GERMANY AND THE UNITED STATES IN THE AGE OF TERROR

Ideas, Domestic Politics, and the International System of States

Donald Abenheim

As the shock waves in the realms of ideas and geopolitical strategy rolled outward from Ground Zero on 11 September 2001, the edifice of German-American security and collective defense shuddered and soon piled up collateral damage in Washington, New York, Paris, Berlin, and beyond. In the aftermath of the terror attacks, culminating in the spring 2003 Anglo-American-Australian-Polish blitzkrieg against Baathist Iraq, the German-U.S. bond, a basic element of the Euro-Atlantic security order that has prevailed for more than a half-century since the end of World War II, seems to be in the process of collapse. Germany and the United States are publicly at odds, and the ties that bind our countries appear to have disintegrated into vituperation and invective that recall the world of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.[1] If this cornerstone of the international system of states changes further for the worse—and any significant German retreat from the U.S. and North Atlantic orientation that has sustained liberal democracy and prosperity in and around the Federal Republic of Germany for decades counts as "for the worse"—unpredictable consequences will follow for the United States and the world order most congenial to it.

Dr. Abenheim is director of graduate education in international strategic studies and an associate professor of national security affairs at the U.S. Naval Postgraduate School (NPS), in Monterey, California. He received his Ph.D. in European history at Stanford University and joined the NPS faculty in 1985. Since 1987 he has been a visiting scholar at the Hoover Institution. He helped create the NPS Center for Civil Military Relations (CCMR) in 1993 and represents CCMR to the Consortium of NATO and 'Partnership for Peace' Defense Academies. He is the author of the monograph Reforging the Iron Cross: The Search for Tradition in the German Armed Forces *(Princeton, 1988); his most recent publications have appeared in the* Oxford Companion to Military History *(2000), as well as in* Orbis *and the* Hoover Institution Digest.

The views herein are the author's own. They represent the position of neither the Department of Defense nor the U.S. government and should not be construed as such. *The author wishes to thank Dr. Carolyn Höfig of the Department of State for her wise aid in the preparation of this article.*

He also acknowledges the support of his colleagues in the Center for Civil-Military Relations, as well as that of one of its sponsors, the U.S. National Guard Bureau.

Naval War College Review, Autumn 2003, Vol. LVI, No. 4

Report Documentation Page

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.

1. REPORT DATE **2003**	2. REPORT TYPE	3. DATES COVERED **00-00-2003 to 00-00-2003**
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE **Germany and the United States in the Age of Terror: Ideas, Domestic Politics, and the International System of States**		5a. CONTRACT NUMBER
		5b. GRANT NUMBER
		5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER
6. AUTHOR(S)		5d. PROJECT NUMBER
		5e. TASK NUMBER
		5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) **Naval War College,686 Cushing Road,Newport,RI,02841-1207**		8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)		10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)
		11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT **Approved for public release; distribution unlimited**		
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
14. ABSTRACT		
15. SUBJECT TERMS		

16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT **unclassified**	b. ABSTRACT **unclassified**	c. THIS PAGE **unclassified**	**Same as Report (SAR)**	**19**	

Standard Form 298 (Rev. 8-98)
Prescribed by ANSI Std Z39-18

What accounts for the rift between Washington and Berlin at present? No single cause emerges from an examination of this situation that hopes to go beyond the facile, reactive, if not jingoistic, analyses of the chattering classes in Berlin and Washington. Rather, the current strain is wrought of a convergence of forces, complicating manifestations of history, ideology, experience, and ambition that have always swirled around the German-American relationship, however inchoately. For a variety of reasons, these factors have coalesced to exacerbate tensions and produce a troubling reaction in the last several months since the American coalition against terror marched to war, first in Afghanistan and then in Iraq. This article examines these complicating factors and the circumstances that have made them so virulent of late.

The following focuses on the German side of the problem, first tracing the role of ideas in German politics and society, the ideological framework on which the current debate is built.[2] Simply put, in the first instance, since the origins of such ideas in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, there have endured mutually negative images in Germany and the United States as concerns politics, society, and culture among political elites;[3] these well-worn negative images have taken on a new virulence in the present crisis because of the upswing in nationalist sentiment on both sides of the Atlantic in the wake of Bin Ladenist terror. Secondly, these ideas interact with domestic political figures and factors that, in the German case, have been particularly important in the transformation of external relations since the waning phase of the first Gerhard Schröder cabinet after 11 September 2001.[4] That is, Schröder is very different from Helmut Kohl as concerns German-American relations, and his source of power and influence in German politics differs from those of his Atlanticist predecessors. Thus, the analysis here turns to the role of German domestic politics in Berlin's external policy today, developments that have not always met with much understanding among foreign policy elites on these shores.

Third, there is the matter of security and defense policy in Germany, particularly the German aversion to extraterritorial operations—an aversion that, although such policy has given way to a much more global orientation since 1990, continues to brake German enthusiasm for sending soldiers overseas compared to, say, the British and French.[5] As we shall see, in the formation of security and defense policy in Germany and the United States, the forces dubious about U.S. diplomacy and strategy in Germany find their echo, as it were, in those figures and institutions skeptical of the phenomena recently caricatured by Robert Kagan.[6]

Finally, the article takes up the implications for the future of a continuing or worsening German-American split. This issue is central to the emergence of "New Europe" versus "Old Europe" and the long-term effects of this diplomatic revolution in the wake of 11 September 2001.

FROM ENTENTE TO CONFLICT

The U.S.-German amity that now seems so precarious is hard won and vitally important to the United States and to the world.[7] The security and defense ties between Washington and Bonn, and later Berlin, represented the success of statecraft that for the first time in modern history forged a durable Central European bond to the Anglo-Saxon and Atlantic realm, a connection that had been impossible in the years from 1848 until 1949.[8] Whereas the rise of German might in the era 1870–1939 was a leading source of concern for American makers of policy in the era of the world wars, the integration of German power into the international system of states became a symbol of peace and stability in the years from 1945 until 1990. It also drove the reconstruction and reorientation of Western Europe, which formed a reliable—and reliably democratic—ally for the United States during and after the Cold War.[9]

The high point of the German-American relationship came in May 1989, as the border that divided Germany and Europe first began to hemorrhage denizens of the East bloc intent on a better life in the West. In the Rhineland city of Mainz, the first President Bush gave a speech in which he identified the United States and the Federal Republic as "Partners in Leadership" and inaugurated an era of good feeling that obtained through October 1990 and German unification.[10] The events of this period and G. H. W. Bush's estimation of the German-American bond marked a fitting conclusion to the Cold War and the century of world wars.

