterrence measure along NATO’s eastern border.<sup>53</sup>

Germany’s role in NATO’s EFP is significant, as Germany is one of four countries that volunteered to be in charge of overseeing and coordinating the EFP in one of the four countries in which EFP troops are stationed. As such, Germany has committed to providing a significant number of resources – both personnel as well as military hardware – to the EFP and thus binds Germany to the operation as one of the states most responsible for its implementation and success. Consequently, since the EFP is “a symbol of allied strength and cohesion,” Germany’s commitment as one of the four lead nations is important to note.<sup>54</sup> During the ceremony that marked the official start of the stationing of the EFP battle group in Lithuania, von der Leyen announced that “Lithuania will never again stand alone.”<sup>55</sup> Von der Leyen elaborated that Lithuania and Germany share a long, and at times difficult, history. During the twentieth century, Lithuania was part of Prussia until the end of the First World War, when it was then annexed by

---

<sup>50</sup> North Atlantic Treaty Organization, “Warsaw Summit Communiqué,” *NATO*, 9 July 2016.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>52</sup> Bundesministerium der Verteidigung, “Tagesbefehl der Verteidigungsministerin zu Enhanced Forward Presence,” *Bundesministerium der Verteidigung*, 30 January 2017.

<sup>53</sup> North Atlantic Treaty Organization, “NATO’s Enhanced Forward Presence: Factsheet,” *NATO*, October 2019.

<sup>54</sup> Zapfe, “Deterrence from the Ground Up,” 150.

<sup>55</sup> Translated by the author from “Litauen wird nie wieder alleine stehen.” in “Was wie hier heute sehen, ist NATO,” *Bundesministerium der Verteidigung*, 7 February 2017.

the Soviet Union. Following the end of the Second World War, Lithuania, as part of the Soviet Union, was a member of the Warsaw Pact, the Soviet response to the formation of NATO. Following the end of the Cold War and Lithuania's independence, Germany and Lithuania have worked toward normalizing their relationship, which had been greatly facilitated by Lithuania's memberships in the EU and NATO. With this history in mind, von der Leyen thus recognized how much trust has been put in Germany and in the *Bundeswehr* by accepting Germany as a lead nation for Lithuania's EFP.<sup>56</sup>

Germany's involvement in and commitment to the EFP and taking over the leadership role for the battle group stationed in Lithuania is representative of Germany's commitment to its core values. This is to say that Germany's and the *Bundeswehr*'s foundational values and priorities are present in the EFP and Germany's leadership role. As the EFP is coordinated through NATO and is therefore inherently multilateral, the German Ministry of Defence is able to align this mission with its core values and consequently garner popular support for its engagement. Moreover, the fact that it was a collective decision to establish the EFP and Germany volunteered to be a framework nation following the decision to stand up deterrence measures along NATO's Eastern Flank. Finally, as a historically adversarial state, Germany was able to use its commitment to this multilateral deterrence effort to further ground itself in its democratic values, which are anchored in the rule of law and the rules-based international order.

Within the German Federal Government, Merkel has been fully supportive of Germany's involvement and leadership role in Lithuania and NATO's EFP. As such, not only the Ministry of Defence but also the Chancellor and consequently the German Government have supported the

---

<sup>56</sup> Ibid.

deployment of NATO member troops to NATO's Eastern Flank since the beginning. The support of the government has gone so far that Merkel was the one who convinced the German military leadership that NATO's EFP and Germany taking on a leadership role was a good idea that would benefit not only Germany but also its allies.<sup>57</sup> These actions suggest that von der Leyen's goal to increase Germany's military involvement internationally is in line with Merkel's overarching government priorities of maintaining strong relationships with Germany's allies and helping protect NATO's territory in the face of deteriorating relations with Russia.

### 6.5. Concluding Analysis

Germany's military commitment and leadership role in the NATO EFP is an important component of Germany's *Russlandpolitik* as it makes Germany take a clear stance with its allies and against Russian acts of aggression. As was done in the preceding chapter with the German Federal Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Germany's actions taken following the Ukraine Crisis, this chapter compared the behaviour and policy actions of the German Federal Ministry of Defence to the overarching priorities and goals of the German Federal Government, specifically focusing on Germany's *Russlandpolitik*. This chapter analyzed the German Federal Ministry of Defence and its decision and motivations behind taking on a leadership role in NATO's EFP. As the RAM assumes that the government of a state is a unified actor that makes rational choices and is able to consider all possible solutions to a problem before making a policy decision, the *Bundeswehr's* and Ministry of Defence's actions and motivations behind its commitment to the EFP would need to align with the federal government's overarching priorities regarding relations with Russia and Germany's allies, most notably NATO allies.

---

<sup>57</sup> Konstantin Eggert, "Angela Merkel faces suspicion in Baltics," *Deutsche Welle*, 13 September 2018.

Since the Ministry of Defence only had one Minister of Defence during the period analyzed in this thesis, the policies would need to remain the same while the German Federal Government's priorities could have shifted due to changing governing coalitions between 2014 and 2019, as the RAM presumes that a state's government is inherently unified and makes rational and consistent choices in line with its unified priorities. This alignment with different governing coalitions would need to remain the same even if the Minister of Defence were to publicly disagree with the federal government's overarching decisions since Germany embraces the freedom of speech and fosters an open, frank, and productive political discourse with the public.

Taking these requirements of the RAM into consideration, the German Federal Government's decision to commit to NATO's EFP is aligned with Germany's condemnation of Russia's actions against the international legal order due to its disregard for Ukraine's sovereignty and territorial integrity. While this announcement was made by Merkel and not attributed to any specific federal ministry, the inherent belief, support of, and dedication to the international legal order and multilateral agreements aligns with the Ministry of Defence's and the *Bundeswehr's* foundational principles that were established following the end of the Second World War to effectively differentiate the German military after the Second World War from that of the Third Reich. Consequently, the inherent nature of the ministry and Germany's military is represented in the federal government's priorities and statements following an increasingly adversarial Russia and its actions in Ukraine.

Moreover, the Ministry of Defence and the *Bundeswehr's* actions closely align with and are a relatively self-explanatory reaction to Merkel's statements and the federal government's

outcry following Russian aggression in eastern Ukraine and Crimea. This is to say that following Russian aggression and Germany's expression of its inherent belief in and support of the rules-based international order that is grounded in international law, the Ministry of Defence worked toward strengthening its primary military alliance – NATO – to help protect its allies that are in closest proximity to Russia. While these military commitments and actions can be seen as a logical conclusion to Germany's statements concerning Russian aggression, the actions also appear to be somewhat contradictory to those taken by the German Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Unlike the majority of Germany's allies, Germany did not minimize its relations with Russia while deploying its troops along the Russian border but rather it maintained and even increased talks with Russia while being a framework nation for NATO's EFP. Interestingly, the diplomatic actions taken by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in an attempt to improve the situation in Ukraine thus stand in contrast to the *Bundeswehr's* commitment to NATO and its leadership role in the EFP.

In addition to the actions the Ministry of Defence has taken, the Minister of Defence, Ursula von der Leyen, has mostly agreed with Merkel in statements and decisions that have been made in relation to Russia, Ukraine, and NATO. Unlike the Ministers of Foreign Affairs, who have publicly criticized some of Merkel's statements and actions, von der Leyen has been supportive and aligned with Merkel, regularly garnering praise from the Chancellor. This behaviour and these relationships between ministers and the Chancellor can appear to be contradictory to what modern day Germany stands for. In other words, there have been more disagreements between Merkel and her Ministers of Foreign Affairs on how to handle the situation with Ukraine diplomatically than between the Minister of Defence and Merkel on its involvement in sending military resources to NATO's eastern border. This is uncharacteristic in the sense that within

Germany since the end of the Second World War, there has been general opposition to the military and the use of military force, even for deterrence purposes.

Although Germany has been more comfortable with its diplomatic efforts and relationships than with its military ones, these two case studies analyzed in this and the preceding chapter indicate better alignment of the Ministry of Defence with Germany's overarching priorities than that of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. One possible reason for this is which political parties are in control of the two ministries. Whereas the Ministry of Foreign Affairs has been controlled by the SPD, Merkel's coalition partner, the Ministry of Defence is controlled by Merkel's own CDU. In addition to the SPD having a reputation of having historically been more open to relations with Russia and the CDU taking a more cautious approach, all three Ministers of Foreign Affairs from 2014 to 2019 have been part of the counterweight that makes up the ruling coalition between the CDU and SPD. However, the fact that Merkel's CDU is in charge of the Ministry of Defence, a government department whose history calls for intrinsic distrust of its capabilities, while the SPD is in charge of the one responsible for diplomatic relations, a domain that is considered to be more trustworthy in Germany, could have been a strategic decision to help balance out diplomatic and military options in German strategic decision- and policy-making.

Germany's statements following Russia's increasingly adversarial behaviour and the Ministry of Defence's actions taken in relation to NATO's EFP closely align and the actions taken by the Ministry of Defence suggest that decisions were made paying close attention to Germany's overarching priorities and goals. As a result, comparing this analysis to the bureaucratic/governmental politics model, the threshold of the Federal Ministry of Defence acting out policies or acting on decisions contrary to the German Federal Government's priorities

and stances has not been met. While some actions and disagreements between the Ministers of Foreign Affairs and the Chancellor brought the Ministry of Foreign Affairs case study close to fitting into the bureaucratic/governmental politics model, the case study concerning the Ministry of Defence left no indication that it could fit into the bureaucratic/governmental politics model. Instead, when only considering the actions taken and commitments made by the Ministry of Defence, the RAM explains its behaviour well. Germany's military commitment to NATO aligns with overarching government priorities and thus suggests that Germany is a rational actor within the international community.

## Chapter 7: The German Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy

### 7.1. Introduction

The *Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie* (BMWi), also known as the Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy, is the federal entity responsible for Germany's economic affairs, development, and relations with economic actors within Germany and abroad. Moreover, the BMWi plays a leading role in the German Federal Government's work surrounding Germany's energy and security, as well as fostering research and technological advancements. As Germany does not have many natural resources other than coal, which Germany has committed to stop using as an energy source, Germany's energy supply comes from a diverse group of countries. As such, pursuing natural gas and renewable sources of energy in Germany and other countries has been a key driver of Germany's *Energiewende* (energy transition). The *Energiewende* is Germany's planned transition to a sustainable, low-carbon, and nuclear-free economy.<sup>1</sup>

One of Germany's main energy suppliers is Russia. However, since there have been numerous disputes between Russia and Ukraine about the gas supply travelling through pipelines from Russia to various European countries during the 2000s and 2010s, the quest to ensure a reliable natural gas supply has become an increasing priority. While Germany also has access to Norwegian natural gas, Russia remains the leading supplier of natural gas to Germany.<sup>2</sup> Recognizing Russia's large natural gas supplies and the volatile relationship between Ukraine and Russia has led German energy suppliers to construct a pipeline that directly connects Russia and Germany via the Baltic Sea. This pipeline is known as Nord Stream and was constructed in 2011,

---

<sup>1</sup> "Germany's Energiewende – The Easy Guide," *Clean Energy Wire*, 2018.

<sup>2</sup> Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie, "Gas," *Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie*.

before Russia annexed Crimea and relations between Russia and the West deteriorated. As the demand for natural gas in Germany increased and the relationship between Russia and Ukraine fractured even further, plans for building a pipeline running parallel to the Nord Stream pipeline were created. This new pipeline would become known as Nord Stream 2. Unlike the construction of Nord Stream, which took place before the Ukraine Crisis, the announcement of Nord Stream 2 raised concerns surrounding Germany's interests and commitments to its western allies and the sanctions regime that had been implemented against Russia by the EU, given the Ukraine crisis.

Keeping this complex set of issues and events in mind, this chapter will focus on the BMWi, how the Ministry's policies relate to the German *Russlandpolitik* and government policies as a whole, and what role the Ministry has played in the construction of the Nord Stream 2 pipeline and Germany's energy relationship with Russia. This chapter will first introduce the BMWi, highlighting the history, nature, and characteristics of this government department. The chapter will then introduce and assess the leadership of the Ministry during the period of analysis, which is from early 2014 until July 2019. Like the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the BMWi had three ministers during the period analyzed; Sigmar Gabriel served as Minister for Economic Affairs and Energy from 2013 until 2017, Brigitte Zypries held the position from 2017 to 2018, and Peter Altmaier has been in the position since March 2018. Following the analysis of the three Ministers, this chapter will discuss key aspects of Germany's energy relationship with Russia. It will also examine how the Nord Stream 2 pipeline project has affected Germany's relations with Russia and the West and how it fits into Germany's overarching *Russlandpolitik*. Finally, the chapter will turn to analyze Germany's energy relations with Russia and the development of the

Nord Stream 2 pipeline project through the lens of the rational actor model (RAM) and subsequently through the lens of the bureaucratic/governmental politics model in order to determine which model more adequately describes the BMWi's role in energy relationship with Russia and the Nord Stream 2 pipeline project.

