



A FRONT ROW MULTILATERALIST

On German parliamentary justifications for a more
assertive defence policy

*Master thesis International Relations - European
Union Studies*

By Jonathan Provoost - s1446185

Supervisor: Dr. M.E.L. David

3 July 2020

Word count: 16136

List of parliamentarians

Nils Annen (SPD)
Franziska Brandtner (The Greens)
Daniela De Ridder (SPD)
Marcus Faber (CDU)
Fritz Felgentreu (SPD)
Thorsten Frei (CDU)
Ingo Gädechens (CDU)
Wolfgang Gehrcke (The Left)
Florian Hahn (CSU)
Heike Hänsel (The Left)
Jürgen Hardt (CDU)
Mark Hauptmann (CDU)
Martin Hebner (AfD)
Wolfgang Hellmich (SPD)
Thomas Hitschler (SPD)
Alois Karl (CSU)
Roderick Kiesewetter (CDU)
Günther Krichbaum (CDU)
Alexander Graf Lambsdorff (FDP)
Karl Lamers (CDU)
Stefan Liebich (The Left)
Wilfried Lorenz (CDU)
Rüdiger Lucassen (AfD)
Elisabeth Motschmann (CDU)
Alexander Neu (The Left)
Thomas Opperman (SPD)
Henning Otte (CDU)

Tobias Pflüger (The Left)

Eckhard Pols (CDU)

Achim Post (SPD)

Norbert Röttgen (CDU)

Karin Stenz (CDU)

List of abbreviations

AfD Alternative for Germany
CDU Christian Democratic Union
CSU Christian Social Union
CSDP Common Security and Defence Policy
EDF European Defence Fund
EEAS European Union External Action Service
eFP Enhanced Forward Presence
ESDP European Security and Defence Policy
EU European Union
EUGS European Union Global Strategy
FDP Free Democratic Party
GDR German Democratic Republic
FRG Federal Republic of Germany
NATO North Atlantic Treaty Organization
PESCO Permanent Structured Cooperation on
Defence
QCA Qualitative Content Analysis
SDP Social Democratic Party
US United States (of America)
UK United Kingdom

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	1
Chapter 1 – Introduction	1
Chapter 2 – Literature review	4
2.1 – The development of German external policy	4
2.2 – The turnaround in German external policy	5
2.3 – Internal and external factors	6
Chapter 3 – Methodology and research design	9
3.1 – Methodology	9
3.2 – Research design	11
Chapter 4 – Permanent Structured Cooperation on Defence	14
4.1 – Context	14
4.2 – Compilation	15
4.2.1 Responsibility	16
4.2.2 Strengthening of the EU	17
4.2.3 Defence	20
4.2.4 Economics	22
4.2.5 Enhancing NATO	22
4.3 Conclusion	23
Chapter 5 – Enhanced Forward Presence	25
5.1 – Context	25
5.2 – Compilation	26
5.2.1 Deterrence and defence	26
5.2.2 Responsibility, allyship and multilateralism	28
5.3 - Conclusion	31
Chapter 6 – Conclusion	32
Bibliography	36
Appendix I: List of Sources	39

Chapter 1 – Introduction

‘Germany’s economic and political weight means that it is our duty to take on responsibility for Europe’s security in association with our European and transatlantic partners in order to defend human rights, freedom, democracy, the rule of law and international law. We must stand up even more for our shared values and demonstrate even greater commitment to security, peace and a rules-based order than we have done to date.’¹

- Dr Angela Merkel, Federal Chancellor of Germany

On the morning of June 5th, 2020, The Wall Street Journal brought the news that US President Donald Trump planned on withdrawing 9500 soldiers from Germany (The Wall Street Journal, 2020). Currently, the troops are permanently assigned, and their removal would cause ‘a further blow to America’s weakening European alliances and likely to be welcomed by President Vladimir V. Putin of Russia’, as the New York Times added. The statement heading this introduction was given by Angela Merkel, Federal Chancellor of Germany since 2005. Written down four years earlier, there is a clear connection with the news of June 5th. The US is developing a different approach towards the security of Europe, so a new balance has to be found. However, that Germany would be the one to declare they wanted to take up the gauntlet, was not necessarily in line with expectations. This study will elaborate on that conundrum.

For decades, Germany has been reluctant in conducting a pro-active defence policy. The guilt felt by the Germans regarding their aggressive history in the 20th century has proven to be an obstacle for engaging in warfare politics again. Additionally, the confidence in US protection of the European continent had made Germany rather reluctant. Berlin clinged to co-operation and multilateralism. Later on, in the 90s and 00s, the country either refused to engage in military operations abroad, or took part grudgingly. The interesting part of post-unification Germany is that it gradually became the centre stage for European affairs. Being the other half of the Franco-German axis, Berlin became one of the most important actors in Brussels. The Eurozone crisis provided the zenith of this process around 2010. However, a vision on security and defence policy lagged far behind. The Bundeswehr did not join their European partners in the intervention of the Libyan civil war in 2011. The latter were not amused.

¹ German Federal Ministry of Defence, *White Paper 2016 on Security Policy and the Future of the Bundeswehr* (2016) 6.

Currently, Germany holds a prominent role both in the EU's Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) and within NATO. At the turn of 2013 into 2014, German ministers voiced their ambitions for Germany to take on more responsibility on the international stage. On October 3rd, 2013, President Joachim Gauck proclaimed that '[Germany] is not an island', and in the following years, Germany saw this through by beginning to take initiatives. There are two cases that display Germany's leading role in the area of security and defence: the Permanent Structured Cooperation (PESCO), and the Enhanced Forward Presence (eFP) of NATO. PESCO is a cooperation project between willing EU member states, aimed at the common development of defence capabilities. It consists of 47 separate projects in various categories, such as maritime, cyber, and land formation systems. Germany is leading seven projects, making it the most active country after France and Italy, with regard to the CSDP's latest cooperation effort. The eFP stands for military presence in the Baltic countries of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Poland. Throughout these EU member states, there are four multinational battalions deployed in reaction to Russian military movement along the Baltic borders. Germany proved itself willing to take the lead of the Lithuanian Battalion, and therefore bears a significant role in deterring Moscow.

The conundrum that arises with these cases of Germany showing leadership is regarding its origin. Therefore, this thesis endeavours to find explanations for the shift that Germany made concerning external policies: moving from a reluctant position towards an assertive one. The question of why this policy shift happened is a very broad question, and there is no unilateral answer to it. This necessitates the debate to look at different aspects of the situation, and use various levels of analyses. There are external factors that can be regarded as pushing Germany towards this increased assertive and leading role: Brexit leaves a gap to be filled in European defence, the US is making a retreating movement from NATO and European security, and Russian aggression serves as catalyst for unrest among German neighbours. However, insisting on mere external factors as an explanation for the change of Germany's external policy is to not to fully understand its nature. Showing that external factors played a major part in this can be valid, but it is not a complete depiction when it leaves aside whether and how the main actor – Germany itself - perceives those very factors itself. Besides, the debate should focus on possible internal factors as well.

This thesis contributes to this debate by analysing how specifically the German parliament perceives external factors itself, and which internal factors can be identified that offer explanation. By interpreting the arguments and motivations that German politicians use to justify German leadership in PESCO and eFP, we gain a better understanding of how and why Germany has shifted its course.