Of course, for all the mutual esteem that Germany and the United States fostered for each other in the years after World War II, the leaders of both countries endured in their personal diplomacy episodes of strife and discord that affected German-American relations. In the first years of the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG), the Americans wrongly thought that Kurt Schumacher, the leader of the socialist opposition to Konrad Adenauer's Atlantic statecraft, was a nationalist holdover, if not a neo-Nazi.[11] After the climax of the Berlin crisis in the summer of 1961, Adenauer believed that John Kennedy had lurched away from the Atlantic statecraft and nuclear strategy of the Eisenhower administration; Adenauer himself shifted toward Charles de Gaulle at the end of his tenure.[12] Ludwig Erhard's chancellorship ended abruptly in 1966, partly as a result of Lyndon Johnson's overbearing attempts to make Germany shoulder additional burdens of Western defense in the era of the Indochina war.[13] Richard Nixon and Henry Kissinger believed that Willy Brandt ventured too far toward Moscow in 1969–70 with his abandonment of Adenauer's Cold War policies toward Central and Eastern Europe.[14] Helmut Schmidt and Jimmy Carter, despite their shared

left-of-center political views, disagreed sharply about the means and ends of North Atlantic Treaty Organization strategy in the second half of the 1970s.[15]

Still, clashes of personality and vision did not disturb the depths of German-American affinity. Not so very long ago, news reports carried images of Chancellor Helmut Kohl and President Bill Clinton, two large men meeting over heart-attack-inducing plates of fettuccini in Georgetown as they consolidated the gains of statecraft that had emerged from the end of the Cold War. There and later, amid the organ-meat-oriented delicacies of Kohl's home region, the Palatinate, the conservative German leader and the Democratic American president later expanded NATO and led German-American diplomacy to new heights of cooperation and effectiveness. It may be, though, that these feasts heralded the last hurrah of the comfortable transatlantic entente.

The present condition of the German-American connection surely contrasts with the recent, but seemingly long gone, past. The German chancellor waged a populist campaign against U.S. foreign policy to win reelection in 2002. American and German diplomats have been on opposite sides of the green felt tables at the United Nations Security Council and the North Atlantic Council amid name-calling and feats of diplomatic sleight of hand that do no honor to the memory of Dean Acheson, Konrad Adenauer, or Lucius Clay. A senior American official has grouped Germany with Libya and Cuba as examples of countries opposed to U.S. interests. Other voices are calling for boycotts of German goods—demands echoed in sporadic, informal refusals by German companies to supply goods to the U.S. market—or punitive acts of defense "realignment" that will greatly weaken the German-American bond. Beyond giving vent to frustrations at a relationship gone seriously awry, such rhetoric augurs a troubled future. Moreover, these pronouncements, as well as the yellow journalism of the tabloid electronic press, recall the escalation of words and events between the sinking of the *Lusitania* in the spring of 1915 and the U.S. entry into World War I in 1917.

The present breakdown in German-American relations began to take shape after the initial shock of September 2001 dissipated and U.S. armed forces counterattacked the terror network in the Hindu Kush; at the same time the United States gave short shrift to any substantial NATO support in the Afghan operation, putatively as a means of avoiding the perceived setbacks of the 1999 NATO campaign in Kosovo. This phase has reinvigorated in part of the American body politic an anti-European and anti-German feeling not seen for decades, doing at the same time much the same among certain elites in Germany who have been anti-American in times past, notably from the mid-1960s until the early 1980s. If this development had antecedents in the past, however, never did these phenomena cross the threshold in bilateral relations that was traversed in 2002.

IDEAS AND THEIR CONFLUENCE IN GERMAN DOMESTIC POLITICS

This writer was in Slovenia on 11 September 2001, as part of the construction of what in other circles is now called "New Europe." While waiting to return to the United States from Vienna, he watched the reactions of people in Central Europe to the calamity here. One saw sympathy for America, the victim, and fear of further attacks targeting other Western powers—a combination that led to expressions of solidarity that echoed the North Atlantic Council's invoking of Article V of the NATO pact within hours of the attack. Such compassion was surely genuine, but in some sectors other sentiments soon emerged. From the earliest moments of the aftermath, one also saw the beginnings of misunderstanding based on old anti-American prejudices in both the popular discourse and political formulations of certain elites and makers of opinion. This misapprehension concerns the inability of certain Germans to interpret fully American history and U.S. ideas about policy and war that appear to contradict what has become, for more than a few members of the present generation of power holders in Germany, a dogma of peace in all circumstances. Professor Jeffrey Herf has best described this phenomenon as, first, an underestimation among the German left of the vices of appeasement in the era 1933–39—that is, the inability to understand the failures of the West to preempt the Nazi regime and the high price the world was to pay;[16] and second, as the tendency to engage in a form of Willy Brandt's *Ostpolitik* ("transformation through proximity," a term coined in 1963 by Brandt's press spokesman, Egon Bahr) in every conceivable diplomatic situation, whether such statecraft is warranted or not. The present German leadership views events inflexibly in terms of its own distinct ideological legacy.[17]

German Chancellor Gerhard Schröder holds office as a Social Democrat, a representative of Germany's largest center-left party, in coalition with the Green Party, the latter having emerged in the political and social upheaval of the late 1960s and 1970s, and now part of the political establishment. The Social Democratic Party (SPD) is also the country's oldest political party, in the sense that its members today trace their direct organizational and ideological roots to the middle of the nineteenth century, the era of Bismarck's German unification and the nation's tumultuous first republican experiment. The SPD is also the party that most stoutly resisted the Nazi march to power in 1930–33. It is a party with a strong pacifist tradition, or at least a deep skepticism about the use of armed force. Nonetheless, in the 1950s and 1960s, key Social Democratic figures had signal roles in the establishment of a new army in the FRG. In no small part because of the party's experiences with the totalitarian left both before and after the Nazi regime, the SPD, unlike many European socialist parties, actively

resisted communism before 1933 and after 1945, particularly in the form of parties led more or less openly from Moscow during the Cold War.

At the same time, however, the party remained dubious of the free market, seeing itself as the arbiter of a "third path" to resolve the tensions of capital and labor, as well as the geopolitical conflict between the capitalist West and the totalitarian East. Before and after the founding of the Federal Republic of Germany in 1949, this habit of thought translated to resistance to American antisocialist influences in western Germany, while the new center-right party, the Christian Democratic Union, at pains to distinguish itself from the reactionary and nationalist tradition of the prewar right, adopted a strong, pro-American stance. Helmut Kohl represented such policy from 1982 until 1998, as does the present leader of the opposition, Angela Merkel. The fondest Social Democratic notions of an independent, neutral Germany, forging a middle way between great powers, endure in the SPD's theoretical substance today. At the same time, the anti-Soviet, pro-Atlanticist wing of the SPD that held sway from the end of the 1950s until the early 1980s—best represented by the career of Helmut Schmidt (chancellor 1974–82)—has no effective successors in Schröder's cabinet or in the left-of-center camp of German politics as a whole.