## 7.2. Overview of the Ministry

The BMWi is mandated to reinvigorate the German social market economy (*soziale Marktwirtschaft*), to foster and further innovation to support long-term planning and growth, and to ensure social cohesion.<sup>3</sup> With the social market economy as its *Leitbild*, the BMWi has identified five strategic goals. The first one focuses on the promotion of medium-sized enterprises and entrepreneurs, as small and medium-sized enterprises build the backbone of Germany's economy.<sup>4</sup> As such, the BMWi aims to help these enterprises and entrepreneurs with more funding, programs, and other similar opportunities. Moreover, and tying into the BMWi's second goal, this is aimed to increase investment and decrease bureaucratic barriers.<sup>5</sup> The third strategic goal promotes the digitalization of the German economy, while the fourth goal focuses on the environment by achieving the *Energiewende*. Finally, the fifth strategic goal underlines Germany's commitment to the European Union (EU) and its intention to help further European integration.<sup>6</sup>

Founded in 1917, the predecessor to the BMWi was founded as the *Reichswirtschaftsamt* (Imperial Office of the Economy) during the democratization process of the German *Kaiserreich*.

---

<sup>3</sup> European Commission, "Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy (BMWi)," *European Commission*.

<sup>4</sup> Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie, "Aufgaben und Struktur des Bundesministeriums für Wirtschaft und Energie," *Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie*.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*

With the first German democratic election in March 1919, the Imperial Office received the title of “Ministry” and thus became the *Reichswirtschaftsministerium* (Imperial Ministry of the Economy).<sup>7</sup> During the first fifteen years of the ministry’s existence, it was tasked with a plethora of tasks ranging from promoting trade, overseeing the German treasury, aiding in the demobilization effort, and facilitating the payment of reparations.<sup>8</sup> Whereas the Ministry held a large number of files during the Weimar Republic, its tasks were greatly reduced over the course of the Third Reich until it was solely responsible for coordinating intra-German economic relations and ensuring the distribution of food and other necessities for the German public. With Germany’s unconditional surrender at the end of the Second World War, the Ministry disintegrated completely.<sup>9</sup>

Following the end of the Second World War, Germany was controlled by the Allied powers, who were also in charge of Germany’s economic affairs. Finally, in 1949, the *Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft* (Federal Ministry of the Economy) was established and Ludwig Erhard became the first Federal Minister of the Economy.<sup>10</sup> Erhard served in this position until 1963 when he was elected Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany. Numerous hallmark developments took place during Erhard’s tenure as Minister. The concept of the social market economy (*soziale Marktwirtschaft*) became the guiding principle of West Germany’s post-war economy, intending to live up to its ambitious slogan of “*Wohlstand für Alle.*” (“Prosperity for all.”) Under the purview of the social market economy, or *ordo-liberalism*, facilitating anti-

---

<sup>7</sup> Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie, “Die Geschichte des Bundesministeriums für Wirtschaft und Energie,” *Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie*.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid.

monopolism and the West German Government refraining from interfering in economic policies that might affect Germany's international trade, such as monetary control or competition policies, became key principles to which the West German Government adhered.<sup>11</sup> While the social market economy became the leitmotif for Germany's internal economic post-war reconstruction, Erhard also oversaw West Germany's negotiation and signature of the *Treaty establishing the European Economic Community*, also known as the *Treaty of Rome*, in 1957, which created the European Economic Community (EEC). The EEC would ultimately lead to the creation of the EU, which forms Germany's primary economic community and guiding framework.

Shortly after the creation of the EEC, West Germany experienced an economic upswing, which would become known as the *Wirtschaftswunder* (economic miracle). The economic miracle was brought about by a combination of West Germany's internal need to physically rebuild after the end of the Second World War and increased western integration through arrangements, such as the EEC. Moreover, through the beginning of the Korean War, a boom in world trade helped West Germany jump start its "export-led recovery."<sup>12</sup> A supporting factor of West Germany's development into a world-renowned exporter is the fact that its export and domestic growth were predominantly based on Germany's industrial sector, resulting in West Germany mostly exporting finished goods, which minimized the fluctuation in price that frequently comes from exporting raw, unprocessed resources. Finally, West Germany's restrictions on its military and the production of military goods enabled the West German industry to focus on profitable non-

---

<sup>11</sup> Leaman, *The Political Economy of West Germany, 1945-1985*, 116.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, 107.

military goods that could be exported more easily.<sup>13</sup> As a result of these factors, West Germany, and later Germany, would hold the self-awarded title of *Exportweltmeister* (export world champion) from 1986 to 1988, in 1990, and from 2003 to 2008.

West Germany's membership in the EEC helped West Germany integrate into the western European community. The EEC brought about a reduction and the ultimate elimination of tariffs and import duties among all countries that were members of the Community. Through a combination of increased trust in West Germany being a reliable trading ally and the reduction of trade costs, West Germany integrated into the international trade and economic communities relatively quickly following the creation of the Federal Republic of Germany in 1949. However, over the course of the 1970s, following the end of the *Wirtschaftswunder*, the West German economy stagnated, and the EEC encountered a number of barriers that prevented it from flourishing. In 1986, members of the EEC signed the Single European Act (SEA), which aimed to revive the Rome Treaty and introduced a number of revisions to the treaty. One of these revisions was the expansion of EEC competencies in the fields of the environment, social policy, and research.<sup>14</sup> Furthermore, the SEA included suggestions that had been proposed a year earlier by the Delors Commission, which would ultimately lead to the goal of creating a European Single Market by 1992.<sup>15</sup>

Furthering European integration, members of the EEC came together in 1992 and signed the Maastricht Treaty, which created the EU and introduced the notion of European citizenship.

---

<sup>13</sup> Ibid., 113.

<sup>14</sup> Constantin Chira-Pascanut, "A Short History of the European Union: From Rome to Lisbon," in *European Union Governance and Policy Making: A Canadian Perspective*, ed. Brunet-Jailly, Hurrelmann, and Verdun (Toronto, ON: Toronto University Press, 2018), 30.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid.

This treaty also cemented the Single Market and acted as a hallmark document that aided in the creation of the European Monetary Union (EMU).<sup>16</sup> Over the course of the 1990s, the EMU prepared for the introduction of a single common currency, the Euro, to all members of the EU. Although Denmark and the United Kingdom refused to give up their own currencies, all other EU member states introduced the Euro as the EU's common currency on 1 January 2002. The introduction of a common currency furthered European integration and helped remove any last barriers that existed for trade between EU member states.

A consequence of European integration is the increasing convergence of Germany's economic policies with those of the EU. As a result, the BMWi is closely connected to the EU and its policies. While a large part of the BMWi's focus is on European integration, resulting in a branch that focuses on European trade and economic policies, the BMWi maintains a significant amount of independence from EU policies. As such, out of the five priorities that the BMWi presents as its main areas of concern, only the last one mentions the EU and European integration.<sup>17</sup> The first three priorities focus on investment in German businesses, reducing bureaucratic hurdles impacting the growth of small and medium enterprises, and promoting the digitalization of Germany's economy. Finally, the only priority that focuses on matters that range beyond Germany's borders and do not explicitly reference the EU is the one concerning Germany's *Energiewende* (energy transition).<sup>18</sup> It is the BMWi's goal to use the *Energiewende* as a driver for modernization, innovation, and digitization. However, the BMWi recognizes that

---

<sup>16</sup> Gabriela Chira and Assem Dandashly, "European Neighbourhood Policy," in *European Union Governance and Policy Making: A Canadian Perspective*, eds. Brunet-Jailly et al. (Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press, 2018), 331.

<sup>17</sup> Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie, "Aufgaben und Struktur des Bundesministeriums für Wirtschaft und Energie," *Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie*.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid.

these goals should not interfere with the competitiveness of Germany's industries and its role as a global export power.<sup>19</sup> As such, the BMWi states that Germany's energy supply must be affordable, not too environmentally taxing, and secure.

The result of this *Energiewende* is the BMWi's attempt to balance Germany's own renewable resources while continuing to import natural resources, such as natural gas, from its trade partners in order to ensure that energy remains affordable and that there continues to be a steady supply of energy.<sup>20</sup> As a result of this effort to balance numerous priorities and concerns, Germany imports a significant amount of its natural gas supply from Russia. Since the early 1970s, the Soviet Union began shipping natural gas to West Germany in return for hardware to construct pipelines manufactured by West German companies.<sup>21</sup> This economic partnership became possible through West Germany's *Ostpolitik* and the West's *détente* with the East during the 1970s, which aimed to calm and improve relations with the Soviet Union. Following the beginning of this economic partnership, East Germany, along with other states from the Eastern Bloc, partook in the construction of a pipeline that would run from the Urals and Kazakhstan through eastern Europe into the West, known in German as the Druschba-Pipeline after the Russian word Дружба, meaning friendship.<sup>22</sup>

While historically, the German-Russian relationship has been one of the strongest of those between the West and Russia, even during the Cold War, it has been strained in recent years. Following Russia's annexation of Crimea and the Ukraine Crisis, the economic sanctions

---

<sup>19</sup> Ibid.

<sup>20</sup> Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie, "Gas," *Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie*.

<sup>21</sup> Nikolas Busse and Majid Sattar, "Die Deutschen und das russische Gas," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 31 March 2014.

<sup>22</sup> Roman Goncharenko, "Anhaltende Freundschaft: Die Druschba-Pipeline und die DDR-Arbeiter," *Deutsche Welle*, 9 December 2019.

implemented by the EU have posed various challenges to maintaining a relatively free trade relationship between Germany and Russia. Bound by the economic sanctions, Germany's restrictions on trade with Russia have impacted the Russian economy.<sup>23</sup> However, despite these sanctions, Germany has maintained certain trade relationships with Russia.

The result of this continuing economic relationship between Germany and Russia has attracted some criticism and controversy. While the BMWi and the German Federal Government fully support the EU's economic sanctions against Russia, German officials from the BMWi have been traveling to Russia regularly despite the sanctions. As such, in February 2019, the parliamentary secretary of state for the economy and energy (*Parlamentarischer Staatssekretär für Wirtschaft und Energie*), Christian Hirte, traveled to Moscow to meet with Russian officials to discuss matters of economic and trade concern. As a justification for the talks, Hirte stated that it is especially important to maintain open channels of communication during politically tense times, such as the ones that have existed since early 2014. Moreover, Hirte stated that he gladly accepted Russia's invitation for talks since Russia continues to be an important customer for German companies.<sup>24</sup> Two months later, in April 2019, Minister for Economic Affairs and Energy Peter Altmaier traveled to Moscow to meeting with Russian President Vladimir Putin and members of Putin's cabinet to further discuss the economic and trade relationships between Germany and Russia. Altmaier's comment regarding his visit to Russia began with the statement

---

<sup>23</sup> Janis Kluge and Sabine Fischer, "The German debate on Russia sanctions is out of touch," *Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik – German Institute for international and Security Affairs*, 9 May 2018.

<sup>24</sup> Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie, "Parlamentarischer Staatssekretär Hirte reist zu Gesprächen nach Russland," *Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie*, 27 February 2019.

that “Germany and Russia maintain close economic relations.”<sup>25</sup> Altmaier continued, underlining that German companies have built close relationships in Russia for decades and that it is in the interest of both countries to renew trust in each other in order to strengthen the bilateral relationship in the long run. Furthermore, Altmaier highlighted the importance and benefits of increased trade between the two countries, arguing that it would be important to create a favourable climate for investors.<sup>26</sup> While these statements and actions reflect the Federal Republic of Germany’s close relationship with the Russian Federation, they do not entirely align with German Federal Government and the BMWi’s commitments to the EU’s economic sanctions against Russia.

### 7.3. Ministerial Leadership

The Minister for Economic Affairs and Energy, also known as the *Bundesminister für Wirtschaft und Energie*, oversees the BMWi. Like the other two ministries analyzed in this thesis, the BMWi is predominantly staffed by non-partisan career public servants. Nevertheless, the Minister for this Ministry also plays a crucial role in the running of this Ministry and overseeing the Ministry’s files. Similar to the other two ministries analyzed, this ministry may be influenced by the interests of each minister, the ruling government’s overall priorities and goals, as well as the personal convictions and history of each minister. To understand the behaviour and policy decisions taken by the BMWi vis-à-vis Russia and especially concerning the Nord Stream 2 pipeline project, this section will focus on the three Ministers of Economic Affairs and Energy since the beginning of the Ukraine Crisis and Russia’s annexation of Crimea in early 2014.

---

<sup>25</sup> Translated by the author from “Deutschland und Russland unterhalten enge wirtschaftliche Beziehungen.” in Bundestag, “Aktuelle Stunde/Vereinbarkeit von Nord Stream 2 mit EU-Klima- und Energiezielen,” *Deutscher Bundestag*, 13 February 2019.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid.

The first of the three ministers that have served since 2014 was Sigmar Gabriel. Gabriel was appointed Federal Minister for Economic Affairs and Energy in December 2013 and served in the position until 27 January 2017, which is when he took on the position of Federal Minister of Foreign Affairs. A prominent member and head of the Social Democratic Party (SPD), Gabriel's tenure as Minister for Economic Affairs and Energy occurred during the time when Angela Merkel's Christian Democratic Union (CDU) had entered into a coalition with the SPD in what would become known as the Grand Coalition (*Große Koalition*). As Gabriel was the head of the CDU's coalition partner, he was appointed Vice Chancellor and thus closely worked with Merkel.