The research is built on two research questions: (i) *how is German leading engagement in PESCO and the eFP being represented and discussed in plenary debate by German parliamentarians*, and (ii) *how do these perceptions by German parliamentarians explain Germany's current position regarding foreign and defence policies?*

Whereas question (ii) aims to identify the overarching question of the origin of Germany's shift, question (i) specifically focuses on the appreciation of two cases that can represent Germany's shift. Research question (i) is therefore complementary to (ii), as its answer offers an explanation to the second.

In short, I will endeavour to answer the question of how Germany's leadership in defence projects like PESCO and eFP are justified by parliamentarians, given their precarious national military history, and how this explains Germany's current assertive external policy. This thesis will argue that parliamentarians indeed refer to the urgency of becoming able to defend both the continent and Germany in order to justify German assertiveness, which, to a large extent, refers to ideological or moral arguments as well. This will be shown by an analysis of parliamentary debates, in which the politicians offer their views to their colleagues and the public. A further outline will be given below in the research design chapter.

The next chapter covers the literature review, which elaborates on the scholarly research already conducted into the normalisation of German defence, NATO, and the Common Security and Defence Policy of the European Union. Thereafter, chapter 3 provides for a justification of the PESCO and eFP cases, the sources, and the methodology chosen. It displays the research design as well. Chapters 4 and 5 provide for the empirical core of the thesis, and deal with the PESCO and eFP cases separately. In chapter 6, all findings of the analysis will be discussed in the conclusion, followed by the bibliography and Appendix 1 of the sources used.

Chapter 2 – Literature review

In order to answer the research questions, this chapter deals with the literature that provides for a theoretical foundation of the subject. The chapter proceeds as follows: Firstly, the development of Germany's external policy is discussed, in order to display its insights and conundrums. Secondly, the review looks at how scholars relate the internal and external factors that shape the foreign policy. Finally, the levels of FPA are identified. This is necessary to find out which role the German parliament plays in foreign policy. This chapter deals with all of the three debates above to explain the position of this thesis as situated within the scholarly debate, and why it is therefore important to view German foreign policy from an internal perspective.

2.1 – The development of German external policy

The first category of debate that is important to take into consideration is the development of Germany's external and defence policy after the Second World War. As the research questions aim at interpreting the current position in these policies, it is important to discuss how Germany arrived at this point.

After the Second World War, Germany adopted a cautious attitude towards conducting external policies. The Nazi-history and the divide of the country between East and West-Germany led to a lack of mainly external legitimacy (Bulmer & Paterson, 2013). After reunification, the country had to 'regain international trust and respectability' (Longhurst & Miskimmon, 2007). After 1989, a 'never alone' policy became customary in the unified Germany, contrary to the former policy of *Alleingang* (Haftenhorn, 2006). This German plural, which translates as 'solo effort' or 'going it alone', refers to a policy of unilateralism. Cooperation with partners and allies (i.e. multilateralism) became of utmost importance for Germany, since that particular virtue had especially pleased the European states that had agreed to the unification of the GDR and the FRG at that time. For this reason, Germany became one of the proponents that were advocating a common European security and defence policy in the early and mid-1990s (Wagner, 2005). From a German perspective, cooperation on security and defence should stimulate the development of multilateral structures within the EU. The strive for multilateralism is a main similarity in the literature concerning German foreign policy. Longhurst and Miskimmon argue that the reunification gave room to engage more actively in foreign, security, and defence policy, although they simultaneously emphasize that opportunities to do so were only used to a certain extent (Longhurst & Miskimmon, 2007). In other words: Germany did not live up to the

commitments of the ESDP. Wagner agrees on this point, and states that their investments in defence budgets and other defence-related spending did not correspond with their eagerly voiced ambitions regarding defence cooperation (Wagner, 2005). Around the turn of the century, Germany did engage in a few missions abroad ('out-of-area'), yet they became more and more reluctant after the terrorist attacks of 9/11, which increased the pressure to engage even further (Longhurst & Miskimmon, 2007). In accordance with domestic public disapproval for the missions above, Berlin cherished its desire for multilateralism, and was unwilling to fight America's war (Longhurst & Miskimmon, 2007). Kundnani supports this view by stating that the war in Afghanistan made Germany outright sceptical about military action (Kundnani, 2012); After all, both German and Afghan people died. Also, Kundnani draws a line between this expression of disapproval and the later abstention from intervening in Libya in 2011. Bulmer and Paterson conclude that 'the unwillingness of Germany to intervene in Libya display the unwillingness to display a leadership more widely' in foreign, security, and defence matters. This is in contrast to economic issues, in which Germany does want to play a leading role (Bulmer & Paterson, 2013, 1400). The United Kingdom, and France for that matter, had actually shown leadership (Kundnani, 2012). The common understanding in the literature is that Germany aims for multilateralism in every respect of external policy, which is a persuasive theory. It logically derives from the fact that Germany had to relent in order to find new allies, and regain their trust. Another valid point, but less pronounced, is Germany's abstention from military intervention. In the last twenty to thirty years, Germany has actually engaged in external operations, although perhaps with some hesitation. More importantly for this thesis, however, is the degree of assertiveness in these operations. There is no doubt about the lack of German leadership in these external affairs, which has occasionally been called a 'leadership avoidance reflex' (Paterson, 1993). This brings us to the next debate about the policy turnaround: did Germany change its course?

2.2 – The turnaround in German external policy

Federal President Gauck repeated his 'our country is not an island' statement at the Munich Security Conference on 31 January 2014. The tide began to turn. Howorth argues that the European defence moved into high gear after the EU Global Strategy (EUGS) of 2016. The EUGS brought forward a new common sense of strategic direction regarding security and defence policies. In the wake of this, common funding and development projects started to ensue, such as the European Defence Fund (EDF) and the Permanent Structured Cooperation on Defence (PESCO) (Howorth, 2017). Blockmans argues that the EU has made greater strides in strengthening defence integration in recent years than in the 50 years preceding them (Blockmans, 2018, 1787). Tocci puts forward the revival of the

cooperation between France and Germany as one of the key drivers of this acceleration. Berlin took the first initiative by writing the German Defence White paper, which laid down the fundamentals of a new security and defence policy (Tocci, 2018). A large proportion of the new policy was to be European cooperation. Moreover, the German government expressed its univocal wish to take on a more prominent role in international affairs (German Federal Ministry of Defence, 2016). France followed Berlin in writing down its policy route, and in July 2017, both countries presented a bilateral agenda for a defence cooperation. With this agenda, they strongly endorsed a common security and defence policy by stressing, amongst other things, the importance of PESCO, EU-NATO cooperation, joined military planning, and the EDF (Kempin & Kunz, 2017). The EUGS was published shortly afterwards, and relied heavily on the German and French proposals. What is important about this, is the fact that Germany initiated the process previously described. Another example is Germany's role in the Ukraine crisis: After Russia had annexed Crimea, Berlin took on a role as diplomatic leader (Hyde-Price, 2015).

Hellmann also observes a profound shift in German leadership ambitions between 2014 and 2017, even bigger than the shift after the reunification towards an ESDP (Hellmann, 2017). Nevertheless, it is important to critically comment these alleged developments. Krotz and Schild state, for instance, that Germany will have to display an increase in defence spending and partaking in military interventions, hence the wish to share costs and risks of common policy (Krotz & Schild, 2018). However, the identifiable change in attitude still needs to be converted into actual deeds. Hyde-Price also comes to that conclusion: Although 'Germany has come a long way since the end of the Cold War', which has resulted in the reawakening of this 'sleepwalking giant', he mentions that Germany still has to do a lot more in order to make a significant contribution to global peace and security (Hyde-Price, 2015, 613). Academic agreement on the fact that Germany obviously showed the leadership in security and defence issues it had abstained from in earlier decades, leads to the conclusion that the country has changed its attitude towards external policy. The remaining question then is: why?