In this vein, the present German-American troubles might be said to have their distant origins a quarter of a century ago when Helmut Schmidt passed the apogee of his power and many of the personalities on both sides of the present German-American tensions perhaps first developed antipathies for one another. These developments transpired in the second half of the 1970s, amid the collapse of superpower détente and the revival of the Cold War in 1979–80, the period of the Iranian hostage crisis, the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, and the election of Ronald Reagan. Before the present epoch of terror, then, the potential for a German-American clash came into starkest relief during the debates between 1977 and 1987 about the deployment of the so-called Euromissiles, NATO's response to Soviet nuclear blackmail.[18] The answer of the German left to such statecraft reflected a misreading of the 1930s by pro-détente forces transmuted into the late 1970s and early 1980s. German advocates of an opening to Moscow misunderstood the fact that the Soviet attempt to overawe the West with the SS-20 medium-range rocket was born of motives that brooked no compromise. Further, the far left in Germany failed to appreciate the efficacy of the North Atlantic strategy of the dual-track approach of the Harmel doctrine—which, beginning in December 1967 and continuing until 1989, fostered a reduction of East-West tensions but also sufficient NATO defense in the face of the Soviet theater and strategic buildup.[19] The sudden end of the Cold War obviated the debate amid national unification in peace, but the return of war to Europe and elsewhere in the 1990s revealed that the discordance of thinking about force

and statecraft had hardly vanished. Despite what seems to be consensus in the FRG on the Schröder cabinet's refusal to back the "coalition of the willing" in the war against Iraq, this German conflict about force and statecraft has grown far more intense since 11 September and will likely persist in the wake of the annihilation of the Iraqi armed forces in March–April 2003.[20]

This phenomenon of a far left that can conceive of statecraft only with an explicit critique of U.S. policy of strength has a Doppelgänger in a strain in American political thought that is ascendant at the moment. The opposite of an anti-American Gerhard Schröder is the anti-European and especially anti-German-socialist dogma that might be said to exist among the foreign-policy elites of the American right.[21] Beyond traditional doubts in some U.S. quarters about European and German socialists, or outright opposition to them, a Europhobic school of thought has operated in part of the American foreign-policy elite since at least the early 1970s.[22] This group originally doubted the goals of Willy Brandt's statecraft and later deplored any lessening of tension with the Warsaw Pact—which, in their view, could only lead to the "Finlandization" of Western Europe.[23] This school also worried in 1983–84 that a red-green coalition would result in a new diplomacy à la Tauroggen and Rapallo, with the FRG marching alongside the USSR against the West.[24] Surely the work of Robert Kagan, which asserts unbridgeable ideological differences between Europe and the United States—that is, the pithy Venus-and-Mars analogy of strategic geography—takes more than a page from the book of these Europhobes and the strategic debates of their day.[25]

In other words, Germany's leftist anti-Americanism collides in the United States with rightist anti-German or anti–continental European sentiments in the current debate over grand strategy. These two notions cause an escalatory diplomatic blow and counterblow of name-calling and invective, as witnessed in the months before the outbreak of war in late March 2003.[26]

THE PRIMACY OF DOMESTIC POLITICS IN GERMANY'S FOREIGN POLICY

With the beginning of the new century, the political burdens arising from the conjuncture of German unification and weaknesses of the German social market economy (which were detectable even before 1989) became ever more daunting. The tasks of economic and social renewal preoccupy the national leadership amid a widespread sense of social and political entropy and crisis. These concerns receive little or no sympathetic analysis among political elites in the United States, who dismiss the advent of peace along the European Cold War battlements and the extension of NATO and the European Union as a sideshow at best. This circumstance leaves Atlantic-minded Germans feeling abandoned by their elder sibling, the United States.

In this vein, for instance, the catastrophic floods of summer 2002 in the five new federal states only served to make Germans more concentrated on their own affairs versus the wider world. Much like the Chernobyl explosion of 1986, the event accentuated the importance of ecological international relations—that is, the floods in Dresden seemed an augur of global warming, a threat more palpable than al-Qa'ida kamikazes in jetliners. More enduringly, Schröder's attention is dominated by Germany's economic straits, as the country comes to resemble 1970s Britain before the Thatcherite free-market coup de main. In the last decade, the economic growth rate in Germany has averaged 1.6 percent—the rate in 2002 was a dismal 0.2 percent.[27] Officially, unemployment hovers near 12 percent, a figure that includes neither the underemployed nor women who, though now jobless, can be counted as housewives. In the eastern part of the country, where workers by law earn no more than 80 percent of the wage that a western German worker makes for the same job, the unemployment rate is much higher, and disaffection for the state and society, expressed through extreme politics and violent gang activity, runs concomitantly high.

It goes without saying, then, that the German leadership has plenty to worry about at home. Interestingly, the war in Iraq may ultimately help ease Germany's economic woes, as it might activate an "exception clause" in the European Union's Stability and Growth Pact, which the Germans could cite as a reason for suspending strict criteria that the Federal Republic cannot meet in its current condition. Under the exception clause, hefty fines for recent violations would be dismissed, and the way for increased deficit spending to spur the economy would be cleared.[28] Nonetheless, the head of Germany's labor office, a Social Democrat, insists that the war and "geopolitical uncertainty" are hindering recovery.[29]

The political cast of the wartime economic analysis in Germany continues the basic domestic-political fact of anti-Americanism as a campaign issue. Chancellor Schröder stood for reelection in the summer of 2002. His once-popular cabinet had by then become enfeebled by the national economic sclerosis, unable and increasingly unwilling to free itself from the vise grip of the trade-union movement, where many cabinet members found their ideological home, to say nothing of their electoral support. However, the economy—particularly the dramatic policy initiatives that the moribund German market would require—made for difficult contests for politicians interested in being all things to all voters.

As the German election campaign took shape—and as the focus of U.S. counterterror strategy shifted from the Afghan expedition against the Taliban and al-Qa'ida to preparations for the military overthrow of the Saddam Hussein regime—the SPD also found itself circumscribed by the pacifism of its coalition partners. These partners were the Green Party and the so-called Party of German Socialism (PDS), the Stalinist successor to the former communist party of

the German Democratic Republic. The PDS kept a strong hold on voters' hearts and minds in the eastern part of the country—in part by promising the anti-American peace platform that the East German leaders had always talked about but never delivered.