Gabriel's convictions, which have persisted over his tenures as Minister for Economic Affairs and Energy as well as Minister of Foreign Affairs, are largely reflective of the SPD's characteristics and reputation. This is to say that Gabriel's priorities align with the concept of the social market economy. Furthermore, Gabriel's prioritization of the social democratic values of *Friedenspolitik* (peace policies) and *Entwicklungspolitik* (development policies) over traditionally more conservative notions, such as defence, is reflected in his tenure as Minister for Economic Affairs and Energy.<sup>27</sup> Gabriel's opposition to defence spending became noticeable early on in his tenure through his public announcement that he would like to move Germany further down the list of weapons exporters, since exporting weapons goes against Germany's pacifist identity that had been established following the end of the Second World War.<sup>28</sup> This announcement was made after Germany was listed as the world's third largest exporter of weapons. Instead of

---

<sup>27</sup>Sigmar Gabriel, *Zeitwende in der Weltpolitik: Mehr Verantwortung in ungewissen Zeiten* (Freiburg, DE: Verlag Herder, 2018), 259-261.

<sup>28</sup>Soraya Sarhaddi Nelson, "Germany's New Defense Minister: More Peacekeeping Missions Welcome," *NPR*, 1 February 2014.

adopting a more *laissez-faire* approach to export regulations, Gabriel has been advocating for Germany to adopt a more prominent role within international affairs since Germany has a responsibility to actively help other countries develop and prevent conflicts by actively helping resolve international conflicts through diplomatic support and increased trade.<sup>29</sup> This approach aligns with the EU's priorities and strategies to help ease international tensions.

Contrary to EU priorities, however, is Gabriel's interpretation of Germany's *Russlandpolitik*. Being guided by the social democratic *Ostpolitik* that was introduced in West Germany during the late 1960s and early 1970s to thaw relations between West Germany and the Soviet Union and other eastern European countries, Gabriel has been holding on to the notion that it is of utmost importance to maintain a good working relationship, or at the very least open channels of communication, with Russia in order to maintain geopolitical stability.<sup>30</sup> Following this logic, Gabriel was supportive of the EU implementing economic sanctions in 2014 because "the alternative [to sanctions] would be worse."<sup>31</sup> This is to say that Gabriel opposed the other two options of a military intervention or doing nothing at all, which would mean that "Europe were to stand and watch a civil war and the death of innocent people out of fear of economic consequences."<sup>32</sup>

Nonetheless, during Gabriel's term as Minister for Economic Affairs and Energy, Gabriel only reluctantly supported the economic sanctions and never backed them as fully as Chancellor Angela Merkel did. Gabriel's pro-Russian tendencies earned him the nicknames

---

<sup>29</sup> Gabriel, *Zeitwende in der Weltpolitik*, 259.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid., 126-127.

<sup>31</sup> Andrea Thomas, "Berlin Lays Groundwork with German Public for Stiffer Russian Sanctions," *The Wall Street Journal*, 27 July 2014.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid.

“*Russlandversteher*” (Russia aficionado) and even “*Putinversteher*” (Putin aficionado) over the course of his tenure. As a result of this political stance, Gabriel was the first western politician to travel to Russia to meet with Putin following the beginning of the Ukraine Crisis in early 2014.<sup>33</sup> Since 2014, Gabriel traveled to Russia regularly to meet with Russian politicians to discuss the impact of the EU’s economic sanctions. During a meeting in October 2015, Gabriel emphasized that Russia would need to be more cooperative and diplomatic concerning the Ukraine conflict.<sup>34</sup>

Since Gabriel continues to support the *Ostpolitik*, Putin even invited Gabriel to his private residence just outside of Moscow in 2016 in an attempt to convince Gabriel that it would be beneficial for Russia and Germany to lift some or all of the economic sanctions which had been put in place by the EU following Russia’s role in the Ukraine Crisis.<sup>35</sup> Contrary to Putin’s hopes, however, Gabriel confirmed his support for the sanctions as the situation in Ukraine had not improved, there was suspicion that Russia had attacked a United Nations aid convoy outside of the Syrian city of Aleppo two days before the meeting, and reports had recently surfaced suggesting that irregularities within the Russian electoral system were preventing opposition members from registering to run for office.<sup>36</sup> While Gabriel’s affirmation of the sanctions was in line with the overarching German Federal Government’s stance, Gabriel continued to highlight numerous events and developments that were an affront to his support of a sound democratic process and the rules-based international order despite his frequent public criticism of the sanctions.

---

<sup>33</sup> Claudia von Salzen, “Auf neuen alten Wegen,” *Der Tagesspiegel*, 28 October 2015.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid.

<sup>35</sup> Markus Feldenkirchen and Christina Hebel, “Ein angenehmer Gast,” *Der Spiegel*, 22 September 2016.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid.

Despite Gabriel's apparent support for the EU, however, Gabriel took a stance with Russia and contrary to the EU position in 2015 when the beginning of the construction of the Nord Stream 2 pipeline project was announced. The European Commission, in opposition to the construction of the pipeline, cited geopolitical concerns as well as the fact that all trade relationships with Russia should centre around a mutually beneficial agreement and that in this situation only the Russian firm Gazprom would benefit as reasons they did not support the pipeline.<sup>37</sup> Moreover, the Commission's proposed Energy Union, which is intended to help join EU member states in pursuing collective sustainable energy goals, announced that it wanted to study the environmental impacts of the pipeline before making a final decision.<sup>38</sup> Opposing these arguments, Gabriel instead focused on maintaining open channels of communication and cooperation with Russia, and highlighted Germany's concern about energy security and the reliability of gas supplies coming through Ukraine as reasons to support the pipeline project.

On 27 January 2017, Brigitte Zypries took over as Minister for Economic Affairs and Energy. Also a prominent member of the SPD, Zypries has been considered to be closely aligned with the interests of the social democrats. As such, when Sigmar Gabriel left the position of Minister for Economic Affairs and Energy to become Germany's Minister of Foreign Affairs, Zypries' ascent to the position brought with it ideological and partisan stability. Zypries studied law and worked in the legal field on multiple levels of government before being elected into the *Bundestag* in 2005.<sup>39</sup> Although Zypries is not an economist but a lawyer by trade, she was

---

<sup>37</sup> Albrecht Meier, "Ausbau der Ostsee-Pipeline: Putin und Gabriel brüskieren Brüssel," *Euractiv / Der Tagesspiegel*, 17 November 2015.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>39</sup> "Zur Person," *Brigitte Zypries: Bundestagsabgeordnete für Darmstadt und Darmstadt-Dieburg 2005-2017*.

appointed to the position of Minister for Economic Affairs and Energy due to her problem solving abilities.<sup>40</sup>

While Zypries' tenure was the shortest of the three Ministers analyzed in this chapter, the 14 months that she served as Minister for Economic Affairs and Energy from January 2017 to March 2018 were largely overshadowed by two events. The first was the United Kingdom's plan to leave the EU and the second was the US's threat to first reconsider the use of economic sanctions against Russia and then the idea to implement sanctions not only against Russian entities and American (US) ones that worked with Russia, but also against European entities that had business ties to Russia. This is to say that while the EU and US, among others, began implementing sanctions against Russia in 2014 following the illegal annexation of Crimea by Russia, the US was now also considering implementing sanctions on European entities that interacted with Russian businesses. As a result, European companies could face difficulties interacting with and conducting business in the US due to their commercial connections to Russia, which would have caused issues for a significant number of German companies.

Over the course of Zypries' tenure as Minister for Economic Affairs and Energy, she participated in numerous interviews with German newspapers regarding the US' deliberations surrounding the implementation of these new sanctions against third country businesses. In February 2017, in an interview with the German newspaper *Frankfurter Allgemeine Sonntagszeitung*, Zypries underlined Germany's commitment to maintaining the sanctions that

---

<sup>40</sup> Jost Müller-Neuhof, "Brigitte Zypries wird gebraucht, also ist sie da," *Der Tagesspiegel*, 26 January 2017.

Germany, along with the EU, had previously committed to Russia under the Minsk Accords.<sup>41</sup> Four months later, in June 2017, Zypries gave another interview, this time with the *Hessische/Niedersächsische Allgemeine*, in which she discussed economic sanctions against Russia in relation to the US.<sup>42</sup> At this point, the US Senate had introduced a bill proposing to implement harsher sanctions against Russia. Similar to her previous interview, Zypries reiterated Germany's commitment to the existing sanctions against Russia and stated her opposition to the newly proposed strengthening of US sanctions against Russia. The first aspect of her opposition to the new proposal was that it would go against the notion of global free trade and the rules and regulations as set out by the World Trade Organization. Secondly, the proposed new sanctions against Russia would not only concern Russian entities but also German ones which conduct business with Russian businesses. In the interview, Zypries specifically used the example of business partnerships between German and Russian companies regarding natural gas projects, as these sanctions would then also punish German companies.

This example of natural gas projects is especially pertinent when considering Germany's intent of ensuring energy security. As will be discussed in more detail in the next section of this chapter, the announcement in 2015 of European companies entering an agreement with the Russian energy company Gazprom in constructing a pipeline that would run parallel the Nord Stream pipeline is a significant development in Germany's recent effort to maintain a reliable supply of energy. Consequently, when the US debated in 2017 whether to impose sanctions on

---

<sup>41</sup> Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie, "“Ein wirtschaftlich starkes und soziales Europa ist die beste Antwort auf die internationalen Veränderungen.” Bundesministerin Brigitte Zypries im Interview mit der Frankfurter Allgemeine Sonntagszeitung,” *Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie*, 5 February 2017.

<sup>42</sup> Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie, “Zypries: “Abschottung hilft niemandem” Bundesministerin Zypries im Interview mit der Hessischen/Niedersächsischen Allgemeinen,” *Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie*, 28 June 2017.

third country companies that engage in trade relationships with Russian entities, the BMWi and its Minister became concerned about German companies working on the construction of the Nord Stream 2 pipeline being negatively affected in their ability to conduct trade freely.

In response to the potential impact of US sanctions on international energy policies, Zypries published a statement emphasizing that Germans and other Europeans needed to reduce their energy consumption, while Germany, along with the EU, needed to find renewable and emission-free sources of energy.<sup>43</sup> Meanwhile, Zypries continued, Germany believed in the forces of free trade and the natural balance between supply and demand, which also inherently applied to that of the energy sector. Zypries further underlined that while German energy providers were free to purchase US liquid natural gas, also known as LNG, Russian natural gas has generally been a preferred supplier for German energy companies' demand for energy resources. Consequently, the German Federal Government did not intend to interfere in German companies' activities in what the Government considered to be a free market. In addition to underlining Germany's support for global free trade and an economy based on supply and demand, Zypries also highlighted that free trade and the willingness to cooperate with Russian companies on energy projects allowed Germany to maintain an additional open channel of communication between Germany and Russia. This open channel of communication has been a guiding principle to which Germany has adhered since the start of the Ukraine crisis and the deterioration of relations with Russia.

---

<sup>43</sup> Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie, "Eine Politik des Dialogs ist notwendiger denn je – Gastkommentar von Bundeswirtschaftsministerin Zypries in der Wirtschaftswoche zu den US-Sanktionen gegen Russland und den Folgen für die internationale Energiepolitik," *Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie*, 4 August 2017.

Peter Altmaier took over as Minister for Economic Affairs and Energy in March 2018. Like Zypries, Altmaier also studied law, and prior to joining German politics in 1994, Altmaier was a public servant with the EU. Unlike his two predecessors, Altmaier is a member of the ruling CDU, which consequently resulted in a handover in the leadership of the BMWi from the SPD to the CDU. In addition to this shift in leadership, Altmaier's party affiliation has brought a number of key assumptions regarding German-Russian relations. The most important of these is the CDU's greater caution vis-à-vis Russia. This is to say, while the SPD has historically been more open to collaboration with Russia and Russian entities, the CDU has taken a more cautious approach, relying more on the backing of Germany's western allies. Consequently, within the German Federal Government, members of the SPD have been historically more outspoken about considering amending, easing, or lifting some or even all of the economic sanctions against Russia. While Altmaier is not a member of the SPD, he has worked to strike a delicate balance between his party's caution of Russia and the CDU's belief in, and support of, Germany's *soziale Marktwirtschaft* (social market economy).

Throughout Altmaier's tenure as Minister for Economic Affairs and Energy, he, like his predecessors, has visited Russia regularly and has met with Russian President Vladimir Putin.<sup>44</sup> Though less open to lifting the economic sanctions imposed on Russia, Altmaier has nonetheless highlighted the importance of open channels of communication, trade cooperation, and the importance for Russia to adhere to the conditions laid out in Minsk II.<sup>45</sup> In addition to the delicate

---

<sup>44</sup> "Altmaier in Moskau: Müssen um deutsch-russische Beziehungen kämpfen," *Der Tagesspiegel*, 7 October 2018.; Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie, "Bundesminister Altmaier reist zu Gesprächen nach Russland," *Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie*, 2 April 2019.