2.3 – Internal and external factors

The last category of debate this chapter deals with, is the question of why Germany repositioned itself in international affairs. The two previous sections discussed the development of Germany's post-war external policy of reluctance, and the turnaround to leading participation among partners. The next chapters of this thesis contain analyses of cases that display how German politicians

perceive, discuss, and justify Germany's leading role. In order to be able to proceed properly, the final discussion of professional literature should concern the scholarly debate on explanations for the policy turnaround.

The academic literature discussed in the previous paragraphs,, describes both the history of, and development towards, the current situation of Germany's security and defence policy. The literature that searches for explanations of Germany's recently adopted leadership is few in number. However, Kempin and Kunz refer to external crises, when explaining the renewed interest in the French-German cooperation within the CSDP (Kempin & Kunz, 2017). They observe three main incentives: security challenges, such as Russian aggression and an unstable Middle-East with corresponding migration, the fact that the UK intends to leave the EU (Brexit,) and, finally, the presidency of Donald Trump, who serves an inward looking agenda. Hellman conducts the same analysis, and states that all these mentioned externalities 'added to a sense of urgency for fundamental adjustments of German foreign policy'. He explains that the Crimea crisis broke what was left of the Russian-German relationship. *Brexit* displayed a situation where the integration of the EU was actually reversible, and that safety guarantees from the USA were no longer reliable, nor even vital (Hellmann, 2017). Hellmann then concludes that this made everyone look to Germany to take the lead due to its economic predominance during and after the Eurozone crisis.

As the section above makes clear, some of the literature focuses on external factors when explaining Germany's development towards a more assertive attitude in defence policy. Yet, another level of analysis should serve to widen the perspective: internal factors. Internal and external factors, or motivators, do not necessarily have to be conflicting, but, instead, can be supplementary. The internal factor explanations that are present in literature are the following: Hyde-Price argues that the ambitions and characters of German governmental figures led to a high profile intervention of the external policy direction (Hyde-Price, 2015). Referring to speeches of Ursula von der Leyen (Minister of Defence at that time), Walter Steinmeier (in his role of Minister of Foreign Affairs) and Joachim Gauck (the president, as mentioned above), Hyde-Price states that they turned away from the reluctance of Guido Westerwelle (Steinmeier's predecessor as Minister of Foreign Affairs). Paterson's points at the role of individuals as well, although his focus is not directly aimed at security and defence policy, but rather at the broader picture of Germany as 'reluctant hegemon' in Europe (Paterson, 2011). He points at the growing role of Germany in the European Union. Berlin gradually developed into a central actor in Brussels' politics, which culminated during the Eurozone crisis. This zenith was accompanied by a shift in Merkel's European approach, according to Paterson. In her first terms as Chancellor, Merkel did not display a clear vision for, nor empathy towards, the Union. Paterson argues that this changed slowly, as she became more and more engaged in European

politics (Paterson, 2011). So following his argument, when Merkel started to increase German participation with Europe, her scope could be widened to issues like security and defence.

Kunz sees the influence of individual figures as well, but stresses a notion on a different level of analysis. She notes that 'responsibility,' rather than 'interest' or 'strategic objectives', is the main argument present in the justification for increased leadership in defence policy (Kunz, 2015), leaving the individual figures and their characters for what they are, and instead focusing attention on motivational inducers. Hellmann follows at that level. He mentions the possibility of domestic factors playing a role in Germany embarking on more assertive security and defence politics. However, he states that it is not likely that domestic ideologies are the cause of policy change, since the standing parties that have shaped the policy in the last decades are still very much in power. With this, he is referring to the coalitions of Christian Democratic Union (CDU) / Christian Social Union (CSU), and Social Democratic Party (SPD) coalitions, often backed by either The Greens or the Liberals (FDP). However, in stating it thusly, Hellmann disqualifies the possibility of ideologically driven policy change, a view I would like to take issue with. As this thesis will argue, Kunz clearly has a case when she refers to ideological driven justifications for leadership, such as 'responsibility'.

Hellmann and others are persuasive when they explain Germany's policy shift by the external factors as suggested above (Trump, Brexit, Russia), but the research into domestic – or internal – justifications can, and perhaps even should, be expanded. Hence, as already explained in the introduction, it is important to further examine whether, and, if so, how, Germany perceives the external factors itself, and to what extent they bring internal factors to the front. Various levels of analysis can offer a perspective on those internal factors. Quotes of Merkel and Gauck, or the Defence White Paper, might provide valuable insights. However, the German parliament is a rich source as well, as it is the prime decision-maker in Germany. The next chapter elaborates on the choice for the level of analysis, by justifying parliament as a relevant source, and subsequently explaining the methodology and research design of the thesis.

Chapter 3 – Methodology and research design

This chapter covers the methodology which is instrumental in answering the research questions, and the research design which displays the way this thesis is build up. These two elements are necessary to explain as they provide for a better insight in the course of the study. The first part discusses the methodology, the cases to be studied and the sources on which this thesis builds. The second part covering the research design explains how the methodology will be applied to the cases at hand.

3.1 – Methodology

In order to answer the research question of this thesis, it delivers a Qualitative Content Analysis (QCA) of German parliamentary debates regarding two cases: the Permanent Structured Cooperation on Defence (PESCO) and the Enhanced Forward Presence (eFP). A QCA aims to deliver understanding from the identification, conceptualization, and categorization of data-bits (Bengtsson, 2016). It is therefore a fit approach to answer the research questions under discussion, for,, in order to provide a sufficient answer, it is necessary to interpret the contributions to the debates in which parliamentarians either justify or disapprove of increased German engagement in military matters. A QCA provides the right toolbox to identify, conceptualize, and interpret the arguments put forward.

The research covers all plenary debates between 2014 and 2019 that touch upon the subjects of PESCO and eFP, in order to include any plenary comment that has been made on either and/or both issues in the analysis. The start of this time frame has deliberately been pinpointed after 2014, the year after which German engagement in all matters concerning security, foreign affairs, and defence accelerated, as identified in the literature review (chapter 2). The written minutes of these debates were accessed via the digital archive of the Bundestag, which is freely accessible. For PESCO, the data set consists of twenty-one debates, and for the eFP the data set counts sixteen debates. The debates cover a wide array of topics, varying from the 2% NATO rule, to the continuation of German army presence in Afghanistan. As explained above, the debates must contain useful data in order to be part of the data set. If, for instance, 'PESCO' is mentioned without any further association, value judgement, or context from which an appreciation can be derived, the data bit is naturally of no use for the analysis. There is no predetermined selection of parties that are covered, as it is necessary to look both at arguments in favour and against the cases in order to gain understanding about the course of policy making.

The choice to take on parliamentary sources as a fundament for this thesis stems from the fact that parliament is the most visible, and therefore the main stage, of political debate, on which political parties both can and/or have to explain and justify their actions and choices to the public (see Burroughs 2015; Jacoby 2000; Van Der Valk 2003). Besides, German parliamentarians enjoy parliamentary privilege, and the discourse is therefore not allowed to be censured, for social reasons (Burroughs 2015, p. 480). In other words, parliamentarians are legally 'encouraged' to speak their hearts and minds, rather than moderating their tone because of possibly detrimental consequences. In this way, the spoken contributions in debates are filtered as little as possible, which creates a highly representative insight into what the politicians really advocate and stand for. Parliamentary contributions in debates on PESCO and the eFP display how political parties actually reflect on these issues, as opposed to the administrative language in which policy papers are written. Policy papers are meant to cluster the wide array of interests and opinions, and hence reflect more of a synthesis of the political party thinking. Around the formulation of policy, either before or after, politicians try to express their view of particular subjects in the clearest language possible putting more emphasis on the wider thinking and ideas underlying political choices. Alternative sources to answer the research questions could be election programs, or individual statements by politicians through media outlets. However, the former are less extensive as to the number of debates regarding useful data, and the latter would be more time consuming than the time frame of carrying out this study allows for.