Thus, when Schröder's challenger from the center right, Edmund Stoiber, the Bavarian minister-president (governor), asserted on the campaign stump that Germany should support the United States against Iraq in the war on terrorism, Schröder found himself another issue. Schröder's camp seized on Stoiber's position to exploit several factors in domestic politics. With his ever more strident expressions of opposition to U.S. strategy, the incumbent chancellor appealed to pacifists and to skeptics of Germany's Western orientation in the ex-GDR. Further, he put the pro-American heirs of Konrad Adenauer and Helmut Kohl on the defensive and, either by accident or by design, emboldened the fringe right and left in their latent anti-American phobias. At the climax of the September campaign Schröder's justice minister, Herta Däubler-Gmelin, long critical of the administration of justice in the United States, in a talk to union members in the southwestern German state of Baden-Württemberg likened the American president to Adolf Hitler—just one week after the first anniversary of the 11 September attacks.[30] Her comments brought about her resignation from the Schröder cabinet immediately after he won reelection, but her swift departure did nothing to diminish the escalation of vitriol and bad feeling between Berlin and Washington.

Herein reemerged the dilemma of German socialism and state power, force and statecraft, that has operated since the end of the nineteenth century. Once more, then, the unhappy experience of German socialists with armed power and the international system loomed within domestic politics. Surely in years to come the Schröder election strategy of 2002 and its attendant effects will stand alongside earlier episodes that tore the SPD apart.[31] The most recent of these ultimately self-destructive allergic reactions to the use of armed force occurred when the left wing of the SPD sandbagged Helmut Schmidt over NATO strategy in the late 1970s and the early 1980s. When the dust and rhetoric settled, the Social Democrats no longer held the chancellor's office and the new German leaders faced some long-term repair work to the German image abroad, particularly in the eyes of the U.S. policy elite. Schröder's version of the new era, however, might yet prove to be even more profound in its long-term effects.

SECURITY AFFAIRS IN THE GERMAN VIEW

The November 2002 North Atlantic Council summit in Prague invited seven "Partnership for Peace"/Membership Action Plan countries to accede to NATO. To the extent that the meeting played out cordially, it falsely presaged a lull in the name-calling between Washington and Berlin. However, the American

rejoinder to the Schröder election campaign soon followed; a senior Washington official compared Germany's resistance to U.S. policy on Iraq (alongside that of France in the UN Security Council) to the actions of such rogue states as Libya and Cuba. Not to be outdone, Europe-bashers in Congress called for the boycott of German goods as well as the withdrawal of U.S. forces from that country. The Federal Republic, along with France, constituted, in the view of certain senior American officials, "Old Europe," an epithet intended to highlight a disparity with the newly democratic nations of Central and Eastern Europe, which constituted a "New Europe."[32] This "other" continent formed a pillar of the U.S.-led coalition against terror and weapons of mass destruction. To underscore this new diplomacy the United Kingdom, Spain, Italy, and several Central and Eastern European countries declared their support for the U.S. campaign against Iraq in the *Wall Street Journal* of 30 January 2003.[33] Henceforth Madrid, Prague, Budapest, Bucharest, and Warsaw would be the leading European partners of the United States. As the military buildup against Iraq gained speed in late February 2003, an American effort within the North Atlantic Council to provide for the collective defense of Turkey as well as the protection of facilities in Western Europe prompted a nonconsensus demarche by Belgium, France, and Germany.[34] This diplomatic impasse briefly appeared to herald the final collapse of the 1949 Washington Treaty establishing NATO and the success of French statecraft to detach the Federal Republic of Germany from its Atlantic foundations and erect an anti-Anglo-Saxon continental bloc.

The crux of the problem for the Germans lies in the knotted issues that attend combat outside their borders, as well as the abhorrence of war by the body politic and nearly all foreign-policy elites, who regard armed conflict solely in terms of futile tragedy. The anti-Washington and anti-London diplomacy visible in Berlin and Paris in the first weeks of 2003 derived most immediately from the collapse of transatlantic consensus about terror and weapons of mass destruction—in addition to the increasing personal antipathy between Schröder and Bush. However, German refusal to be dragged into other people's fights is proverbial, going back to Bismarck and his attempts in 1879–88 to keep the second German Empire out of the Habsburg adventures in the Balkans that would have alienated Petersburg and thus shattered Bismarck's European system.[35] Even in 1914–18 and 1939–42 there remained a certain grand strategic misunderstanding or indifference to areas beyond continental Europe narrowly defined (that is, the so-called *Kontinentalblick*), notwithstanding the Flottenverein (imperialist Navy League) and Vaterlandspartei (wartime pre-Nazi Fatherland Party) war aims of 1916 and Nazi propaganda of 1941.

Such indifference and caution reemerged in the Federal German leadership after 1949. This policy was dictated by national division, as well as by the

strategic conditions of the Cold War that impelled Bonn to keep the United States and the United Kingdom linked to the defense of Central Europe but at the same time to avoid French colonial warfare, later that of the United States, in Indochina. Indeed, skepticism of what later was called "out of area" (a reference to the geographical limits embodied in Article VI of the Washington Treaty) was central to the defense clauses of the German constitution, the Basic Law, drafted in the 1950s.[36] The Basic Law banned the waging of a war of aggression, made collective security through the United Nations the highest goal of statecraft, and limited the mission of the armed forces to defense. Statements by the German cabinet as recently as the early 1980s insisted that the Germans would stay out of non–Article V contingencies and adhere to the NATO battle lines of the Thuringian Salient and the North German Plain. Of course, at this same time, the United States became increasingly engaged in the Middle East because of the Ayatollah Khomeini's Iran and Leonid Brezhnev's Afghanistan.[37]

When the precursors of the first Gulf War occurred in the summer of 1990, amid the process of German unity, the Kohl government watched the United States withdraw a significant portion of its forces from the FRG and hurl them into combat against Iraq, while the United Kingdom and France sent their soldiers to the Gulf as well. For their part, the Germans provided behind-the-scenes logistical and financial support—measures that bestirred much domestic furor about "out of area" adventures and a militarization of German foreign policy.[38] The next years saw a fight between the Kohl government's interventionist interpretation of Article 24 and the SPD opposition's constructionist adherence to Article 87a—that is, the Bundeswehr exists solely for national defense in the narrowest sense. As the war in ex-Yugoslavia grew more awful, Germans appalled first by Saddam Hussein's missile bombardment of Israeli cities and now by Slobodan Milosevic's sieges of Vukovar and Sarajevo turned the political momentum toward an alteration of the constitutional status quo.