<sup>45</sup> Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie, "Bundesminister Altmaier reist zu Gesprächen nach Russland."

balance between maintaining open channels with Russia and standing with the EU's policies, Altmaier emphasizes that both Russia and the EU need to be satisfied with Germany's actions. As a result of this effort, Altmaier has worked with the EU to find a compromise that will satisfy both Russia's trade interests and the EU's governance considerations by allowing the Nord Stream 2 pipeline to proceed with EU environmental oversight.<sup>46</sup>

#### 7.4. Case Study: German Energy Security and the Nord Stream 2 Pipeline Project

Germany's energy security is dependent on its allies, trading partners, and the maintenance of good bilateral and multilateral relations. Historically, Germany's main natural energy resource has been coal.<sup>47</sup> As costs around mining increased and Germany's finite coal deposits decreased, other energy sources needed to be explored. Furthermore, coal as a source of energy has been determined to have significantly higher greenhouse gas emissions and other pollutants than what are often referred to as "greener" sources of energy. Consequently, over the course of the second half of the twentieth century, the Federal Republic of Germany has been searching for other energy sources. The use of natural gas, nuclear energy, and other renewable sources of energy, such as wind and solar energy, have been identified as priorities by the German Federal Government over the past number of decades.

While natural gas has the highest level of emissions of the three above-mentioned categories of natural resources, it has moved into the spotlight over the past two decades for a number of reasons. Unlike France, which heavily relies on nuclear energy, Germany's nuclear energy sector lost government support and declined rapidly following the 2011 nuclear disaster

---

<sup>46</sup> Bundestag, "Aktuelle Stunde/Vereinbarkeit von Nord Stream 2 mit EU-Klima- und Energiezielen," *Deutscher Bundestag*.

<sup>47</sup> Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie, "Kohle," *Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie*.

in Fukushima, Japan.<sup>48</sup> Other renewable sources of energy, such as solar and wind power, have been popular among the German population and are backed by the German federal and state-level governments, yet they remain insufficient to satisfy all of Germany's energy needs. Moreover, diversifying Germany's sources of energy has been a top priority for the German Federal Government in order to ensure the stability, consistency, and continuity of energy to Germany and the German population.<sup>49</sup> As such, expanding and securing access to natural gas has increasingly come to the forefront of Germany's effort to ensure German energy security.

There are two main sources from which Germany receives its natural gas supplies. The first source is Norway, which provides Germany with a large, steady supply of natural gas, and the other is Russia, which provides the majority of Germany's natural gas. During the 1990s and 2000s, Germany, along with other European states, relied on the Soviet pipeline infrastructure that extended from Russia into the former Soviet and eastern European states.<sup>50</sup> The volatility of the Soviet infrastructure, however, became apparent during the gas disputes between Russia and Ukraine, which would become known as the gas wars. Following contractual disputes between Russian state-backed companies and the Ukrainian government and companies, as well as accusations of Ukraine siphoning off gas intended for central and western European countries, Russian entities cut off the gas supply that had been running through pipelines in Ukraine to supply Ukraine as well as other European states.<sup>51</sup>

---

<sup>48</sup> Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie, "Kernenergie und Uran," *Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie*.

<sup>49</sup> Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie, "Unsere Energiewende: sicher, sauber, bezahlbar," *Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie*.

<sup>50</sup> Adam N. Stulberg, "Out of Gas?: Russia, Ukraine, Europe, and the Changing Geopolitics of Natural Gas," *Problems of Post-Communism* 62, no. 2 (2015): 113.

<sup>51</sup> Tom Parfitt, "Ukraine accused of stealing Russian gas as fuel flow declines," *The Guardian*, 3 January 2009.

Following these gas disputes, Germany, along with the EU, increasingly focused on diversifying the pipeline routes that would supply Russian and Caucasian gas to the European market, in addition to diversifying its energy supply overall. However, while this diversification process was underway, the Nord Stream pipeline helped to alleviate the negative consequences of the gas wars. This pipeline runs directly from Russia through the Baltic Sea to Germany, circumventing all of eastern Europe. While the construction of the Nord Stream pipeline was contentious in the 2000s, the announcement in summer 2015 that a pipeline running parallel to the Nord Stream pipeline called Nord Stream 2 would be constructed in a shared partnership between Russian government-back Gazprom and a conglomerate of European gas companies, most of which were German, received widespread criticism.<sup>52</sup> The pushback to this announcement was twofold; first, eastern European states decried the announcement because this pipeline would effectively remove them out of the European energy security equation and second, the announcement happened a year after Russia's annexation of Crimea and the Ukraine Crisis.<sup>53</sup> As discussed above, eastern European states, which had been located east of the Iron Curtain during the Cold War, were using their existing pipeline systems as a leveraging point to have a voice in EU energy decision-making. This *status quo* appeared to be threatened by the expansion of the Nord Stream pipeline system.

The Ukraine Crisis and Russian aggression in eastern Ukraine beginning in early 2014 had cooled relations between Russia and the West. Moreover, the implementation of economic sanctions by the EU and its members against Russia had severely limited the economic

---

<sup>52</sup> "Our Shareholders," *Nord Stream*.

<sup>53</sup> Meier, "Ausbau der Ostsee-Pipeline: Putin und Gabriel brüskieren Brüssel."

interactions between European entities and Russian ones. As Germany had a very strong economic and trade relationship with Russia before the implementation of sanctions, to which Germany continue to adhere, the sanctions regime negatively impacted Germany and was met with implicit, as well as explicit, opposition from the German business community.<sup>54</sup> Interestingly, while there was some opposition to the sanctions among members of German industry as well as within parts of the German Federal Government, Germany has also been a vocal supporter of sanctions against Russia.

Before Peter Altmaier assumed his position as Minister for Economic Affairs and Energy in 2018, the Nord Stream 2 pipeline project had already been announced. Following the US' announcement to consider implementing stricter sanctions against Russia and all entities that deal with Russia, including German businesses, and the US' ultimate decision to refrain from implementing these stricter sanctions, it became clear that German companies would not be adversely affected by US sanctions. Nevertheless, the German Government's decision to let the pipeline project proceed was met with criticism internationally as well as from within the German Federal Government. Altmaier worked to strike a balance by underlining the fact that since German gas consumption would increase in the medium term, Germany needed to ensure that it met the demand.<sup>55</sup> Moreover, Germany's social market economy dictates that energy is supplied by private companies, that operate within a free market environment, and that are also responsible for maintaining the infrastructure to supply Germany's population and industry with

---

<sup>54</sup>Tuomas Forsberg, "From *Ostpolitik* to 'frostpolitik'? Merkel, Putin and German foreign policy towards Russia," *International Affairs* 92, no. 1 (2016): 38.

<sup>55</sup> Bundestag, "Aktuelle Stunde/Vereinbarkeit von Nord Stream 2 mit EU-Klima- und Energiezielen," *Deutscher Bundestag*.

energy. As a result of this combination, the German Government did not have control over where all of Germany's gas supplies came from. Nevertheless, Altmaier assured the German *Bundestag* that Germany's energy supply would still remain diverse, but that the new pipeline would also aid in ensuring geostrategic stability.<sup>56</sup>

Further supporting the German Federal Government's decision to allow the Nord Stream 2 pipeline project to proceed was the EU Commission's decision to give the green light to the pipeline on 12 February 2019. A compromise was made between the EU and numerous stakeholders, the German Federal Government among them, thereby giving the EU a limited amount of environmental oversight while allowing certain freedoms for Germany and other states directly implicated in the construction and operation of the Nord Stream 2 pipeline.<sup>57</sup> This compromise allowed Germany to balance its belief in a market economy while also maintaining its commitment to the EU. This is to say that German companies were able to continue expanding and enhancing Germany's energy infrastructure, and the German Federal Government was able to comply with EU standards and regulations. In addition to the balance between ensuring free market access for German companies and adhering to EU environmental controls was Altmaier's focus on these two factors regarding the Nord Stream 2 pipeline as opposed to its connection to Russia. While the realization of this pipeline project creates a literal connection between Germany and Russia and could aid in the maintenance of open channels of communication between the two countries, Altmaier reflected the CDU's priorities of Germany's EU membership

---

<sup>56</sup> Ibid.

<sup>57</sup> "Common rules for gas pipelines entering the EU internal market," *European Parliament Think Tank*, 27 May 2019.

and the maintenance of a market economy instead of close and friendship-like relations with Russia.

Despite Germany's support of sanctions, the German Federal Government has been trying to strike a balance between maintaining open channels of communication and collaboration between Germany and Russia while also standing with Germany's allies in condemning Russia's actions. As a result, Germany's social market economy, a key interest of the BMWi, Germany's adherence and commitment to advancing European integration, and Germany's position to maintain open channels of communication with Russia are all met regarding the Nord Stream 2 pipeline project. The balance to uphold the social market economy was achieved by allowing German businesses to help build the Nord Stream 2 pipeline while also ensuring that the EU's environmental framework would help mitigate any environmental concerns the pipeline may pose. Furthermore, the negotiations that resulted in the EU's environmental framework being applied to the pipeline project signifies Germany's continued commitment to the European project and integration. Finally, ensuring that the Nord Stream 2 pipeline project will be realized has put Germany in the critical position of being able to create a close connection with Russia that helps Germany maintain more channels of communication and negotiation regarding the precarious relationship between Russia and the West.

### 7.5. Concluding Analysis

Germany's economic affairs and energy relations play key roles in Germany's relationship with Russia and its *Russlandpolitik* as Germany continues to be a nexus in the West's relationship with Russia. This became particularly evident in Germany's role in the negotiations surrounding the Nord Stream 2 pipeline project, which was designed to double the capacity of natural gas

that could be shipped from Russia through the Baltic Sea to Germany and the European market. As was conducted in the two preceding chapters with the German Federal Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the German Federal Ministry of Defence, this chapter compared the behaviour and policy actions of the BMWi, its Ministers, and its decision and motivations behind the Nord Stream 2 pipeline project. As the RAM assumes that the government of a state is a unified actor that makes rational choices and is able to consider all possible solutions to a problem before making a policy decision, the BMWi's motivations and actions behind its role in the Nord Stream 2 negotiations would need to align with the Federal Government's overarching priorities regarding relations with Russia and Germany's trade, economic, and energy interests.

The BMWi is distinct when it comes to the Ministers that served in the Ministry between 2014 and 2019. Unlike the Ministers of Foreign Affairs who were all members of the SPD and the fact that there was only one Minister of Defence during the time period, there were three Ministers of Economic Affairs and Energy during the period analyzed and only two of the three were part of the SPD. The last Minister, Peter Altmaier, is a member of the CDU. As a result of this diversity in leadership, the concluding analysis takes into consideration that two different parties were in charge of the ministry discussed in this chapter. Nevertheless, all three ministers served under Merkel governments. Consequently, as the RAM presumes that a state's government is inherently unified and makes rational and consistent choices in line with its unified priorities, there should not be any discrepancies between the time that the SPD was at the helm of the Ministry versus the latter years when the CDU was in charge. This should hold true even if there were public disagreements between the Ministers and the Federal Government's

overarching decisions since the freedom of speech and the promotion of open and frank political discourse form the centre of Germany's core values.

Since the *soziale Marktwirtschaft* (social market economy) has been an integral part of Germany's federal system of governance since the concept's creation over half a century ago, the BMWi's main goal of achieving and promoting the social market economy clearly aligns with the Federal Government's overarching economic values and goals. Moreover, similar to the balancing act of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the BMWi has continuously worked to strike a balance between individual and party interests and the Federal Government's overarching goals. In the BMWi's case, the two aspects that needed to be balanced were the first two ministers' tendencies to represent their party line of favouring Russia and Germany's support for free global trade. While the overarching government strategy may not include an entirely friendly position toward Russia due to Russia's disregard of Ukraine's sovereignty and territorial integrity, free trade has been something widely embraced within the German Federal Government. As such, all three ministers between 2014 and 2019 were able to balance Germany's overarching priorities with their personal and party interests.

In the case study analyzed in this chapter, the Nord Stream 2 pipeline project is a notable example of how all three Ministers, and especially Gabriel and Zypries, worked to balance their own interests and beliefs with those of the Federal Government. Interestingly, while both Gabriel and Zypries promoted the advancement and ultimate construction of the Nord Stream 2 pipeline project, neither of them were able to gain final approval for the pipeline. It was not until Peter Altmaier, a member of Merkel's CDU, took over the office of the Minister for Economic Affairs and Energy that the pipeline project gained final approval and was able to advance to the

construction phase. Arguably, it was due to Altmaier's prioritization of EU cooperation, free trade, and ensuring energy security that led to the approval of EU actors and other EU members to let the Nord Stream 2 project proceed. However, while this significant development in the project coincided with the change in the governing party of the Ministry, this final approval can also be attributed to the fact that the negotiations with other stakeholders finally reached a critical point that led to the approval. While Altmaier was not as outspoken about supporting Russia's causes as were his predecessors, Altmaier nevertheless regularly traveled to Russia and met with Russian officials, including President Vladimir Putin.