QCA is the appropriate choice in terms of method, as it focuses on the interpretation of what has been said, without losing sight of what has actually been said. Methods in the school of discourse analysis, for instance, instead aim to unravel a 'hidden meaning' behind the (spoken) text. However, since this study is searching for what German parliamentarians put forward as an argument, either in favour or against PESCO or eFP, it is important to keep looking at what is said publicly, rather than a possible underlying hidden meaning of a stream of words.

While studying (spoken) text, there is a risk of misinterpretation or personal bias. Furthermore, different researchers could arrive at different results, despite using of the same dataset. In order to ensure clarity of interpretation, direct reference is made to the original speech texts wherever possible, including translation from German to English.

3.2 – Research design

This section will outline the actually proceeding of the analysis. Regarding transparency, it is also beneficial to present an example of the analysis process, which is to be found further on in this subchapter. The QCA process is described by Bengtsson in four stages: decontextualization, recontextualization, categorisation, and compilation. The thesis will follow this format, as it provides for a clear and insightful process of analysis: the stages are distinctive, and the step-by-step approach is traceable.

The first stage is decontextualization, which starts with familiarisation with the data. In other words, initial readings. After that, the useful data is broken down into meaning units: the smallest unit – a paragraph or sentence – that contains relevant insight. The meaning unit is labelled with a code, providing later identification. After the initial readings, every meaning unit is labelled with a code including explanations of the codes, to minimize the risk of cognitive change (Bengtsson, 2016). Then comes the second stage, which calls for recontextualization. The data is re-read in order to account for any missing meaning units, and remove unnecessary data bits. In the third stage, all meaning units are categorised based on their code. Coded meaning units within one category can contain different substance, while sharing the reference to their category. Categories can thence consist of different codes, as long as the character of the code is communal. Therefore, codes cannot fall into different categories. Bengtsson describes it as follows: ‘Identified themes and categories should be internally homogenous and externally heterogeneous, so no data should fall between two groups nor fit into more than one group.’ (Bengtsson, 2016).

Finally, the compilation stage consists of analysing the identified categories. This compilation of categories displays the key themes through which either PESCO or the eFP have been represented and discussed. The categories are namely able to show the distinction between the arguments made, and, by doing so, distinguish between the justifications for a certain action. The distinctions give, therefore, a clear overview of the debate: what did the parliamentarians refer to, what was their line of argumentation, and in which context can they be seen? The compilation provides an answer to the research questions. Below, Table 1 displays the whole process from meaning unit to categorization.

Table 1			
Meaning unit	Condensed meaning unit	Code	Category
I think the step to participate in PESCO has been wise. [...] It is important that the European Union, which is economically a giant, politically a middleweight and, in terms of security, rather a dwarf, finally gains responsibility that corresponds to its economic performance.	Participating in PESCO is wise because the EU must gain responsibility.	EU's responsibility	Responsibility
If you believe experts, Russia can overrun the Baltic States in just 60 hours. Even if such an approach were highly irrational, one has to take these skills into account and take the feeling of threat in Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia or Poland seriously, particularly with a view to history. Mr Hofreiter has shown that very well. I would like to emphasize: Four permanent, rotating battalions in the east of the Alliance are urgently needed	Germany has to take the feeling of threat seriously. Therefore, the eFP battalion is urgently needed.	Defence against Russian threat	Deterrence and defence
We also support this with an enhanced forward presence, a so-called front presence, to make it clear: we are in the Baltic States, we are in Poland. Because we say: Alliance defence is also national defence.	Germany has to engage in eFP, not only to defend the Baltic states, but also to defend Germany itself. After all, alliance defence is national defence as well.	National defence	Deterrence and defence

From the first spoken text (meaning unit), it becomes clear that the speaker, Jürgen Hardt (CDU), argues that the EU should stretch its range of responsibility beyond economic, or even political, affairs. Therefore, he regards Germany's partaking in PESCO as a wise step. According to Hardt, the fact that Germany engages in PESCO is justified because the EU must gain responsibility. The second and third examples derive from contributions by Florian Hahn (CSU) and Otte. They plead for German eFP participation, in order to defend either the Baltic states or Germany itself. The justification, in this regard, therefore lies in defence.

It is important to recognise there is both a deductive part to this study, as well as an inductive part. The literature shows that scholarly research focuses on external factors that explain Germany's turnaround in foreign policy. On the basis of this predetermined theory, it is relevant to look at

internal factors as well. Hence, this is where the deductive aspect of the analysis is present. However, the thesis works a process of developing conclusions from collected data by compiling new information into a theory – as shown by the table above. It is therefore essential to analyse the parliamentary debates ‘with an open mind in order to identify meaningful subjects answering the research question’ (Bengtsson, 2016). Summarizing, the deductive nature is reflected in the overarching distinction between external and internal factors for Germany's policy shift, and the inductive nature in the internal appreciation of two cases related to this shift.

In conclusion, this chapter argues that a qualitative content analysis of parliamentary debates best serves to gain a deeper understanding of how German parliamentarians appreciate PESCO and the eFP. The analysis focuses on the interpretation of what has been said, without losing sight of what actually has been said. The following chapter discusses the analysis of the debates concerning PESCO, in accordance with the four stages as explained in this chapter.

Chapter 4 – Permanent Structured Cooperation on Defence

This chapter covers the analysis of the debates regarding Germany's engagement in the Permanent Structured Cooperation on Defence. To introduce the context of the analysis, this chapter first offers a brief summary of what PESCO consists of, why PESCO embodies the Europeanization of EU defence, and Germany's role in this. It is followed by the core of this chapter: the actual analysis of the arguments put forward. Finally, the conclusion will summarise the findings of the chapter.

4.1 – Context

On June 23rd, 2017, the European Council formally launched the Permanent Structured Cooperation (PESCO) on Defence. The legal footing of this cooperation had already been laid down in articles 42(6) and 46, and Protocol No 10 of the Lisbon Treaty, but waited for their implementation. Under PESCO terms, countries ought to meet military commitments that fulfil higher criteria than without it. This means that countries are encouraged to develop military capabilities together that are of a higher level than the capabilities probably would have been, if there had been no mutual agreement to do so. The decision to invoke the specific Lisbon provision and develop the PESCO instrument, derived from the European Union's search for strategic autonomy (Duke, 2019). This quest was the result of the EU awareness of the changing global order, and external threats like ISIS, the migration crisis, Russia' expanding its influence, and the Trump presidency that called for a joint and unanimous answer from the Union. A Franco-German initiative laid the ground for the EU Global Strategy (EUGS) in 2016. By writing that 'our wider region has become more unstable and more insecure' and that 'in challenging times, a strong Union is one that thinks strategically, shares a vision and acts together', Federica Mogherini – then High Representative – concisely wrote down the EUGS's core objective in the foreword of the report (EEAS, 2016). Subsequently, the Lisbon intent for defence cooperation could be embodied by PESCO. 25 member states joined the cooperation scheme, leaving the UK (then a member state), Denmark, and Malta out of the scheme.