Finally, in the summer of 1994, the Federal German constitutional court decided in favor of the Kohl cabinet.[39] The "no to out of area" syndrome was abated by a policy of gradual steps—from a hospital in Cambodia to the expeditionary force in Somalia, to the German peacekeeping task in Bosnia, to the combat role in Kosovo and its aftermath, and most recently, to the security-building phase of the campaign in Afghanistan.[40] The Bundeswehr of 2003 maintains some nine thousand troops outside of Germany, which, granted the decline of its strength since 1990, is a substantial number. Nonetheless, this accomplishment tends to be denigrated by Americans who perpetually misunderstand, for partisan reasons, such issues of defense-burden sharing.[41]

This transformation of German security and defense to responsibilities beyond the horizons of Central Europe received little positive recognition in the

United States, just as the social and economic burdens of national unification have often been overlooked.[42] In the view of some it is as if the management of the FRG has failed, in its hostile takeover of a failed rust-belt industry, to treat its newly acquired property with sufficient sangfroid. The West had won, and Francis Fukuyama's "end of history" had eventuated. Why did the Germans persist in wringing their hands and nattering about the economic consequences of unification when a real, free-market liberal-democratic ally would, in a phrase, "just *do* it"?

In fact, German unification revived an old American habit to overestimate and simultaneously underestimate—which is to say, generally to misunderstand—the situation of the Germans. This issue goes back to the era of Teddy Roosevelt and Kaiser William II, whose conflicting attitudes about the Monroe Doctrine and the fate of the Caribbean revealed this phenomenon of misunderstanding and overestimation of power.[43]

The syndrome continued through Franklin D. Roosevelt's assumption, circa late 1940, that the Germans would soon march on the Amazon Basin as a means to strike at the United States.[44] Similarly, during World War II, the U.S. side overestimated the ardor of Nazi Germany's attempt to secure atomic weapons, and it overboldly expected Hitler, the Waffen-SS, and the Hitler Youth to fight to the death until 1948 in the Bavarian Alps. The American project of denazification in 1945–47 also proceeded from a serious misunderstanding of how German society had operated in the Third Reich.[45] Nothing symbolized such crossed purposes as the simultaneous war-crimes trials against German political and military figures and hiring by the U.S. Army of German military officers to write studies on how to fight a war against the Soviet Union (a project that proved a prelude to the armament of the FRG).[46]

When unification was at hand in 1989–90, there was impatience with the tentative, circle-and-sniff approach that German lawmakers took to assimilating the erstwhile East. On the other hand, there arose, at least in certain quarters of the chattering classes in 1989 and 1990, nightmare suspicions that a unified Germany would revert to the imperialist policy goals of Himmler's SS Rasse- und Siedlungshauptamt (SS Race and Settlement Office, home of the SS racial imperialists). In contrast to these fears was the reality of a policy of incremental change in the Federal Republic of Germany's force and statecraft, beginning in the summer of 1990 and accelerating over the decade to come.

Such a process accorded fully with the pattern of German civil-military relations that took shape at the beginning of the 1950s and has obtained, perhaps, until quite recently. That is, the formation of U.S. and Atlantic strategy has been surprisingly open to German interests since 1948;[47] its periodic major shifts (for example, the armament of the FRG, the introduction of tactical nuclear weapons into NATO strategy and force posture, the advent of Flexible Response, the

diplomacy of unification in 1989–90) subsequently require the laborious formation of consensus in German political parties and other groups.[48] This process of consensus building usually progresses with less turbulence when Germany's external context—especially official American opinion—is clear and stable. Where, as in the later half of 2002 and into the present, old tensions collide with new uncertainties, the immediate outcome has been less predictable.

IMPLICATIONS FOR THE UNITED STATES, GERMANY, AND THE WORLD

One might conclude with the generalization that German-American relations have gone off the rails in the age of terror, in part (but only in part) because of the problematic state of politics and society in Germany as it affects external relations. Such a pronouncement does not suggest that all guilt rests with the Schröder cabinet and the pie-eyed, if not wrongheaded, adherence by some German elites to the principles of Egon Bahr, laudable ideas in 1963 (when he was press spokesman of West Berlin and soon to become a chief architect of Willy Brandt's Ostpolitik and a leading figure in SPD politics) that may be dysfunctional four decades later amid a radically changed international context. One should be grateful that because the reality of a *Volk in Waffen* (nation at arms) proved such a disaster in 1914–45, the Germans are dubious about the efficacy of war. Only an abject disregard for the past allows serious irritation with the contemporary German reluctance to take up arms in the wider world. Thus, the Europhobes inside the Beltway who beat their drums of scorn do so for their own amusement and domestic political profit, not to set sound policy for the United States.

To be sure, the Schröder government, in the face of a stagnating society and politics, has given in to the temptation to flirt with nationalist extremes. The present German government appears to have forgotten the role of common sense in sound diplomacy, as well as of the long view of statecraft in Central Europe. A more advised view argues for the simultaneous orientation of the FRG to a peaceful Western Europe, including a Gaullist France, and also to the United States and the Atlantic dimension. However, this analysis does not fully explain the wreckage of U.S.-German relations since 2001.

The United States, particularly in the preemptive campaigns to come in the war against its terrorist foes, must better perform the trick of evoking gratitude in statecraft from Europeans while also instructing them in the vitality of U.S. interests. Since the 1999 NATO campaign against the Serbs in Kosovo, if not long before, the American school of thought that puts national interests first—and that touts its refrain of "the mission defines the coalition"—has brought a return to the bad habits and messy, if not brutal, customs of the Atlantic burden-sharing fights

of the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s.[49] The difficult diplomacy about collective defense, national prestige, nuclear and conventional arms, and balance of payments between London, Washington, and Bonn that no doubt enraged people on both sides in 1963 may have been appropriate in the context of that year, just as Bahr's idea of détente may have been, as well. That was then, however. Since 11 September 2001 the postmodern revival of Lyndon Johnson's burden-sharing headlock of a hapless Ludwig Erhard has become excessive.

Such unhelpful practices, customary to the secondary, technical level of bilateral relations, must have their counterweight in statecraft that comprehends the strengths as well as the limitations of military power and that assesses realistically the respective civil-military potential of each democratic nation. One must grasp without illusion what a given country can and cannot do in the realm of defense, in terms not just of force strength and hardware but also political and social realities. Only thus can one avoid the exaggerations of over and underestimation, as have recently had such acrimonious effect. To be sure, this writer regrets that the Germans have not, and will not, increase their defense spending, as they did in the years 1960–80. But one cannot expect the same performance on this score from a now unified, but nonetheless self-preoccupied and encumbered, Germany as one can from a United States on the march. To embrace a punitive policy by which Germany, the most populous and important country in Europe, should be outflanked by Spain and Poland may be an efficacious tactic in the short term, but it will surely backfire over time. It will become increasingly clear that something must operate to limit American global power; meanwhile, what has been the fringe phenomenon of nationalism will intrude into the center of domestic German politics.