Similar to the deciding factors within the Ministry of Defence concerning Germany's leadership role in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)'s Enhanced Forward Presence (EFP), the BMWi's actions vis-à-vis Russia concerning the Nord Stream 2 pipeline played on the duality of certain values that are intrinsic to the Federal Republic of Germany. In the decision to become a framework nation for NATO's EFP, Germany's inherent value of multilateral cooperation and its commitment to international organizations and alliances, such as NATO stood in contrast to Germany's general aversion to military engagements. Despite the tension between these two values, the Ministry of Defence and the Federal Government were able to align these two values to allow for Germany's commitment to the EFP. Similarly, three intrinsic values stood at odds with one another in the discussion surrounding the Nord Stream 2 pipeline project. In this case, Germany's support of free trade through its social market economy, Germany's commitment to the EU and European integration, and Germany's belief in diplomatic relations and open channels of communication caused tension within the German Government as well as with its international partners. Once again, the Ministers of Economic Affairs and

Energy were able to align the core values of Germany in order to achieve what they perceived to be the best possible outcome for the country, thus upholding and representing German values and interests.

While all activities and the behaviour of the three Ministers of Economic Affairs and Energy during the period analyzed fit into the RAM due to their effort to align their position and ministry with overarching Federal Government priorities, there is one aspect that could fit better in the bureaucratic/governmental politics model. During Sigmar Gabriel's tenure of Minister for Economic Affairs and Energy, Gabriel regularly spoke out against the Federal Government's decision and actions concerning Russia in the wake of Russia's annexation of Crimea and activities in Eastern Ukraine. Interestingly, these instances of public criticism either subsided or led to the shift in overarching federal priorities, subsequently ending the criticism brought forth by Gabriel. Moreover, Gabriel continued to publicly criticize certain government decisions when he moved into the position of Minister of Foreign Affairs, resulting in the same shift in priorities. Therefore, even the most outspoken of the three ministers that held the position of Minister for Economic Affairs and Energy ultimately aligned with the overarching Federal Government and its priorities. Thus, Germany's presentation of itself as a rational actor on the international stage was supported and ensured a unified front when making decisions internationally.

## Chapter 8: Conclusion

### 8.1. Review of the Thesis

Germany's *Russlandpolitik* is complex and has been widely debated by scholars and experts. While the relationship between Germany and Russia has existed for centuries, both countries have undergone drastic changes in governance systems over the past century. One of the most significant changes in governance occurred at the end of the Cold War, the fall of the Berlin Wall, and the disintegration of the Soviet Union. During this two-year window from 1989 to 1991, East and West Germany reunified and became the Federal Republic of Germany. During the same time, the Soviet Union disintegrated and split into 15 individual states. Russia was identified as the main heir of the Soviet legacy as the largest of the 15 post-Soviet states and the heir to the Soviet Union's nuclear arsenal. While Russia is the largest successor state of the Soviet system, the disintegration of the Soviet Union significantly impacted the power the Soviet Union possessed within the bipolar Cold War system.

Another significant, and more recent, shift in German-Russian relations and the consequent effects on Germany's *Russlandpolitik* occurred with Russia's illegal annexation of Crimea and the unrest in Eastern Ukraine. While relations between Germany and Russia following the end of the Cold War had largely been positive and collaborative, relations between the two states began to deteriorate in the years leading up to the Ukraine crisis and deteriorated drastically following Russia's annexation of Crimea. Germany's *Russlandpolitik* since then has been complex, with some policy decisions seemingly contradicting one another. As such, this thesis asked the question: *How can the nature and decision-making processes of Germany's Russlandpolitik, since the annexation of Crimea in 2014, be best explained?*

To answer this research question, this thesis analyzed three key German policies under the *Russlandpolitik* umbrella by applying the rational actor and the bureaucratic/governmental politics models to the three policies and their respective Federal Ministries. The first case study focused on Germany's involvement in finding a diplomatic solution to the Ukraine crisis through the Minsk Accords and the German Federal Ministry of Foreign Affairs' (*Bundesministerium des Auswärtigen*) role in the process. The second case study discussed Germany's leadership role in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)'s Enhanced Forward Presence (EFP) that aimed to reassure NATO's eastern members of NATO's support and act as a deterrent to a resurgent Russia by stationing troops from NATO members along borders shared between NATO members and Russia. As the German Federal Ministry of Defence (*Bundesministerium der Verteidigung*) has been in charge of coordinating Germany's leadership role, this case study analyzed the decision-making process within the Ministry of Defence. The third and final case study focused on the German Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy (BMWi) and the German Federal Government's role in the discussion surrounding the Nord Stream 2 pipeline that will directly supply Germany with Russian natural gas. While all three of these activities reflect Germany's characterization on the international stage, together they appear to be diverging and at times contradicting one another.

This thesis therefore hypothesized that the bureaucratic/governmental politics model could more adequately describe the nature and decision-making processes surrounding Germany's *Russlandpolitik* as exemplified by this thesis' three case studies. The basis for this hypothesis was that, unlike what is argued by the majority of the existing literature, Germany's Russia policies are not adherent to the rational actor model (RAM), which would require Germany

to present a clear and non-contradictory *Russlandpolitik* through which all policies affecting Russia are made with a coherent strategic goal in mind. In an attempt to balance out this discrepancy, the existing academic literature has proposed that Germany runs a dual-track policy vis-à-vis Russia, without explaining how these two tracks relate or co-exist. In response to the literature, this thesis hypothesized that Germany's *Russlandpolitik* is more complex than is argued in the existing literature and does not reflect a clear, easily discernible, and non-contradictory strategic goal. Instead, each Federal Ministry and executive actor, namely Federal Ministers, has been taking a different and individualized approach to operationalizing Germany's relations with Russia, which have become evident through the seemingly divergent approaches to maintaining relations with Russia. This is to say that while the German Federal Ministry of Defence plays a leadership role in positioning NATO troops along Russia's border, the German Federal Ministry of Foreign Affairs opposes the provision of military support to Ukraine to fight off Russian encroachment and tries to find a diplomatic solution to the crisis, while the BMWi has promoted the construction of a pipeline directly connecting Russia with Germany.

The hypothesis was tested through an in-depth analysis of the German Federal Ministries of Foreign Affairs, Defence, and Economic Affairs and Energy and the distinct policy approaches to the three German policies affecting Russia as introduced above. As part of its historical foundation of values, the German Federal Ministry of Foreign Affairs favours the use of diplomacy and diplomatic tools over other foreign policy tools. As such, Germany's and the Ministry's involvement in the diplomatic talks surrounding the Ukraine crisis and the consequent creation of the Minsk Accords clearly aligns with the Ministry's core values of prioritizing diplomatic efforts. Similarly, the Ministry of Defence's support of Germany taking on a leadership role in

NATO's EFP reflects the Ministry's priorities and values of focusing on defensive operations and acting through multilateral mandates. Since the EFP is intended to reassure members of a multilateral alliance and deter possible Russian aggression, the EFP fits the German Ministry of Defence's *Leitmotif*. Nevertheless, the first approach focuses on diplomatic efforts with the intention of avoiding the use of any military means, while the latter one directly involves the German military and deploys troops. Even though these two initiatives both align with each ministry's core values, they already indicate certain discrepancies that would appear to be difficult to align with one another to promote a unified German approach to relations with Russia.

Finally, Germany's BMWi values the maintenance of free trade internationally and the social market economy (*soziale Marktwirtschaft*) in Germany. Moreover, the *Energiewende* (shift in energy sources) has been a guiding principle regarding the maintenance of Germany's energy security. As such, negotiations surrounding the Nord Stream 2 pipeline project align with the Ministry's values of free trade; the social market economy, which includes the privatization of energy suppliers and the energy infrastructure; and ensuring that Germany receives reliable supplies of energy from a diverse group of countries. Even though economic interdependence is broadly accepted as a pillar in ensuring a peaceful and collaborative international community, the fact that this pipeline was announced after the beginning of the Ukraine crisis and would be a direct collaboration between European, namely German, companies and the Russian company Gazprom, raised concerns domestically and internationally about Germany's commitment to its allies and adherence to the European Union (EU) sanctions framework against Russia. Furthermore, the Ministry's willingness to consider this pipeline project stood in stark contrast to the other Ministries' efforts to resolve the Ukraine crisis diplomatically and to be a framework

nation for NATO's EFP in the Baltics. As such, there appeared to be discrepancies among the ministries of Germany's *Russlandpolitik*, as well as more "tracks" than any dual-track policy could provide.

## 8.2. Summary of Findings

Over the course of this thesis, a number of factors were tested as the possible reason why there appears to be a disjointed *Russlandpolitik* across the Federal Ministries. The first factor was the possibility of the ministries analyzed having different mandates and therefore possessing different core values, which would provide reason for these ministries to prioritize different policy considerations, thus resulting in contradictory Russia policies. While there is some slight variation between the different ministries' core values, they all include the foundational support of the democratic system; loyalty to the *Grundgesetz*, Germany's constitution; the maintenance of bilateral and multilateral relationships; and the adherence to and promotion of the international rules-based liberal order. As a result, the distinct mandate of each ministry did not sufficiently influence the apparent discrepancy between the three policies undertaken by the three ministries.

Another possible factor that could have contributed to the divergence is the fact that each ministry had a different constellation of ministers over the course of the time analyzed for this thesis (2014 to 2019). This is to say that while the Ministry of Defence had one Minister over the course of the analyzed time period, the other two Ministries each had three Ministers during the same period. Further distinguishing the Ministries from one another is the fact that while both the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the BMWi each had three ministers, all Ministers of Foreign Affairs from 2014 to 2019 were members of the Social Democratic Party (SPD), while only the

first two Ministers for Economic Affairs and Energy were members of the SPD and the third one is a member of the Christian Democratic Union (CDU).

As one could have hypothesized that the individual Ministers or their political party affiliations could have influenced the policy-making of each Ministry in question, the policies would have needed to change in response to the change of each Ministry's leadership. Using the Ministry of Defence as a baseline since it did not have a change in leadership between 2014 and 2019, any greater change in policy direction in the other two Ministries could have suggested that individuals' convictions or their party affiliation would be influential enough to change the Ministry's trajectory. A clear indication that individual Ministers did not have the power or interest in changing policy trajectories of their Ministries becomes obvious in the case of the Nord Stream 2 pipeline, which was announced when the BMWi was in the hands of the SPD. However, when the Ministry changed hands and came under the leadership of the CDU, a party known to be more wary of Russia, Peter Altmaier continued to promote Germany's interests in pursuing the pipeline project.

Moreover, despite some ministers openly criticizing some of Germany's overarching Russia policies, they consistently found a compromise, were able to sway the overarching policies to align them with their own arguments, or halted their criticism and aligned their ministry with the government's overarching goals and priorities. Sigmar Gabriel was one of the most outspoken critics of some of the Federal Government's overarching *Russlandpolitik*, most notably concerning the implementation of the EU sanctions regime. Gabriel presents an interesting case as he first served as Minister for Economic Affairs and Energy until he moved over to become Minister of Foreign Affairs in 2017, consequently being represented in both Ministries' case

studies in this thesis. While Gabriel was outspoken about his disagreement with a number of overarching Russia policies as put forth by the German Federal Government and Chancellor Angela Merkel, he continuously worked to strike a balance between his personal and party convictions and overarching government priorities. For example, despite Gabriel's opposition to the EU sanctions regime against Russia due to his fears over further alienating Russia, he nonetheless supported these sanctions since the core values of the German Federal Government, as well as individual Ministries', include the adherence to and promotion of the international rules-based liberal order and that order includes the adherence to international law and the respect for other states' sovereignty and territorial integrity.

Following the conclusions drawn from this thesis' three case studies, the hypothesis that Germany's *Russlandpolitik* can be best explained through the bureaucratic/governmental politics model rather than the RAM does not stand true. Instead, the RAM appears to be a more adequate model through which to explain Germany's Russia policies. However, unlike the existing literature, the dual-track policy, which is so often used to explain Germany's Russia policies, also did not become evident through these three case studies. While the three case studies presented different approaches to Germany's relationship with Russia, they did not clearly fall into one track or the other of the dual-track policy. Instead, each policy decision ultimately aligned with Germany's overarching goals and interest, presenting a relatively unified stance toward Germany's *Russlandpolitik*.

One interesting factor that is largely left out of other analyses of Germany's foreign and Russia policies is the matter of time and how far in the future each policy looks. This is to say that while the policy decisions taken now concerning the three case studies may not appear to be

entirely coherent, they begin to appear more coherent the more long-term one applies them. While Germany's decision to support the construction of the Nord Stream 2 pipeline may seem contrary to the EU's current sanctions regime and Germany's actions within the realm of diplomatic peace talks with Ukraine and Germany's commitment to NATO's EFP, the decision begins to make more sense and fall more in line with Germany's overarching goals and interests when looking at it within a thirty or even fifty year time frame. How likely is it that relations between Germany and Russia will still be sour half a century from now? When looking at Germany's history, a lot has happened in the past century, half century, and even thirty years. Thirty years ago, Germany was on the verge of reunification and the Soviet Union had yet to disintegrate. During the three decades that followed, the relationship between Germany and Russia went through waves of good relations, followed by periods of a cooling of relations.

Since the nature of all three ministries analyzed in this thesis presented strong historical links and Germany's recognition that regimes, eras, and certain relations with other countries are in constant flux, it becomes clearer as to why and how Germany took on a leadership role in NATO's EFP and stationed German troops on Russia's border with NATO, opposed getting involved in Ukraine militarily, and is building a pipeline that will directly connect Germany with Russia. In the short term, Germany has been able to simultaneously reassure its NATO allies that Germany remains fully committed to NATO and NATO members by its role in the EFP, being able to align this commitment with the Ministry of Defence's and the *Bundeswehr's* emphasis on multilateral commitments. Although Germany contributes significantly to NATO's EFP militarily, Germany has also been able to maintain open channels of communication with Russia by promoting working toward a diplomatic solution with Ukraine rather than using military means.