PESCO now consists of 47 projects, in seven categories: training facilities; land formation systems; maritime; air systems; enabling joint multiple services; cyber; and space. Each project is led by one or more member states. The key difference between PESCO and other cooperation vehicles is the legally binding nature of its commitments.

Germany's role in PESCO has been evident from the start, as the combined force with France led to its actual creation (Biscop, 2017). In a White Paper on defence in 2016, the then Minister of Defence Ursula von der Leyen wrote down the ambitions for Germany's security policy and the future of the armed forces (Bundeswehr). The key message of the White Paper was that Germany should take on more responsibility for international security, and therefore strengthen its military role. Note that this ought to be done explicitly within the EU. History made sole German operation both unfeasible and undesirable. The document shows some clear connections and overlap with the EU Global Strategy that had been published shortly before the White Paper. Von der Leyen said that Germany and France would engage in promoting closer defence cooperation between the European Member States. A Franco-German non-paper on this subject followed shortly after, and at the end of 2016, the European Council agreed on preparing the development of PESCO. Coordinating 7 projects, Germany holds the third most active leadership following France (10 leaderships) and Italy (9 leaderships). From this, it becomes evident that Germany has a significant leading role in the project, equal to other large member states such as France and Italy. Berlin seems to finally have translated its relative economic size and political position to a defence project: something it had refused to do for a long time (Bulmer & Paterson, 2013).

With the brief overview set out above, both PESCO's place in the EU's common security and defence policy, and the prominent role of Germany regarding PESCO become more pronounced. To summarize then: the EU tried to enhance its efforts regarding security and defence, spurred on by France, but, most interestingly, by Germany as well. Leaving Paris aside, for Germany, this case shows that it is now willing to lead in this policy area. The next subchapter covers the actual analysis of the way German politicians explain and judge this turnaround to willingness in parliament.

4.2 – Compilation

In 20 debates in and between 2017 and 2019, PESCO was mentioned by members of the German parliament, the Bundestag. All collected contributions regarding PESCO within the scope of this thesis have gone through a process of interpretation, coding, and categorisation. Not only the word 'PESCO', but also its German translations are included. Thereafter, the data was compiled and interpreted within its context in order to gain a deeper understanding of what has been said. The methodology chapter has already shown a table containing the process of analysis. This subchapter covers the analysis of five categories that were identifiable from the data. These categories differ in size, according to the number of times it was referenced. The categories therefore are regarded as

basis for either justifying or questioning German engagement in PESCO. The end of the chapter will contain an interim conclusion on the PESCO case analysis, instead of at the end of each category within this case.

4.2.1 Responsibility

The first category that stands out, when reading through the debates that cover PESCO in any way, is 'responsibility'. There are many references regarding the responsibility that either Germany, the European Union, or its member states have in protecting their citizens, guarding the continent, or strengthening its cooperation. Otte presented Germany as a responsible actor on the international stage. According to Otte, PESCO and its development is quite welcome, and it would be best to increase coordination of defence policy within Europe even more. The fact that Germany engages in PESCO results from the responsibility the country takes on an international level. Both Otte, and his fellow party member Hahn, even explained Germany's reason for engaging in PESCO from Berlin responsibility as an *Anlehnungspartner* within the EU CSDP: a term that best translates as the proverbial 'shoulder to lean on'. Later on, during a debate on the two-percent target of NATO, Otte appealed once again to the responsibility his country carries with respect to securing peace and freedom, quoting philosopher Georg Picht: 'Whoever affirms responsibility in the world must not escape the burden that results from it'. Although this statement is directly aimed at the financial burden that ought to be spent on national defence, Otte links his message to the need to invest and modernize defence capabilities within the EU two sentences later. 'We are taking a path of the Defence Union in Europe, keyword: PESCO'. Discussing NATO even brought right wing Alternative for Germany (AfD) politician Rüdiger Lucassen, an ex-NATO official and Bundeswehr colonel, to applaud the European project of PESCO. He warned that it would be 'irresponsible' to take peace and freedom for granted, and that the efforts undertaken by PESCO were therefore most welcome.

Hardt followed up on that. He observed a naturally increasing responsibility for Germany – and France – in the EU framework, and regarded PESCO as a positive result. PESCO is not only a result of Germany taking responsibility, but 'its success [also] depends on Franco-German coordination', according to Hardt. Roderick Kiesewetter (CDU) wanted to see Germany and the EU practice what they preach. Taking on more responsibility in the field of security and defence would be the only road to face threats like ISIS, and PESCO enables member states to develop the necessary capabilities, he said. Karin Stenz (CDU) underlines this by bringing the Bundeswehr into the debate. In order for the armed forces to answer to any kind of responsibility, capabilities must be

cooperatively developed with other EU member states. Alexander Graf Lambsdorff (FDP) pleaded correspondingly, and referred to the famous Munich Security Conference of 2014 when stating that Germany by then decided that it ought to take on more international responsibility. 'Our European and international allies rely on that'.

This notion of 'reliance', or even 'trust' from others, especially European states, vis-à-vis Germany does not just come from anywhere, and is not only militarily. It also finds its roots in the financial crisis of 2008, amongst other things. When the majority of EU member states found themselves in huge economic and monetary trouble, it was Merkel-led Germany that turned its economic power into vigour, and was thereby informally granted decision power in the EU institutional framework (Bulmer & Paterson, 2013). The logic that follows this development would suggest that, besides economic leadership, Germany should carry political leadership, and therefore political responsibility, as well. From Otte, it becomes clear that he reasons correspondingly, although he stretches responsibility to the EU as a whole, rather than just Germany. Otte acknowledged that the EU is an economic giant, but a political welterweight, and a dwarf regarding security policy. In order to change that, 'it is important that the EU finally takes some responsibility that matches its economic performance.'

4.2.2 Strengthening of the EU

A second identified category contains arguments that justify German engagement in PESCO by the projects' imputed quality to strengthen the EU in certain ways. Hardt argues that civil efforts and military means go hand in hand, by maintaining peace sustainability in warzones. As maintaining peace 'should be a characteristic of the CFSP', PESCO should strengthen the latter, by providing for the military part. Achim Post (SPD) complements this by pointing out three moments when neither 'the EU or Germany had anything to say': the *Sochi-talks* on the Syrian conflict, the *16-plus-1-cooperation* between China and sixteen European countries (eleven of which were member states), and finally US president Trump's decision to recognize Jerusalem as capital of Israel. 'If we want to change that, then we need PESCO first.', said Post. His encouragement for the EU to claim a seat during international crises and affairs, rather than Germany itself, says something about the way he regards the relations between the two actors. Apparently, Germany has no business on the level of resolving global conflict, or, at least, not unilateral or representing nothing more than its own interests. Only the EU is able to weigh up against the geopolitical powers of the US and China. A defence scheme like PESCO should provide the EU with the necessary power of persuasion. Posts'

party colleague Daniela De Ridder (SPD) even only believes in a European solution, and regards PESCO as a stepping stone towards a European defence fund. In other words, Post and De Ridder state that PESCO is needed for the EU and Germany, in order for Germany to play a role of significance on the world stage. Both Hardt, Post, and De Ridder express their conviction about the usefulness of PESCO in relation to the international role of Germany and the EU. Norbert Röttgen (CDU) speaks a little more carefully, and states that PESCO is a start, but by no means sufficient enough to make the EU 'able to act internationally'. Franziska Brandtner (The Greens) takes a more defensive approach, arguing that, the CFSP should, essentially, be strengthened in order to prevent the EU from becoming at the mercy of Trump, Erdogan, and Putin. It is interesting to see that PESCO can therefore count on support from The Greens, provided that it does not violate German parliamentary control, and conducts military restraint. This also indicates that The Greens are concerned about the loss of the US security guarantee. Although leftist parties like The Greens normally plea for demilitarisation, disarmament, and pacifist policies, it becomes evident from Brandtner's statement that she would rather strengthen the military efforts of an institution she believes in (the EU) than becoming a pacifist without a say in the international arena.