The present war against terrorism may have implications beyond the obvious—the collapsed World Trade Center and the toppled statues of Saddam Hussein. If one is to believe the idea of new Europe versus old Europe, implying the marginalization of Germany by the United States, the defense bond to Germany will decline. This contingency would mean a diplomatic revolution for both Germany and the United States, a foreign relations scenario that was always the subject of intellectual inquiry but never took on the life and depth that it seems to have in the last year. A United States cut off from Germany and vice versa, while the former somehow tenuously anchors itself more to the latter's neighbors (and victims of the nineteenth and twentieth century), may well reinforce baleful trends in the evolution in peace and security in Europe. This assertion reflects no criticism of Poles, Danes, or Czechs, or of the Romanians and Bulgarians, either, who were victims of a different kind. The United States and the entire project of Western liberal democracy need the newly democratized states of Central and Eastern Europe. However, the U.S.-German bond

continues to have a particular significance in this connection. Germany can reach out to the countries of Central and Eastern Europe, and they respond in kind, because of the Atlanticist foundation that has operated for more than a half-century—such has been the central goal of American policy since 1945. Although it may sound peculiar in 2003 to those ignorant of the history of Europe, Germany's peace and security have relied on its bond to America and France simultaneously, much in the way that Prussia's and later Germany's good fortune from 1815 until 1888 relied on the bond with czarist Russia. In the latter case, the northern courts had been a force for stability and order, as well as peace of a kind—a peace and an international system that, despite its faults, proved far better than the fragmented European system that arose thereafter and culminated in world wars.[50] The world order anchored by the U.S.-German relationship has integrated Germany into Europe without more bloodshed, brought the transformation of communist Europe, and visited prosperity—and the political and demographic stability that go with it—on a part of the world that could easily have found itself mired in the kind of enduring strife that tore asunder ex-Yugoslavia and roils Israel today. There is rather more to lose here than Hummel figurines and wooden nutcrackers in the tourist shops of Garmisch-Partenkirchen and the sticky French pastries at NATO headquarters in Brussels.

Indeed, the passing of the post-1945 order poses a vast question mark over the brave new world of *Machtpolitik* and the vigorous pursuit of U.S. interests by first strikes and punitive expeditions. Germany will be cut loose, no longer fully settled in a complete European structure that can hold it. France, Belgium, and Luxembourg plainly do not constitute the totality of Europe, and the new Europe of Prague, Budapest, Bratislava, Tallin, Sofia, and Bucharest cannot function sensibly—or democratically—without its central and western portions. The danger exists that this new system, which appears to have lurched into existence through secondary causes, will face an enduring test of grand strategic effectiveness—that is, to provide a durable and lasting peace that has been the criterion for the system crafted in the years after 1945.

This question of the grand strategic efficacy of the "coalition of the willing" within the Euro-Atlantic sphere is the final issue, when one gets past the collective lunacy represented by boycotting German meat products, McDonald's, Coca-Cola. One need only recall that the collapse of the European system in the 1890s began with tariff fights over food and the like, disputes later instrumentalized by demagogues and zealots who railed against the limitations and musty diplomacy of the old world. The results were appalling—two world wars, a riven Europe, and all the opportunities that these circumstances cost. This insight is one to bear in mind, even in the blast of war and the rapture of victory.

NOTES

1. Jan Rose, "Die Falken der Freiheit: Wo sind Amerikas Freunde in Deutschland geblieben?" in *Die Zeit,* no. 20, 2003, pp. 14–15; "Du mußt das hochziehen," in *Der Spiegel*, no. 13, 24 March 2003, pp. 52–60.

2. This analysis is particularly indebted to Dan Diner, *Verkehrte Welten: Antiamerikanismus in Deutschland* (Frankfurt am Main: Eichhorn, 1993). This investigation also follows Jeffrey Herf, *War by Other Means: Soviet Power, West German Resistance, and the Battle of the Euromissiles* (New York and Toronto: Free Press, 1991), which remains an excellent treatment of ideas, German domestic politics, and international security with relevance beyond the period of the 1970s and early 1980s.

3. For the origins and character of negative images of Europe in U.S. diplomacy, a useful point of departure is John Lamberton Harper, *American Visions of Europe: Franklin D. Roosevelt, George Kennan and Dean Acheson* (Cambridge, Mass.: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1994); for German-American diplomacy in the era before 1989, see Manfred Jonas, *The United States and Germany: A Diplomatic History* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell Univ. Press, 1984).

4. For German foreign policy until unification in 1989–90, see Wolfram Hanrieder, *Germany, America, Europe: Forty Years of German Foreign Policy* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale Univ. Press, 1989); Klaus Hildebrand, *German Foreign Policy from Bismarck to Adenauer: The Limits of Statecraft,* trans. Louise Willmot (London: Routledge, 1989), esp. pp. 199ff. For foreign policy since unification, see Helga Haftendorn, *Deutsche Außenpolitik zwischen Selbstbeschränkung und Selbstbehauptung* (Stuttgart and Munich: Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 2001).

5. An introduction to German security policy is John S. Duffield, *World Power Forsaken: Political Culture, International Institutions, and German Security Policy after Unification* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford Univ. Press, 1998). Also of note are a study from the early 1990s, Hans Adolf-Jacobsen et al., eds., *Bundeswehr und europäische Sicherheitsordnung* (Bonn: Bouvier, 1991), and a later work, Franz H. U. Borkenhagen, *Außenpolitische Interessen Deutschlands: Rolle und Aufgabe der Bundeswehr* (Bonn: Bouvier, 1997). The official statement of security and defense policy of the Kohl cabinet is Bundesministerium der Verteidigung (BMVg), ed., *Weißbuch 1994: zur Sicherheit der Bundesrepublik Deutschland und zu Lage und Zukunft der Bundeswehr* (Bonn: BMVg, 1994); a similar document for the Schröder cabinet is BMVg, ed., *Bundeswehr 2002: Sachstand und Perspektiven* (Bonn: BMVg, 2002).

6. Robert Kagan, *Of Paradise and Power: America and Europe in the New World Order* (New York: Knopf, 2002); for a useful criticism of Kagan, see Ronald Asmus et al., "The New Transatlantic Project," in *Policy Review* 115 (October/November 2002), pp. 5–17; Tony Judt, "America and the World," in *New York Review of Books,* 1 June 2003, pp. 28–31.

7. For U.S.-German relations from the nineteenth century until 1941, see Reiner Pommerin et al., eds., *Quellen zu den deutsch-amerikanischen Beziehungen, 1776–1917* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgemeinschaft, 1996); Reinhard Doerries, *Imperial Challenge: Ambassador Count Bernstorff and German-American Relations, 1908–1917* (Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1989); Herbert Sirios, *Zwischen Illusion und Krieg: Deutschland und die USA 1933–1941* (Paderborn, Munich, Vienna: Schoenigh, 2000).

8. See Paul Kennedy, *The Rise of the Anglo-German Antagonism, 1860–1914* (London: Unwin Hyman, 1980); Klaus Hildebrand, *Das Vergangene Reich: deutsche Außenpolitik von Bismarck bis Hitler* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 1995), pp. 149ff.