Finally, if relations between Germany and Russia were to improve over the next half decade, which, judging from the constant flux of the past century of German-Russian relations, could likely happen, the two countries will already have another pipeline constructed between the two of them to facilitate the supply of natural gas to Germany and Western Europe. Using a long-term lens when assessing these policies and planning for multiple decades ahead, relations with Russia could once again be more positive, in which case Germany would have been able to maintain open channels of communication with Russia, assured Germany's NATO allies of its commitment to the transatlantic Alliance, and partook in the continued establishment of long-term paths toward ensuring energy security.

Taking this long-term perspective into consideration, the RAM only explains Germany's Russia policies more adequately than the bureaucratic/governmental politics model, since Germany has a unified approach toward relations with Russia, but falls short of explaining Germany's decision- and policy-making perfectly, as Germany's *Russlandpolitik* is more complex and has consequently been considered to be disjointed by the existing literature. A possible reason as to why neither of the two models explain Germany's *Russlandpolitik* perfectly is because both models were constructed with American politics and the United States (US) governance system in mind. As such, both models may possess an insufficient understanding of the complexity of European governments and their regional norms, behaviours, political interactions, and trans-territoriality, most notably exemplified by the EU and its roles within European national governments. Furthermore, Allison and Zelikow in the bureaucratic/governmental politics model presume the longevity of a political system and a government's priorities, as is evident in the US. However, the reflexivity of German politics is tied

to the historical changes Germany has undergone since the late nineteenth century and continues to undergo as European integration continues.

### 8.3. Future Research

While most well-known decision-making models are based on the US, ones with European origins, such as the one found in Thomas Risse's "'Let's argue!': Communicative Action in World Politics," may be able to better explain Germany's *Russlandpolitik* and might even come close to explaining the decision-making behind Germany's Russia policies perfectly.<sup>1</sup> As such, a possible future research project could utilize the same, or similar, case studies and analyze them using different models which have their origins in Europe and are based off of European examples. This further research could add to the analysis and explanation of Germany's complex decision-making processes surrounding its Russia policies and provide further depth to explain why Germany makes the decisions it makes when it comes to its relationship with Russia, as Europe's history and its current system of multiple layers of governance ranging from the local to the trans-European level are unique and heavily influence European actors' policies and decision-making throughout.

---

<sup>1</sup> Thomas Risse, "'Let's argue!': Communicative Action in World Politics," *International Organization* 54, no. 1 (2000): 1-39.

## Bibliography

- Allers, Robin. "The framework nation: can Germany lead on security?" *International Affairs* 92, no. 5 (2016): 1167-1187.
- Allison, Graham, and Philip Zelikow. *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis*. New York, NY: Longman, 1999.
- "Altmaier in Moskau: Müssen um deutsch-russische Beziehungen kämpfen." *Der Tagesspiegel*. 7 October 2018. Accessed 15 February 2020. <https://www.tagesspiegel.de/politik/beim-petersburger-dialog-altmaier-in-moskau-muessen-um-deutsch-russische-beziehungen-kaempfen/23158610.html>.
- Auswärtiges Amt. "Die transatlantischen Beziehungen." *Auswärtiges Amt*. Accessed 5 December 2019. <https://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/de/aussenpolitik/regionaleschwerpunkte/usa/transatlantischebez-allg-node>.
- Auswärtiges Amt. "Grundprinzipien deutscher Außenpolitik." *Auswärtiges Amt*. 9 October 2019. Accessed 5 December 2019. <https://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/de/aussenpolitik/themen/grundprinzipien/216474>.
- Auswärtiges Amt. "Potential for momentum in the conflict in eastern Ukraine." *Federal Foreign Office*. 19 November 2019. Accessed 5 December 2019. <https://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/en/aussenpolitik/laenderinformationen/ukraine-node/supportukraine/maas-ukraine/2277910>.
- Auswärtiges Amt. "Rede von Außenminister Frank-Walter Steinmeier anlässlich der 50. Münchner Sicherheitskonferenz." *Auswärtiges Amt*. 1 February 2014. Accessed 5 December 2019. <https://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/de/newsroom/140201-bm-muesiko/259554>.
- Auswärtiges Amt. "Speech by Foreign Minister Heiko Maas at the New Year reception of the German Eastern Business Association (OAOEV)." *Federal Foreign Office*. 10 January 2019. Accessed 7 March 2020. <https://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/en/newsroom/news/new-year-reception-german-eastern-business-association/2177446>.
- Auswärtiges Amt. Deutsche Botschaft Maskat. "The German Foreign Minister." *German Embassy Muscat*. Accessed 5 December 2019. <https://maskat.diplo.de/om-en/themen/politik/02-Politik>.
- "Außenminister Maas in Russland: Keine Aufweichungen der Sanktionen." *ZDF*. 22 August 2019. Accessed 5 December 2019. <https://www.zdf.de/nachrichten/heute/aussenminister-maas-in-russland-keine-aufweichung-der-sanktionen-100.html>.
- Baumann, Robert F., George W. Gawrych, and Walter E. Kretchik. *Armed Peacekeepers in Bosnia*. Fort Leavenworth, KS: Combat Studies Institute Press, 2004.
- Bowlby, Chris. "Germany: Reluctant military giant?" *BBC News*. 12 June 2017. Retrieved 23 December 2019. <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-40172317>.

- Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce, and David Lalman. *War and Reason: Domestic and International Imperatives*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1992.
- Bundesministerium der Verteidigung. "Cybersicherheit." *Bundesministerium der Verteidigung*. Accessed 14 December 2019. <https://www.bmvg.de/de/themen/cybersicherheit>.
- Bundesministerium der Verteidigung. "Friedenssicherung." *Bundesministerium der Verteidigung*. Accessed 14 December 2019. <https://www.bmvg.de/de/themen/friedenssicherung>.
- Bundesministerium der Verteidigung. "Geschichte." *Bundesministerium der Verteidigung*. Retrieved 22 September 2019. <https://www.bmvg.de/de/themen/verteidigung/die-parlamentsarmee/geschichte>
- Bundesministerium der Verteidigung. "Geschichte des Verteidigungsministeriums." *Bundesministerium der Verteidigung*. Retrieved 22 September 2019. <https://www.bmvg.de/de/ministerium/geschichte-des-verteidigungsministeriums>.
- Bundesministerium der Verteidigung. "Keynote Speech by Federal Minister of Defence Dr Ursula von der Leyen Opening the 55<sup>th</sup> Munich Security Conference on 15 February 2019." *Bundesministerium der Verteidigung*. 15 February 2019. Accessed 7 March 2020. <https://www.bmvg.de/resource/blob/32548/55509659e4b51afb5df21ee62f5577/20190215-rede-ministerin-msc-engl-data.pdf>.
- Bundesministerium der Verteidigung. *Konzeption der Bundeswehr*. Berlin, DE: Bundesministerium der Verteidigung, 2018.
- Bundesministerium der Verteidigung. "Multinationale Zusammenarbeit." *Bundesministerium der Verteidigung*. Accessed 14 December 2019. <https://www.bmvg.de/de/themen/verteidigung/multinationale-zusammenarbeit>.
- Bundesministerium der Verteidigung. "Sicherheitspolitik." *Bundesministerium der Verteidigung*. Accessed 14 December 2019. <https://www.bmvg.de/de/themen/sicherheitspolitik>.
- Bundesministerium der Verteidigung. "Tagesbefehl der Verteidigungsministerin zu Enhanced Forward Presence." *Bundesministerium der Verteidigung*. 30 January 2017. Accessed 23 December 2019. <https://www.bmvg.de/de/aktuelles/tagesbefehl-der-verteidigungsministerin-zu-enhanced-forward-presence-11266>.
- Bundesministerium der Verteidigung. "Verteidigung." *Bundesministerium der Verteidigung*. Accessed 14 December 2019. <https://www.bmvg.de/de/themen/verteidigung>.
- Bundesministerium der Verteidigung. "Was wir hier heute sehen, ist NATO." *Bundesministerium der Verteidigung*. 7 February 2017. Accessed 23 December 2019. <https://www.bmvg.de/de/aktuelles/was-wir-heute-hier-sehen-ist-nato-11126>.
- Bundesministerium der Verteidigung. *Weißbuch 2016 zur Sicherheitspolitik und zur Zukunft der Bundeswehr*. Berlin, DE: Bundesministerium der Verteidigung, 2016.
- Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie. "Aufgaben und Struktur des Bundesministeriums für Wirtschaft und Energie." *Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und*

*Energie*. Accessed 9 February 2020.

<https://www.bmwi.de/Navigation/DE/Ministerium/Aufgaben-und-Struktur/aufgaben-und-struktur.html>.

Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie. “Aus zwei wird eins: 1990 bis heute.”

*Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie*. 2019. Retrieved 23 September 2019.

<https://www.100.bmwi.de/BMWI100/Navigation/DE/Meilenstein-08/1990-heute.html>.

Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie. “Bundesminister Altmaier reist zu Gesprächen nach Russland.” *Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie*. 2 April 2019. Accessed 15 February 2020.

<https://www.bmwi.de/Redaktion/DE/Pressemitteilungen/2019/20190402-bundesminister-altmaier-reist-zu-gespraechen-nach-russland.html>.

Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie. “Die Geschichte des Bundesministeriums für Wirtschaft und Energie.” *Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie*. Accessed 9 February 2020.

<https://www.bmwi.de/Redaktion/DE/Textsammlungen/Ministerium/geschichte-des-bmwi.html>.

Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie. ““Ein wirtschaftlich starkes und soziales Europa ist die beste Antwort auf die internationalen Veränderungen.” – Bundesministerin Brigitte Zypries im Interview mit der Frankfurter Allgemeine Sonntagszeitung.”

*Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie*. 5 February 2017. Accessed 15 February 2020. <https://www.bmwi.de/Redaktion/DE/Interviews/2017/20170201-zypries-fas.html>.

Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie. “Eine Politik des Dialogs ist notwendiger denn je – Gastkommentar von Bundeswirtschaftsministerin Zypries in der Wirtschaftswoche zu den US-Sanktionen gegen Russland und den Folgen für die internationale Energiepolitik.” *Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie*. 4 August 2017. Accessed 15 February 2020.

<https://www.bmwi.de/Redaktion/DE/Namensartikel/2017/20170804-gastkommentar-zypries-energiepolitik-wirtschaftswoche.html>.

Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie. “Gas.” *Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie*. Accessed 15 February 2020.

[https://www.bmwi.de/Redaktion/DE/Textsammlungen/Energie/gas.html?cms\\_artId=218216](https://www.bmwi.de/Redaktion/DE/Textsammlungen/Energie/gas.html?cms_artId=218216).

Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie. “Kernenergie und Uran.” *Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie*. Accessed 15 February 2020.

[https://www.bmwi.de/Redaktion/DE/Textsammlungen/Energie/kernenergie.html?cms\\_artId=241964](https://www.bmwi.de/Redaktion/DE/Textsammlungen/Energie/kernenergie.html?cms_artId=241964).

Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie. “Kohle.” *Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie*. Accessed 15 February 2020.

<https://www.bmwi.de/Redaktion/DE/Artikel/Energie/kohlepolitik.html>.

- Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie. "Parlamentarischer Staatssekretär Hirte reist zu Gesprächen nach Russland." *Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie*. 27 February 2019. Accessed 9 February 2020. <https://www.bmwi.de/Redaktion/DE/Pressemitteilungen/2019/20190227-hirte-reist-zu-gespraechen-nach-russland.html>.
- Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie. "Unsere Energiewende: sicher, sauber, bezahlbar." *Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie*. Accessed 15 February 2020. <https://www.bmwi.de/Redaktion/DE/Dossier/energiewende.html>.
- Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie. "Wohlstand für alle: 1945-1966." *Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie*. 2019. Retrieved 23 September 2019. <https://www.100.bmwi.de/BMWI100/Navigation/DE/Meilenstein-05/1945-1966.html>
- Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie. "Zypries: "Abschottung hilft niemandem" – Bundesministerin Zypries im Interview mit der Hessischen/Niedersächsischen Allgemeinen." *Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie*. 28 June 2017. Accessed 15 February 2020. <https://www.bmwi.de/Redaktion/DE/Interviews/2017/20170628-zypries-hna.html>.
- Bundesregierung. "Bundesregierung verurteilt Referendum." *Die Bundesregierung*. 18 March 2014. Accessed 5 December 2019. <https://www.bundesregierung.de/breg-de/aktuelles/bundesregierung-verurteilt-referendum-454002>.
- Bundesregierung. "Speech by the Federal Chancellor Dr Angela Merkel on 16 February 2019 at the 55<sup>th</sup> Munich Security Conference." *The Federal Government*. 16 February 2019. Accessed 7 March 2020. <https://www.bundesregierung.de/breg-en/news/speech-by-federal-chancellor-dr-angela-merkel-on-16-february-2019-at-the-55th-munich-security-conference-1582318>.
- Bundestag. "Aktuelle Stunde/Vereinbarkeit von Nord Stream 2 mit EU-Klima- und Energiezielen." *Deutscher Bundestag*. 13 February 2019. Accessed 15 February 2020. <https://www.bundestag.de/mediathek?videoid=7325524#url=L21IZGhldGhla292ZXJsYXk/dmlkZW9pZD03MzI1NTI0JnZpZGVvaWQ9NzMyNTUyNCZ2aWRlb2lkPTczMjU1MjQ=&mod=mediathek>.
- Bundeswehr. "Afghanistan – ISAF (International Security Assistance Force)." *Bundeswehr*. Accessed 23 December 2019. <https://www.bundeswehr.de/de/einsaetze-bundeswehr/abgeschlossene-einsaetze-der-bundeswehr/afghanistan-isaf>.
- Bundeswehr. "Armee im Kalten Krieg." *Bundeswehr*. 5 February 2015. Retrieved 22 September 2019. [https://www.bundeswehr.de/portal/a/bwde/start/streitkraefte/grundlagen/geschichte/anfaenge/!ut/p/z1/04\\_Sj9CPykyssy0xPLMnMz0vMAfljo8zinSx8QnyMLI2MTM0sDAw8DU MCPDy9TIOMDAz0wwkpiAJKG-AAjgb6wSmp-pFAM8xxm2GqH6wfpR-VIViWWKFXkF9UkpNaopeYDHKhfmRGYI5KTmpAfrIjRKAgN6LcoNxREQCKF9HU/dz/d5/L2dBISEvZ0FBIS9nQSEh/#Z7\\_B8LTL292256800I1TPHIJ52005](https://www.bundeswehr.de/portal/a/bwde/start/streitkraefte/grundlagen/geschichte/anfaenge/!ut/p/z1/04_Sj9CPykyssy0xPLMnMz0vMAfljo8zinSx8QnyMLI2MTM0sDAw8DU MCPDy9TIOMDAz0wwkpiAJKG-AAjgb6wSmp-pFAM8xxm2GqH6wfpR-VIViWWKFXkF9UkpNaopeYDHKhfmRGYI5KTmpAfrIjRKAgN6LcoNxREQCKF9HU/dz/d5/L2dBISEvZ0FBIS9nQSEh/#Z7_B8LTL292256800I1TPHIJ52005).

- Bundeswehr. "Die Bundeswehr in Afghanistan – Resolute Support." *Bundeswehr*. Accessed 23 December 2019. <https://www.bundeswehr.de/de/einsaetze-bundeswehr/die-bundeswehr-in-afghanistan>.
- Bundeswehr. "Die Geschichte der Bundeswehr." *Bundeswehr*. 5 June 2019. Retrieved 22 September 2019. [https://www.bundeswehr.de/portal/a/bwde/start/streitkraefte/grundlagen/geschichte/!ut/p/z1/hU69DolwGHwWB9Z-tSigG6iDBhONJEIXU7AWTWIJqdTHF-NkovG2-80BhRyoYv1VMHvVismBFzQ4JVGapWRGSLZbLPPF66yfJeE9INAnh-C9ABxv\\_QIzhcOZQDBvhr41sFcABKNAb69KdtdpYyS1i1eshFDVTZ8I3uorfwgaokLp8X49V6UcCqOEXbrhBdzPitbVtN\\_ewh51zSGgtJEeVbjz8rVLrzkL-mYS2yR32p7JP49ETxeawAQ!!/dz/d5/L2dBISEvZ0FBIS9nQSEh/#Z7\\_B8LTL2922TPCD0IM3BB1Q22TE6](https://www.bundeswehr.de/portal/a/bwde/start/streitkraefte/grundlagen/geschichte/!ut/p/z1/hU69DolwGHwWB9Z-tSigG6iDBhONJEIXU7AWTWIJqdTHF-NkovG2-80BhRyoYv1VMHvVismBFzQ4JVGapWRGSLZbLPPF66yfJeE9INAnh-C9ABxv_QIzhcOZQDBvhr41sFcABKNAb69KdtdpYyS1i1eshFDVTZ8I3uorfwgaokLp8X49V6UcCqOEXbrhBdzPitbVtN_ewh51zSGgtJEeVbjz8rVLrzkL-mYS2yR32p7JP49ETxeawAQ!!/dz/d5/L2dBISEvZ0FBIS9nQSEh/#Z7_B8LTL2922TPCD0IM3BB1Q22TE6).
- Busse, Nikolas, and Majid Sattar. "Die Deutschen und das russische Gas." *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*. 31 March 2014. Accessed 13 April 2020. <https://www.faz.net/aktuell/politik/inland/energieabhaengigkeit-von-russland-die-deutschen-und-das-russische-gas-12871459.html>.
- Carr, E. H. *The Twenty Years' Crisis 1919-1939: An Introduction to the Study of International Relations*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave, 2001.
- Chira, Gabriela, and Assem Dandashly. "European Neighbourhood Policy." In *European Union Governance and Policy Making: A Canadian Perspective*, edited by Emmanuel Brunet-Jailly, Achim Hurrelmann, and Amy Verdun, 317-336. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press, 2018.
- Chira-Pascanut, Constantin. "A Short History of the European Union: From Rome to Lisbon." In *European Union Governance and Policy Making: A Canadian Perspective*, edited by Emmanuel Brunet-Jailly, Achim Hurrelmann, and Amy Verdun, 21-40. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press, 2018.
- "Common rules for gas pipelines entering the EU internal market." *European Parliament Think Tank*. 27 May 2019. Accessed 15 February 2020. [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/thinktank/en/document.html?reference=EPRS\\_BRI\(2018\)614673](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/thinktank/en/document.html?reference=EPRS_BRI(2018)614673).
- Connolly, Kate. "Germany to abolish compulsory military service." *The Guardian*. 22 November 2010. Accessed 23 December 2019. <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2010/nov/22/germany-abolish-compulsory-military-service>.
- Craig, Gordon A., and Alexander L. George. *Force and Statecraft: Diplomatic Problems of Our Time*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1983.
- Demmer, Ulrike, and Daniel Goffart. *Kanzlerin der Reserve: Der Aufstieg der Ursula von der Leyen*. Berlin, Germany: Berlin, 2015.

- Deutsch, Morton. "Bargaining, Threat, and Communication: Some Experimental Studies." In *Strategic Interaction and Conflict: Original Papers and Discussion*, edited by Kathleen Archibald, 19-40. Berkeley, CA: Institute of International Studies, 1966.
- Eggert, Konstantin. "Angela Merkel faces suspicion in Baltics." *Deutsche Welle*. 13 September 2018. Accessed 23 December 2019. <https://www.dw.com/en/angela-merkel-faces-suspicion-in-baltics/a-45463745>.
- European Commission. "Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy (BMWi)." *European Commission*. Updated 31 January 2020. Accessed 9 February 2020. <https://rio.jrc.ec.europa.eu/en/organisations/federal-ministry-economic-affairs-and-energy-bmwi>.
- European External Action Service. "The European Union and the Russian Federation." *European Union External Action*. 30 May 2019. Accessed 29 September 2019. [https://eeas.europa.eu/headquarters/headquarters-homepage/35939/european-union-and-russian-federation\\_en](https://eeas.europa.eu/headquarters/headquarters-homepage/35939/european-union-and-russian-federation_en).
- European Union. "EU sanctions against Russia over Ukraine crisis." *European Union Newsroom*. Accessed 29 September 2019. [https://europa.eu/newsroom/highlights/special-coverage/eu-sanctions-against-russia-over-ukraine-crisis\\_en](https://europa.eu/newsroom/highlights/special-coverage/eu-sanctions-against-russia-over-ukraine-crisis_en).
- "Everything you wanted to know about the Minsk peace deal, but were afraid to ask." *Euromaidan Press*. Accessed 5 December 2019. <http://euromaidanpress.com/minsk-agreements-faq/>.
- Falbisoner, Martin. "Gründung der Bundeswehr." *Konrad Adenauer Stiftung*. Accessed 29 September 2019. <https://www.konrad-adenauer.de/politikfelder/aussepolitik/gruendung-der-bundeswehr>.
- Feldenkirchen, Markus, and Christina Hebel. "Ein angenehmer Gast." *Der Spiegel*. 22 September 2016. Accessed 15 February 2020. <https://www.spiegel.de/politik/ausland/sigmar-gabriel-bei-wladimir-putin-in-moskau-ein-angenehmer-gast-a-1113382.html>.
- Filippov, Mikhail. "Diversionary Role of the Georgia-Russia Conflict: International Constraints and Domestic Appeal." *Europe-Asia Studies* 61, no. 10 (2009): 1825-1847.
- Forsberg, Tuomas. "From *Ostpolitik* to 'frostpolitik'? Merkel, Putin and German foreign policy towards Russia." *International Affairs* 92, no. 1 (2016): 21-42.
- Fürstenau, Marcel. "Heiko Maas: Who is Germany's new foreign minister?." *Deutsche Welle*. 9 March 2018. Accessed 5 December 2019. <https://www.dw.com/en/heiko-maas-who-is-germanys-new-foreign-minister/a-42898811>.
- Gabriel, Sigmar. *Zeitwende in der Weltpolitik: Mehr Verantwortung in ungewissen Zeiten*. Freiburg, DE: Verlag Herder, 2018.
- Gaskarth, Jamie, and Kai Oppermann. "Clashing Traditions: German Foreign Policy in a New Era." *International Studies Perspectives* (2019): 1-22.
- "German Foreign Minister Frank-Walter Steinmeier Criticizes NATO Military Drills in East Europe and European Union Sanctions on Russia." *The Ukraine Crisis Timeline, Center for*

- Strategic & International Studies*. 19 July 2016. Accessed 5 December 2019.  
<http://ukraine.csis.org/#444>.
- Germany and Eastern Europe since 1945: From the Potsdam Agreement to Chancellor Brandt's "Ostpolitik". New York, NY: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1973.
- "Germany's Energiewende – The Easy Guide." *Clean Energy Wire*. 2018. Accessed 13 April 2020.  
<https://www.cleanenergywire.org/easyguide>.
- "Germany's Merkel, Maas defend NATO after Macron's rebuke." *Deutsche Welle*. 10 November 2019. Accessed 5 December 2019. <https://www.dw.com/en/germanys-merkel-maas-defend-nato-after-macrons-rebuke/a-51191565>.
- Goncharenko, Roman. "Anhaltende Freundschaft: Die Druschba-Pipeline und die DDR-Arbeiter." *Deutsche Welle*. 9 December 2019. Accessed 13 April 2020.  
<https://www.dw.com/de/anhaltende-freundschaft-die-druschba-pipeline-und-die-ddr-arbeiter/a-51543858>.
- Greive, Martin, and Dietmar Neuerer. "Heiko Maas to be foreign minister as Gabriel loses job." *Handelsblatt*. 8 March 2018. Accessed 9 March 2020.  
<https://www.handelsblatt.com/today/politics/new-government-heiko-maas-to-be-foreign-minister-as-gabriel-loses-job/23581404.html?ticket=ST-5347711-yOzzVIVnmk6uE9SUTagC-ap6>.
- Grewe, Wilhelm G. *Deutsche Aussenpolitik der Nachkriegszeit*. Stuttgart, DE: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1960.
- Haftendorn, Helga. "Germany's accession to NATO: 50 years on." *NATO Review*. 2005. Retrieved 22 September 2019. <https://www.nato.int/docu/review/2005/Peace-Building/Germany-accession-NATO/EN/index.htm>
- Haftendorn, Helga. *Coming of Age: German Foreign Policy since 1945*. Oxford, UK: Rowman & Littlefield, 2006.
- Halperin, Morton H., and Priscilla A. Clapp. *Bureaucratic Politics and Foreign Policy*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 2006.
- Harsanyi, John C. "Some Social-Science Implications of a New Approach to Game Theory." In *Strategic Interaction and Conflict: Original Papers and Discussion*, edited by Kathleen Archibald, 1-18. Berkeley, CA: Institute of International Studies, 1966.
- Herwig, Holger H. "Aggression Contained? The Federal Republic of Germany and International Security." *Final Report, NATO Research Fellowship*. 1998. Accessed 23 December 2019.  
<https://www.nato.int/acad/fellow/96-98/herwig.pdf>.
- Irish, John, and Andrea Shalal. "Powers push for ceasefire, weapons withdrawal in eastern Ukraine." *Reuters*. 18 February 2017. Accessed 5 December 2019.  
<https://www.reuters.com/article/us-ukraine-crisis/powers-push-for-ceasefire-weapons-withdrawal-in-eastern-ukraine-idUSKBN15X0JI>.
- Janes, Jackson. "Merkel 3.0: German Foreign Policy in the Aftermath of the 2013 Bundestag Election." *German Politics and Society* 32, no. 3 (2014): 86-97.