Although the discussed categories differ, the connection between the justifications above (regarding strengthening) and the previous ones (regarding responsibility) is evident. The EU has a responsible role to play on the international stage, and therefore has to be, or become, a strong actor.

Another group of justifications for PESCO engagement is fundamentally different, as they regard strengthening of the EU or its policies as justifiable in itself. Hardt assigns PESCO with the same stature as the Schengen zone, Common Market and the Euro, considering these latter three to be 'milestones and building blocks for European unity'. 'PESCO has the potential to unify', according to Hahn. Two relevant interpretations can be drawn from these statements. Firstly, apparently these three European milestones are positive creations, as they provided for European unity, according to Hardt. Secondly, PESCO can, and should, be cut from the same wood. These observations are important, as they show the line of thinking of Hardt and Hahn. European unity is a good thing to amplify, and is clearly brought to the forefront, as a goal in itself. Hahn's observation that the EU finds itself in a confidential crisis among its citizens reinforces that thought. To him, more Europe is needed regarding the 'big issues like defence, security and economy', and less on the small issues, without specifying what 'small' entails. PESCO therefore belongs to the big issues, and serves to regain people's trust in the EU. Strengthening the EU is a pure counter-reaction to its weakened image. It is a characteristic of an inexhaustible belief in the European project. Liberal Graf Lambsdorff goes even further, when he links PESCO predominantly to the creation of European sovereignty. He

supports Macron's call for a 'common European strategic culture', of which PESCO can be a part. This view met fierce opposition in parliament.

For opponents, the creation of common EU policies, or even worse 'EU sovereignty', is indefensible as it would harm Germany's national sovereignty. Lambsdorff (FDP) stated that PESCO is just what the people want, as they plead for the EU to protect them. The contention between this argument and PESCO opponents displays a fundamental difference in the use of the democratic argument. Lucassen warns against a centralized European policy, which would take away the power of the German parliament, especially when PESCO would lead to a European army. 'The German people should remain in charge', according to him. Martin Hebner (AfD) says the Bundestag, and not Brussels, or any EU-Commissioner, should take decisions that touch upon the German people. PESCO would undermine that basic thought. Franzisca Brantner (The Greens) thinks that military matters should essentially be a prerogative of the parliament. Thereby she does not reject PESCO immediately, provided that the European parliament has parliamentary control on each PESCO project. She starts using the same premise, but arrives at a rather different outcome as Lucassen and Hebner do. Alexander Neu and Heike Hänsel (both The Left) feel the same as Brantner and Lucassen, when expressing their fear of loss of parliamentary control on military matters. Hänsel is particularly afraid that PESCO is an irreversible process, through the means of which other member states can put the Bundestag under pressure. From this data, it becomes clear that for its opponents, it is not so much the question of whether the intended goal of PESCO is legitimate, but of its democratic legitimacy.

Three times within this category, politicians referred indirectly to German military history. Thomas Hitschler (SPD) does so when he admits that, to him, 'German dominance would not be positive for European security', rather than harmonise defence efforts throughout the EU. In another debate, Mark Hauptmann (CDU) touched a raw nerve, by pleading PESCO provide for 'binding European arms export norms, rather than just the label 'German-free' as a new quality standard in the European security policy.' Hardt regards the fact that Poland and France are behind PESCO as a sign that Germany has left its history behind, and is a trusted ally again. 'We luckily left behind a piece of history and historical confrontation.'. Germany participating in PESCO is a wise thing to do, just because cooperation in itself is better than acting alone. These politicians who warn for a German unilateral strategy do so quite implicitly. The stance that security and defence policy ought to be designed on a European level is manifest, but its silent message seems in line with Germany's post-unification policy: 'never alone' (Haftenhorn, 2006). The EU can help Germany making it seem less threatening to those on the outside. Although Germany can have a prominent say in EU affairs, EU decisions and policy will more often be linked to Brussels than it will to Berlin.

Less appealing, but equally present, are the general statements of support for a PESCO which strengthens common European defence, security and foreign policy. Throughout the debates, they come from various politicians and parties. The end goal is not so much mentioned, as it is just pre-assumed. Hitschler's conclusion that 'more Europe is the right answer regarding these matters' aptly summarizes this breed of considerations.

As this analysis shows, the argumentative use of 'strengthening the EU' as a justification for Germany's engagement in PESCO is less straightforward than using responsibility, since taking responsibility is perceived as a goal in itself, while strengthening the EU ought to serve a higher goal. This 'higher aim' is not always mentioned in the debates. Roughly two groups constitute this category: the group that advocates strengthening of the EU (policies) in order to gain international significance, and the one that perceives such strengthening as a logical explanation in itself. The latter group of parliamentarians fail to answer why the EU then is a good thing to strengthen or amplify. Interpreting contributions of Hitschler, Hauptman, and Hardt offers another explanation: the fear of *Alleingang*. It is believed to be true that Germany should not go at it alone regarding military efforts. A different, albeit adjacent, explanation is the fact that Germany has always been a fervent supporter of the European project. The efforts that Chancellors like Konrad Adenauer and Helmut Kohl made to engage in the EU stand for themselves. In view of this, it is not that strange that strengthening the EU can actually be a goal in itself.

4.2.3 Defence

The third category consists of arguments in favour of PESCO which refer to the need for defensive measures and mechanisms for various reasons. This category is interesting, as it is the most present and discussed one in scholarly debate. In the literature review, it became clear that Germany's increased assertiveness regarding military efforts is mostly explained by external factors, such as the Trump presidency, Brexit, or Russian aggression. Some of these factors are indeed mentioned more than once.

Hardt regards PESCO's popularity (25 participants among now 27 member states) as the result of security concerns in Europe, especially referring to middle- and eastern European partners who face Russia exerting its influential sphere. The fact that 'we are rather sceptical about whether America under the leadership of President Donald Trump will retain the strength that we are used to', in combination with the UK leaving, does not take away these concerns, according to Hardt. Fritz Felgentreu (SPD) supports this view and points to the Syria-crisis. 'Developments in Syria in particular

have made it clear to us what risks can arise if a low level of commitment by the United States and Europe's weaknesses create a security vacuum in an unstable region.' Otte continues to add Mali, Afghanistan, and IS to the list of threats and instabilities. In other words, Felgentreu argues that the EU should grow stronger and fill a power vacuum, before others do. 'PESCO is the answer to a changing world', both politicians conclude. Hahn argues that the security threat has never been so high in Germany and Europe. Therefore, a security offensive is needed, and even 'PESCO started too late'. By stating the latter, Hahn underlines the urgency to increase EU security efforts. Otte is of the opinion that common military operations, such as NATO and EU projects - alike PESCO -, provide freedom and security, and then scolds the leftist parties for supporting an *Alleingang*. Hahn acknowledges that Germany already started to alter the trend regarding security policy in 2014, because of the massive changes in foreign affairs. The common denominators of all of the politicians mentioned above is the observation that the world has changed, both rapidly and substantially, and, hence, they feel the need to develop a defence capability. However, Germany should by all means work together, and engage in European security and defence cooperation such as PESCO. Only then the EU is able to defend the outer borders of the EU, and 'provide its citizens with the feeling they are protected in a changing world', according to Hauptmann. The opposing side of this category raised the concern for further militarisation. Brandtner is not fundamentally against PESCO – as already mentioned above – ,but underlines that it all depends on the substance of each project (for example, she is against the drone project), and whether PESCO serves the interests of the defence industry. The absence of militarisation is even more important for The Left. Andrej Hunko states that PESCO is a step in the wrong direction, as it will cause further armament, rather than disarmament. European cooperation on defence is only acceptable if its aim is disarmament, according to him. Tobias Pflüger (The Left) worries that PESCO might develop the EU into a military union, which would not be justifiable; 'The EU should remain a civil project'.