9. Among a wide literature on this matter, see Helga Haftendorn, *Deutsche Außenpolitik;* Frank Trommler et al., eds., *Deutsch-amerikanische Begegnungen: Konflikt und Kooperation im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart and Munich: Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 2001); Klaus Larres et al., eds., *Deutschland und die USA im 20. Jahrhundert* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgemeinschaft, 1997); Heinz Bude et al., *Westbindungen: Amerika in der Bundesrepublik* (Hamburg: Hamburger Editionen, 1999); Dieter Mahncke, ed., *Amerikaner in Deutschland: Grundlagen und Bedingungen der*

transatlantischen Sicherheit (Bonn: Bouvier, 1991).

10. U.S. Diplomatic Mission to Germany, "Europe Whole and Free: Remarks to the Citizens of Mainz" (speech by President George H. W. Bush, 31 May 1989), available at www.usembassy.de/usa/etexts/ga6-89035.htm [accessed 8 May 2003]; Phillip Zelikow et al., *Germany Unified and Europe Transformed* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1995), pp. 30–32.
11. Lewis J. Edinger, *Kurt Schumacher: A Study in Personality and Political Behavior* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford Univ. Press, 1965), pp. 144–89.
12. Hans-Peter Schwarz, *Adenauer*: *Der Staatsmann: 1952–1967* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 1991), pp. 629ff.
13. Hubert Zimmermann, *Money and Security: Troops, Monetary Policy and West Germany's Relations with the U.S. and Britain, 1950–1971* (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2002), pp. 171–208; Volker Hentschel, *Ludwig Erhard: ein Politikerleben* (Munich and Landsberg: Olzog, 1996), pp. 435ff.
14. See Henry Kissinger, *The White House Years* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1979), pp. 405–12; A. James McAdams, "The New Diplomacy of West German 'Ostpolitik,'" in *The Diplomats, 1939–1979,* ed. Gordon Craig et al. (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton Univ. Press, 1994), pp. 537–63.
15. Helmut Schmidt, *Menschen und Mächte* (Berlin: Siedler, 1987), pp. 222–29; Hubertus Hoffmann, *Die Atompartner: Washington-Bonn und die Modernisierung der taktischen Kernwaffen* (Koblenz: Bernard Graefe, 1986).
16. Jeffrey Herf, "Die Appeaser: Schröder und Fischer haben nichts gelernt," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung,* 11 February 2003, p. 33.
17. The assertion of a rigid left-inclined viewpoint among certain of Germany's political elite does not suggest that all Germans or even all German socialists and Greens are so oriented; the point is simply that key figures in the present generation have derived very specific doctrines from their political experience since the early 1960s until 1989 and these ideas find their application in the post–11 September realm. For more on the related theme of SPD views of the United States, see Dietrich Orlow, "Ambivalence and Attraction: German Social Democrats and the United States, 1945–1974," in *The American Impact on Postwar Germany,* ed. Reiner Pommerin (Providence, R.I.: Berghahn Books, 1995), pp. 35–52.
18. Herf, *War*.
19. On the origins and character of the Harmel report on the long-range tasks of NATO of December 1967, see Helga Haftendorn, *NATO and the Nuclear Revolution: The Crisis of Credibility, 1966–1967* (Oxford, U.K.: Clarendon Press, 1996), pp. 320–85.
20. "Wirbel um Merkels Schröder Schelte" in *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung,* 21 February 2003, p. 1.
21. For a résumé of this school of thought in the present, see Richard Lambert, "Misunderstanding Each Other," *Foreign Affairs* 82, no. 2 (March/April 2003), pp. 62–74.
22. The phrase "Europhobe" is from Harper, *American Visions*, pp. 60ff. Although used here to refer to contemporary political thought, the antecedents of such an idea can be said to have existed since the eighteenth century. See Felix Gilbert, *To the Farewell Address: Ideas of Early American Foreign Policy* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton Univ. Press, 1961).
23. Haftendorn, *Deutsche Aussenpolitik,* pp. 173–307; Hoffmann, *Die Atompartner*, pp. 323ff.; Johannes Steinhoff, *Wohin treibt die NATO? Probleme der Verteidigung Westeuropas* (Hamburg: Hoffmann & Campe, 1976), pp. 9–122.
24. In the December 1812 Convention of Tauroggen (modern Taurage, Lithuania) the Prussian general Yorck von Wartenburg, commanding a corps of Napoleon's Grande Armée then retreating from Russia, on his own initiative declared his troops neutral and thus permitted the Russians to continue their pursuit of the French. The April 1922 Treaty of Rapallo (in Italy) established normal relations between Germany and the Soviet Union and abandoned all mutual financial claims. See Beate Braitling, ed., *Ploetz Lexikon der deutschen Geschichte* (Freiburg: Ploetz, 1999), pp. 398, 482.
25. Kagan's tendentious generalizations about peaceful Europeans might, perhaps, apply to some Germans, but these assertions surely fail

to comprise the reality of attitudes about force and statecraft in Europe in its totality. Further, his oversimplification of the statecraft of defense burden sharing reveals significant flaws in his analysis. Nonetheless, his thesis fits the mood among certain foreign policy elites in much the same way that the generalizations of Francis Fukuyama and Samuel Huntington did in the 1990s. In this connection, one is nostalgic for the reasoned writings on diplomacy of Walter Lippman, Dean Acheson, George Kennan, and Henry Kissinger.

26. "Wo sind Amerikas Freunde in Deutschland geblieben?" *Die Zeit*.

27. For up-to-date figures on German unemployment, see, e.g., "Germany's Unemployment Rate Hits 5-Year High," DW-World.de, 5 March 2003, available at www.dw-world.de/english/0,3367,1430_A_772191,00.html [accessed 10 May 2003].

28. "War in Iraq May Help Germany Ease Its Financial Woes," DW-World.de, 12 February 2003, available at www.dw-world.de/english/0,3367,1431_A_777497,00.html [accessed 10 May 2003].

29. "German Labor Market Recovery Hampered by War," DW-World.de, 3 April 2004, available at www.dw-world.de/english/0,3367,1431_A_824202_1_A,00.html [accessed 10 May 2003].

30. See "Däubler-Gmelin weist Vorwürfe zu Bush-Hitler-Vergleich zurück," ZDF Heute, 20 September 2002, available at www.heute.t-online.de/ZDFheute/artikel/3/0,1367,POL-0-2015619,00.html [accessed 10 May 2003]. Däubler-Gmelin was quoted in the Schwäbisches Tagblatt as saying of the U.S. war plans, "Bush wants to distract [attention] from his domestic-political difficulties. It is a popular method. Hitler did it, too." The justice minister claimed first that the newspaper misquoted her, but the editor in chief claimed personally to have received Däubler-Gmelin's authorization to use the quote. Later, Däubler-Gmelin insisted that she meant only to compare the approach to political leadership, not the men.