- Keohane, Robert O. "Theory of World Politics: Structural Realism and Beyond." In *Neorealism and its Critics*, edited by Robert O. Keohane, 158-203. New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1986.
- Keohane, Robert O. *International Institutions and State Power: Essays in International Relations Theory*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1989.
- Kluge, Janis, and Sabine Fischer. "The German debate on Russia sanctions is out of touch." *Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik – German Institute for International and Security Affairs*. 9 May 2018. <https://www.swp-berlin.org/en/point-of-view/2018/the-german-debate-on-russia-sanctions-is-out-of-touch/>.
- Leaman, Jeremy. *The Political Economy of West Germany, 1945-1985: An Introduction*. Basingstoke, UK: Macmillan Press, 1988.
- Lütjen, Torben, and Lars Geiges. *Frank-Walter Steinmeier: Die Biografie*. Freiburg, Germany: Herder, 2017.
- Mann, Siegfried. *Das Bundesministerium der Verteidigung*. Bonn, DE: Boldt Verlag, 1971.
- Maoz, Zeev. *National Choices and International Processes*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Martin, David. "A history of Germany's coalition governments." *Deutsche Welle*. 15 December 2017. Accessed 14 March 2020. <https://www.dw.com/en/a-history-of-germanys-coalition-governments/g-41818483>.
- Maulucci, Thomas. *Adenauer's Foreign Policy: West German Diplomacy in the Shadow of the Third Reich*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2012.
- Mayer, Sebastian. "The EU and NATO in Georgia: complementary and overlapping security strategies in a precarious environment." *European Security* 26, no. 3 (2017): 435-453.
- Meier, Albrecht. "Ausbau der Ostsee-Pipeline: Putin und Gabriel brüskieren Brüssel." *Euractiv / Der Tagesspiegel*. 17 November 2015. Accessed 15 February 2020. <https://www.euractiv.de/section/energie-und-umwelt/news/ausbau-der-ostsee-pipeline-putin-und-gabriel-bruskieren-brussel/>.
- Miller, Zeke J. "World Leaders Cancel G-8 Summit in Russia After Ukraine Crisis." *Time*. 24 March 2014. Accessed 29 September 2019. <https://time.com/35965/world-leaders-cancel-g8-summit-in-russia-after-ukraine-crisis/>.
- Morgenthau, Hans J. *Politics among Nations*. New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf, 1973.
- Morgenthau, Hans J. *Politics among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*. New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf, 1978.
- Müller-Neuhof, Jost. "Brigitte Zypries wird gebraucht, also ist sie da." *Der Tagesspiegel*. 26 January 2017. Accessed 15 February 2020. <https://www.tagesspiegel.de/politik/designierte-wirtschaftsministerin-brigitte-zypries-wird-gebraucht-also-ist-sie-da/19304020.html>.

- Mushaben, Joyce Marie. *Becoming Madam Chancellor: Angela Merkel and the Berlin Republic*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- Nelson, Soraya Sarhaddi. "Germany's New Defense Minister: More Peacekeeping Missions Welcome." *NPR*. 1 February 2014. Accessed 20 December 2019.  
<https://www.npr.org/sections/parallels/2014/02/01/269410945/germanys-new-defense-minister-more-peacekeeping-missions-welcome>.
- Newnham, Randall. "Germany and Russia Since Reunification: Continuity, Change, and the Role of Leaders." *German Politics and Society* 35, no. 1 (2017): 42-62.
- North Atlantic Treaty Organization. "NATO's Enhanced Forward Presence: Factsheet." *NATO*. October 2019.  
[https://www.nato.int/nato\\_static\\_fl2014/assets/pdf/pdf\\_2019\\_10/20191024\\_1910-factsheet\\_efp\\_en.pdf](https://www.nato.int/nato_static_fl2014/assets/pdf/pdf_2019_10/20191024_1910-factsheet_efp_en.pdf).
- North Atlantic Treaty Organization. "Resolute Support Mission (RSM): Key Facts and Figures." *NATO*. October 2019. Accessed 23 December 2019.  
[https://www.nato.int/nato\\_static\\_fl2014/assets/pdf/pdf\\_2019\\_10/20191022\\_2019-10-RSM-Placemat.pdf](https://www.nato.int/nato_static_fl2014/assets/pdf/pdf_2019_10/20191022_2019-10-RSM-Placemat.pdf).
- North Atlantic Treaty Organization. "The fall of the Wall: Berlin: German Reunification." *NATO*. Retrieved 23 September 2019.  
[https://www.nato.int/cps/su/natohq/declassified\\_136311.htm](https://www.nato.int/cps/su/natohq/declassified_136311.htm)
- North Atlantic Treaty Organization. "Warsaw Summit Communiqué." *NATO*. 9 July 2016. Updated 29 March 2017. Accessed 20 December 2019.  
[https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official\\_texts\\_133169.htm](https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_133169.htm).
- Oltermann, Philip. "Ursula von der Leyen appointed as Germany's first female defence minister." *The Guardian*. 15 December 2013. Accessed 20 December 2019.  
<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2013/dec/15/ursula-von-der-leyen-germany-defence-minister>.
- "Our Shareholders." *Nord Stream*. Accessed 15 February 2020. <https://www.nord-stream.com/about-us/our-shareholders/>.
- Owen IV, John M. *Liberal Peace, Liberal War: American Politics and International Security*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1997.
- Parfitt, Tom. "Ukraine accused of stealing Russian gas as fuel flow declines." *The Guardian*. 3 January 2009. Accessed 13 April 2020.  
<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2009/jan/03/russia-ukraine-gas-supplies-gazprom>.
- Pifer, Steven. "Five years after Crimea's illegal annexation, the issue is no closer to resolution." *Brookings*. 18 March 2019. Accessed 5 December 2019.  
<https://www.brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2019/03/18/five-years-after-crimeas-illegal-annexation-the-issue-is-no-closer-to-resolution/>.

- Pittman, Avril. *From Ostpolitik to Reunification: West German-Soviet Political Relations since 1974*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Radkau, Joachim. "Eine kurze Geschichte der deutschen Antiatomkraftbewegung." *Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung*. 10 November 2011. Accessed 28 September 2019. <https://www.bpb.de/apuz/59680/eine-kurze-geschichte-der-deutschen-antiatomkraftbewegung?p=all>.
- Rahr, Alexander. "Germany and Russia: A Special Relationship." *Washington Quarterly* 30, no. 2 (2007): 137-145.
- Risse, Thomas. "'Let's argue!': Communicative Action in World Politics," *International Organization* 54, no. 1 (2000): 1-39.
- Sarhaddi Nelson, Soraya. "Germany's New Economy Minister Takes Aim At Arms Exports." *NPR*. 23 September 2014. Accessed 15 February 2020. <https://www.npr.org/sections/parallels/2014/09/23/349641603/germanys-new-economy-minister-takes-aim-at-arms-exports>.
- Schelling, Thomas C. *The Strategy of Conflict*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1960.
- Siddi, Marco. "German Foreign Policy towards Russia in the Aftermath of the Ukraine Crisis: A New *Ostpolitik*?" *Europe-Asia Studies* 68, no. 4 (2016): 665-677.
- Smale, Alison. "Germany's Foreign Minister, a Man in the Middle." *The New York Times*. 19 November 2014. Accessed 5 December 2019. <https://www.nytimes.com/2014/11/20/world/europe/frank-walter-steinmeier-germanys-foreign-minister-a-man-in-the-middle.html>.
- Snyder, Glenn H., and Paul Diesing. *Conflict Among Nations: Bargaining, Decision Making, and System Structure in International Crises*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1977.
- "Steinmeier appelliert an Vernunft, Merkel gibt sich hart." *Handelsblatt*. 19 December 2014. Accessed 5 December 2019. <https://www.handelsblatt.com/politik/deutschland/russland-sanktionen-steinmeier-appelliert-an-vernunft-merkel-gibt-sich-hart/11144952.html?ticket=ST-12390175-hYfEjEmqe35glyHaqWRj-ap1>.
- Stratmann, Klaus. "Peter Altmaier: „Nord Stream 2 ist der falsche Prügelknabe“." *Handelsblatt*. 20 January 2019. Accessed 7 March 2020. <https://www.handelsblatt.com/politik/deutschland/interview-peter-altmaier-nord-stream-2-ist-der-falsche-pruegelknabe/23883662.html>.
- Stulberg, Adam N. "Out of Gas?: Russia, Ukraine, Europe, and the Changing Geopolitics of Natural Gas." *Problems of Post-Communism* 62, no. 2 (2015): 112-130.
- Szabo, Stephen F. "Germany's Commercial Realism and the Russia Problem." *Survival* 56, no. 5 (2014): 117-128.
- Thomas, Andrea. "Berlin Lays Groundwork with German Public for Stiffer Russian Sanctions." *The Wall Street Journal*. 27 July 2014. Accessed 15 February 2020.

- <https://www.wsj.com/articles/berlin-lays-groundwork-with-german-public-for-stiffer-russian-sanctions-1406482633>.
- Timmins, Graham. "German-Russian Bilateral Relations and the EU Policy on Russia: Between Normalisation and the 'Multilateral Reflex'." *Journal of Contemporary European Studies* 19, no. 2 (2011): 189-199.
- Traynor, Ian, and Patrick Wintour. "Ukraine crisis: Vladimir Putin has lost the plot, says German chancellor." *The Guardian*. 3 March 2014. Accessed 29 September 2019. <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2014/mar/03/ukraine-vladimir-putin-angela-merkel-russian>.
- Tsygankov, Andrei P. "The final triumph of the Pax Americana? Western intervention in Yugoslavia and Russia's debate on the post-Cold War order." *Communist and Post-Communist Studies* 34, no. 2 (2001): 133-156.
- Vinocur, John. "How Germany went wobbly on the West." *Politico*. 2 May 2019. Updated 4 May 2019. Accessed 7 March 2020. <https://www.politico.eu/article/germany-nato-russia-ukraine-crimea-west-defense-army-military/>.
- "Von der Leyen will Bundeswehr verstärkt im Ausland einsetzen." *Spiegel Online*. 26 January 2014. Accessed 23 December 2019. <https://www.spiegel.de/politik/deutschland/von-der-leyen-fuer-staerkeres-engagement-der-bundeswehr-im-ausland-a-945568.html>.
- "Von der Leyen will familienfreundliche Bundeswehr." *Zeit Online*. 12 January 2014. Accessed 23 December 2019. <https://www.zeit.de/politik/2014-01/von-der-leyen-will-bundeswehr-familienfreundlicher-machen>.
- Von Rohr, Mathieu, and Britta Sandberg. "'The World Is Changing Dramatically'." *Der Spiegel*. 24 September 2018. Accessed 7 March 2020. <https://www.spiegel.de/international/germany/interview-with-former-german-foreign-minister-sigmar-gabriel-a-1229393.html>.
- Von Salzen, Claudia. "Auf neuen alten Wegen." *Der Tagesspiegel*. 28 October 2015. Accessed 15 February 2020. <https://www.tagesspiegel.de/politik/sigmar-gabriel-bei-wladimir-putin-auf-neuen-alten-wegen/12511136.html>.
- Waltz, Kenneth N. *Man, the State and War: A Theoretical Analysis*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2001.
- Wasserstein, Bernard. *Barbarism and Civilization: A History of Europe in Our Time*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Weiland, Severin, and Philipp Wittrock. "Der Nebenzkanzler." *Spiegel Online*. 19 November 2014. Accessed 5 December 2019. <https://www.spiegel.de/politik/deutschland/putin-und-ukraine-merkel-und-steinmeier-ringen-um-geschlossenheit-a-1003772.html>.
- Weiland, Severin. "Ärger um Gabriels Alleingang." *Spiegel Online*. 18 February 2018. Accessed 5 December 2019. <https://www.spiegel.de/politik/deutschland/russland-sanktionen-cdu-kritisiert-alleingang-von-sigmar-gabriel-a-1194133.html>.

- Western European Union. "Western European Union – Union de l'Europe Occidentale."  
*Western European Union*. Accessed 5 December 2019. <http://www.weu.int/>.
- "Who were Germany's Red Army Faction militants?." *BBC News*. 19 January 2016. Accessed 28 September 2019. <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-35354812>.
- Williams, Allison, and André Ballin. "Germany's foreign minister suggests lifting sanctions on Russia." *Handelsblatt*. 11 January 2018. Accessed 7 March 2020.  
<https://www.handelsblatt.com/today/politics/eastwards-easing-germanys-foreign-minister-suggests-lifting-sanctions-on-russia/23580682.html?ticket=ST-4307927-LCWWyTICgkbsMaVSEvXd-ap6>.
- Wolczuk, Katarzyna. "Managing the flows of gas and rules: Ukraine between the EU and Russia."  
*Eurasian Geography and Economics* 57, no. 1 (2016): 113-137.
- Wood, Steve. "Germany, Russia, Europe: Multilevel politics and the divergent resonance of "history"." *International Journal* 72, no. 3 (2017): 338-355.
- Yoder, Jennifer A. "From Amity to Enmity: German-Russian Relations in the Post Cold War Period." *German Politics and Society* 33, no. 3 (2015): 49-69.
- Zapfe, Martin. "Deterrence from the Ground Up: Understanding NATO's Enhanced Forward Presence." *Survival* 59, no. 3 (2017): 147-160.
- "Zur Person." *Brigitte Zypries: Bundestagsabgeordnete für Darmstadt und Darmstadt-Dieburg 2005-2017*. Accessed 15 February 2020. <https://www.brigitte-zypries.de/561-zur-person/>.