In general, the mentioned politicians desire a Europe that can defend itself, both its own borders and outside its external borders. They suggest that the changed international order, and developments both close at home and far abroad, ask for such aim, and that PESCO is at least one of the instruments in creating the needed defence infrastructure. So, the data supports the explanation that is given by some scholarly literature as discussed in the literature review: external threats explain Germany's turnaround towards assertive military policies (Kempin & Kunz, 2017; Hellman 2017). Notwithstanding the consistency of the defence category within the literature, there is more motivation for German engagement. These motivations should be conceived more broadly and nuancedly. The next category provides another example.

4.2.4 Economics

Apart from the ideological arguments for PESCO participation, it should be no surprise that German politicians refer to economic considerations as well. After all, PESCO consists of more than twenty member states pooling resources, engaging in joint research and development projects, and shaping policy together. With such cooperation efforts, inevitably, there is money involved. PESCO projects are funded mostly by the member states themselves, but are incentivised by the European Defence Fund as well (EEAS, 2019). Most references concern the potential efficiency on which that PESCO delivers. All parliamentarians that refer to economic arguments, point at the potential efficiency PESCO provides. Where Lambsdorff (FDP) states that PESCO is able to shape the preconditions for working together on common European defence projects, which is more efficient and saves Germany money, Otte sees PESCO as a vehicle that could make military structures more efficient. 'Cooperation with other European member states is therefore paramount'. SPD members account for more than half of the economic arguments. Felgentreu finds PESCO smartly constructed, in part because of its efficiency. His fellow party member Hitschler goes even further, and explicitly disapproves of a larger German defence budget. Partly because he does not favour German dominance – as already discussed above –, but also because the pooling of financial resources should be more efficient. Besides the efficiency and effectiveness of budget use, Wolfgang Hellmich, also SPD, thinks outside the box. He sees political opportunities through PESCO regarding the strengthening of social rights for military personnel. At least it counts as an innovative idea in which PESCO is justified as being a vehicle through which domestic economic policy goals can be achieved.

4.2.5 Enhancing NATO

In the analysis of the data one minor category in favour of PESCO can be identified. PESCO is seen by many to be at least a relative of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation. NATO's Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg already made himself clear at the doorstep of the EU Foreign Affairs council in November 2017: 'I also welcome the fact that so many European leaders have highlighted or underlined the importance that European defence has to be developed in a way that it's not competing with NATO, but which is complementary to NATO. We don't need duplication, we don't need competition, but what we need is cooperation and a European defence which is complementing NATO' (Stoltenberg, 2017). European leaders rushed to promise that PESCO is, and

will never become, a copy of NATO. The line of argument in the Bundestag echoes these promises. PESCO is displayed explicitly as 'NATO's European pillar' by both Karl Lamers and Otte (both CDU). In order to invest in European security, PESCO should be strengthened as the European pillar of NATO, Lamers said. Gunther Krichbaum (CDU) also points to the strengthening of the EU on the international stage, but underlines that it should be done whilst respecting NATO and the US as 'Germany's most important ally'. That is generally the way it is argued by all: 'We should get a new watchdog, but only to strengthen the current one!'.

There were two instances when the subject of NATO was discussed as providing for a reason not to engage in PESCO. Lucassen states that PESCO will undermine NATO, since it contains a structure parallel to NATO's cause. Stefan Liebich (The Left) rejects PESCO for that matter, as 'it will transform the EU into a replacement' of NATO: an organisation The Left despises. On this subject AfD and The Left draw the same conclusion, but start at a different premise. AfD wants to respect NATO, and The Left fears another NATO. Both are supported by Duke's view, who is of the opinion that Europe's search for strategic autonomy actually does interfere with NATO: developing the EU's own acquisition of defence capabilities strengthen European industries, not those of the US or other competitors (Duke, 124).

4.3 Conclusion

From the analysis of the data it becomes clear that the categories are inevitably linked to one another. Engaging in PESCO because of a supposed responsibility on the international stage is not at all entirely separate from the argument that the EU should be strengthened, or that Germany and the EU should harness themselves for external threats. On the contrary: they connect, reinforce and follow each other. However, the analysis shows that there is a distinction to be made as well. It is necessary to identify these distinctions in order to bring the wide array of arguments to the surface that serve to either justify PESCO, or not. Overall, the defence category shows consistency with the literature, which would explain Germany engaging in PESCO as motivated by external factors. The other categories however, show that it should be conceived more broadly and with more nuance.

How, then, do German parliamentarians justify German engagement in PESCO, and which arguments give reason to believe there is need for a more nuanced interpretation? A first justification is the notion of *responsibility*, arising in various compositions. According to some, it is Germany being an international actor that carries a responsibility, to others it is Germany as economic powerhouse, and to some it is Germany being a EU member state. So, Germany should engage in PESCO, because it

has the responsibility to either secure freedom and peace within and outside of Europe, defend the continent, or show leadership within the EU. The *strengthening of the EU* was also cited as a reason to participate in PESCO. Moreover, it was the largest category of arguments, for that matter. The main observation that can be concluded from this category, is the widely shared and unfailing belief in the European project. With the exception of the AfD, all parties applauded the strengthening and expansion of EU policies. Therefore, partaking in EU cooperation on defence was proposed as a logical step forward, according to the majority of the speakers. In fact, for some it made so much sense that they completely failed to explain the purpose of strengthening the EU, and it is perceived as an end in itself. Others did argue beyond that, and pled for the EU to have greater international significance. The reasoning behind this argument is that the European Union should take on the role that nation states had for a long time. Security and defence is regarded by them as a policy area, one that should not be conducted unilaterally, barely bilaterally, but preferably multilaterally. Not everyone agreed on that. A reason for disapproving PESCO participation was the esteemed loss of German sovereignty as PESCO is EU policy. With regard to the category of *defence*, the analysis supports the academic work discussed in the literature review. External threats do offer an explanation for increased military effort of Germany. Parliamentarians who referred to the defence argument, pointed mainly at USA's receding movement in the international order, Russia's aggressiveness, Brexit, and trouble spots in the Middle-East and Africa. In other words, reasons for Germany and EU member states to feel either threatened and left-alone, and thereby feel urged to increase its defence capabilities. Critics argued that PESCO would satisfy the interests of the defence industry. PESCO appeared to be an *economic* benefit as well, following the data of the fourth category. Efficiency was the key word in this argument, and thus reason enough to engage in PESCO. Finally, *NATO* was mentioned as justification of PESCO engagement. On the one hand PESCO was presented as its European pillar, and served to strengthen both the EU and its Atlantic allies. Opponents of PESCO did not agree. Either PESCO threatened NATO's legitimacy (AfD), or it would create a duplication of (The Left).