31. For examples, see (on the 1914 war credits vote) Roger Chickering, *Imperial Germany and the Great War, 1914–1918* (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1998), pp. 7–9; (on the SPD and the army, 1919–30) Harold Gordon, *The Reichswehr and the German Republic, 1919–1926* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton Univ. Press, 1957); (on the armament of FRG and the role of nuclear weapons 1950–60) Catherine Kelleher, *Germany and the Politics of Nuclear Weapons* (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1975); (on the "out of area" issue in the Gulf War, 1990–95) Duffield, *World Power*, pp. 200–21.

32. This rhetorical contrast of "old" and "new" Europe—perhaps unwittingly—echoed Woodrow Wilson as well as alluding to the nationalism of Central and Eastern Europe against the 1815 settlement of Napoleon's wars on the continent, especially as realized by the northern courts of Petersburg, Vienna, and Berlin. Such references were all the more ironic, as the phrase today serves to underscore differences and divisions in Europe and, apparently, to negate long-standing goals of U.S. foreign and security policy.

33. "United We Stand," *Wall Street Journal*, 30 January 2003, available at www.opinionjournal.com/extra/?id=110002994 [accessed 8 May 2003].

34. "Statement by NATO Secretary General Lord Roberston," 6 February 2003, available at www.nato.int/docu/speech/2003/s030206a.htm.

35. Klaus Hildebrand, *Deutsche Außenpolitik, 1871–1918* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 1989), pp. 5–21; George F. Kennan, *The Decline of Bismarck's European Order, Franco-Russian Relations, 1875–1890* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton Univ. Press, 1979); Andreas Hillgruber, *Bismarcks Außenpolitik* (Freiburg: Rombach, 1993), pp. 115ff.

36. The relevant clauses of the Basic Law are cited in Ortwin Buchbender et al., eds., *Wörterbuch zur Sicherheitspolitik mit Stichworten zur Bundeswehr* (Hamburg, Berlin, and Bonn: E. S. Mittler, 2000), pp. 33, 375–77. The drafters of the Basic Law of 1949 made no provisions for national security, which were added in the course of the 1950s amid the armament of the FRG. See Donald Abenheim, *Reforging the Iron Cross: The Search for Tradition in the West German Armed Forces* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton Univ. Press, 1988), pp. 121ff.

37. On the "out of area" problematic of the late 1970s, see Douglas Stuart et al., *The Limits of*

Alliance: NATO Out of Area Problems since 1949 (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 1990); and Elizabeth Sherwood-Randall, *Allies in Crisis: Meeting Global Challenges to Western Security* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale Univ. Press, 1990).

38. Michael J. Inacker, *Unter Ausschluß der Öffentlichkeit? die Deutschen in der Golfallianz* (Bonn: Bouvier, 1991).

39. Duffield, *World Power*, pp. 207–12; Sabine Berghahn, "Out of Area Urteil des Bundesverfassungsgerichts," in *Lexikon der Internationalen Politik,* ed. Ulrich Albrecht et al. (Munich: Oldenbourg: 1997), pp. 410–13.

40. Duffield, *World Power*, pp. 173ff.; Peter Goebel, ed., *Von Kambodscha bis Kosovo: Auslandseinsaetze der Bundeswehr* (Frankfurt am Main and Bonn: Report, 2000).

41. See BMVg., ed., *Bundeswehr 2002*—on operations outside of Germany and Europe in support of international collective security and collective defense organizations, see pp. 6–12; on personnel issues of conscription and term of service, see pp. 28–30, 53–55.

42. See Donald Abenheim, "German Statecraft and Arms at the End of the Twentieth Century," in *Force, Statecraft and German Unity: The Struggle to Adapt Institutions and Practices,* ed. Thomas Durell-Young (Carlisle, Penna.: Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, 1996), pp. ix–xiii.

43. Holger Herwig, *The Politics of Frustration: The United States in German Naval Planning, 1889–1941* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1976), pp. 13ff. See also Edmund Morris, "'A Matter of Extreme Urgency': Theodore Roosevelt, Wilhelm II, and the Venezuela Crisis of 1902," *Naval War College Review* 55, no. 2 (Spring 2002), pp. 73–86.

44. Justus Doenecke, *Storm on the Horizon: The Challenge to American Intervention* (Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield, 2000), pp. 119–38.

45. Edward N. Peterson, *The American Occupation of Germany: Retreat to Victory* (Detroit: Wayne State Univ. Press, 1978), pp. 138ff.

46. Charles Burdick, "Vom Schwert zur Feder: Deutsche Kriegsgefangene im Dienst der Vorbereitung der amerikanischen Kriegsgeschichtsschreibung über den II. Weltkrieg. Die Organisatorische Entwicklung der Operational History Section," in *Militgeschlichtliche Mitteilungen* 2 (1971), pp. 69–80; Thomas Allan Schwarz, *America's Germany: John J. McCloy and the FRG* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1991), pp. 210–34.

47. Harper, *American Visions of Europe*, pp. 278ff.; Thomas Risse-Kappen, *Cooperation among Democracies: The European Influence on U.S. Foreign Policy* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton Univ. Press, 1995), pp. 3–14.

48. See Manfred Dormann, *Demokratische Militärpolitik: Die Allierte Militärstrategie als Thema deutscher Politik, 1949–1968* (Freiburg: Rombach, 1970); Duffield, *World Power Forsaken*.

49. Certain observers imagine that the American view reflects a radical, new strategy, while, in fact, it has antecedents that reach back to the early twentieth century. For the issues of the formation of strategy and the role of allies in the era of total and Cold War, see Mark Watson, *The Chief of Staff: Prewar Plans and Preparations* (Washington, D.C.: Historical Division, Dept. of the Army, 1950), pp. 85ff; Mark A. Stoller, *Allies and Adversaries: The Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Grand Alliance and U.S. Strategy in World War II* (Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 2000); Henry G. Gole, *The Road to Rainbow: Army Planning for Global War, 1934–1940* (Annapolis, Md.: Naval Institute Press, 2003); D. Clayton James and Anne Sharp Wells, *Refighting the Last War: Command and Crisis in Korea, 1950–1953* (New York: Free Press, 1993), pp. 196–214. Also see: Donald Abenheim, "Birth Pangs of the New NATO" in *Orbis* Vol. 46, no. 1 (Winter 2002), pp. 173–86.

50. Kennan, *The Decline of Bismarck's European Order,* pp. 398ff; Andreas Hillgruber, *Bismarcks Aussenpolitik* (Rombach: Freiburg, 1993) pp. 154ff.