The next chapter covers the analysis of the Enhanced Forward Presence-case, yet another example of active German engagement in a military project. As the analysis is conducted similarly to the PESCO-case, the structure of the chapter remains the same.

Chapter 5 – Enhanced Forward Presence

This chapter covers the analysis of the debates regarding Germany's engagement in NATO's Enhanced Forward Presence (eFP) in Lithuania. The context of the data analysis is explained below, and covers the key elements of the eFP operation, Germany's leading role in it, and the connection to the overall research. At the end of the chapter a conclusion will follow.

5.1 – Context

In July 2016, the NATO allies decided upon enhancing their presence in the Baltic region. The Russian annexation of Crimea, and its military movement alongside the borders of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Poland reminded the Alliance not only of their commitment to common defence, but also of the fact that it were European borders that were being threatened. The fact that Russia did not report, nor announce its military exercises – as agreed upon under OSCE (Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe) oversight –, made the situation even more tense. During the 2016 Warsaw summit, the NATO members agreed that four multinational battalion sized battle groups were to be deployed in the four countries mentioned here. The operation became known as 'enhanced Forward Presence', or eFP.

The reason for doing so was mainly deterrence of Russia. Deploying NATO troops ought to show that an attack on one NATO Ally would be considered an attack on the entire Alliance. The soldiers train and take part in all major exercises during deployment. However, the members agreed upon a rotation system. The troops serving in the battalion rotate every six months in order to comply to the 1997 NATO-Russia Founding Act on new permanent stationing of forces (NATO, 1997). Russia resented the eFP. President Vladimir Putin and Minister of Foreign Affairs Sergei Lavrov, for instance, voiced strong concerns about negative consequences of the eFP. They warned that Russia would be prepared to take necessary measures to counter these trends (Godzimirski, 2019).

The four battle groups are led by the United Kingdom, Canada, Germany, and the United States. The German Bundeswehr leads the Lithuanian battalion in Rukla, which is also composed of military personnel from seven other NATO members: Lithuania, the Netherlands, Norway, Belgium, Iceland, Luxembourg, and Croatia. Germany's availability and willingness to take the lead in such a military project reminds us of the main focus of this thesis, and therefore provides for a second suitable case to study. However, the case of eFP is different from PESCO due to its character. While PESCO focuses

on development and training of EU member states' capabilities in the broadest sense, eFP has a direct military purpose. When looking at arguments for increased military engagement of Germany, eFP can easily be explained as an answer to a perceived Russian threat, and therefore as an external factor driving Germany towards a more assertive military attitude – policy wise. However true that may be, this chapter argues that the eFP case offers an opportunity to look at other factors as well. If the basic reason for leading participation in an operation appears to be externally driven (Russian threat), internal motives stand out even more. The following analysis of parliamentary debates endeavours to display how German politicians justify German engagement and the heading of a military project that could easily be framed as a provocative one.

5.2 – Compilation

Germany's engagement in the Enhanced Forward Presence was discussed in sixteen debates during a period from 2016 to 2019. The analysis of the minutes is conducted similarly to the PESCO data. This means that all relevant data containing the German words for 'enhanced forward presence', 'Lithuania' and 'Baltic' have been interpreted, coded, and categorized. This subchapter provides the compilation of the data, and displays two identified categories which serve as basis for either the justifying or questioning of Germany's engagement in the eFP.

5.2.1 Deterrence and defence

The category that stands out most evidently is the one regarding 'deterrence' and 'defence'. The data concerned refers, just as with PESCO, to the need for defensive measures against external threats. When using this line of argumentation, German politicians consequently state that the Bundeswehr ought to play a role in the eFP in order to defend against a perceived adversary. As shown below, Russia provides the adversary, and the subject to be defended is either Baltic soil, European borders, or national sovereignties.

Thomas Oppermann (SPD) directly pointed at Russian military manoeuvres that 'increase fear in Poland and the Baltic states', and said that a clear answer is needed from NATO. Oppermann additionally stated that there can be no doubt about NATO's ability and willingness to defend itself. 'The collective defence of the alliance is a guarantee of security for us, especially for the Baltic countries and Poland.'. By stating this, Oppermann aptly brings down the majority of arguments to

two main points: supplying an answer to Russia (deterrence), and guaranteeing security for NATO allies (defence). Both justify eFP as providing for the right reinsurance measures.

Hahn repeated the defence argument, and stated that, even if the fear for a Russian overrun of the Baltics were highly irrational, Germany and NATO should take these concerns seriously. Not only for the Baltic people, but also since their borders are EU's external borders. eFP is therefore 'urgently needed', Hahn said. Henning Otte (CDU) added: 'Alliance defence is also national defence'. Hahn and Otte hereby plead not only for the Baltic case, but argue that defending their borders will count as self-defence, too. Otte, Wilfried Lorenz, Lamers, Thorsten Frei (all CDU), and Felgentreu took note of the Baltic feeling threatened as well. Lorenz summed up the reasoning: Russia has large military camps just over the borders, the Kremlin stationed Iskander missiles in Kaliningrad (near the Baltics), and the military manoeuvres were not registered according OSCE agreement. Hardt and Frei made it crystal clear: Germany is militarily engaged in Lithuania 'with a view to defend the country', and to 'send the clear signal that we want to defend community security in Europe'. Franz Thönnies ties in with that by stating that the eFP engagement is to 'ensure security and protection' for the Baltics. A protection 'NATO partners Poland, Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia have asked for', according to Elisabeth Motschmann (CDU). So, in conclusion, all politicians mentioned above see eFP as the right response from NATO and Germany, because it aims at defending either Lithuania, NATO members, Europe, or Germany. This multi-aimed argumentation is often mentioned, and is the core of multilateralist policy: one engages in an allyship to prevent itself from becoming a victim of attack. This is not remarkable, but nevertheless important to mention, as it shows the connection between this category and the other one covering responsibility, allyship and multilateralism.

The only parliamentarian that questioned the feeling of threat was Pflüger, who simply stated that there was no need for armament, 'not even against Russia'. From this, it becomes clear that the Baltic concerns are taken seriously throughout the entire parliament. Even the opponents of NATO intervention do not seem to dare questioning the fear – except for Pflüger. It underlines the sense of urgency felt, although there are different views on the course of action. More precisely, views differed on the role NATO and Germany should take.

The deterrence-argument creates more of a political distinction than the defence-argument. The Left stated that the eFP creates more instability. In fact, they view a policy of deterrence as being needlessly provocative. Wolfgang Gehrcke (The Left) questioned whether eFP 'means more security, or less security for the countries concerned', hereby referring to a potential reaction from Moscow. 'Do not make the Russians our enemies!', he said. Hänsel also warns for Germany partaking in major military manoeuvres 'which increases the risk of military confrontation'. These takes are contrary to

the mainstream position: eFP would create more stability in the Baltic region, and hence on NATO territory. Marcus Faber (FDP) stated that the Lithuanians cherish their NATO membership, and 'are very happy that we are there' with military presence. Otte called the deployment of troops 'like liability insurance', while Lamers called it 'precaution'. From these statements, it becomes clear that the Alliances should not only show its teeth, but, by doing so, it is preventing a domino of crises – perhaps even war. After all, NATO rests on the idea that its members consider an attack on one as an attack on all. This collective defence agreement is coded in art. 5 NATO treaty. 'This [war] should not happen if possible', said Otte, while adding that 'we don't let threats intimidate us'. Felgentreu (SPD) echoed the collective defence argument, and added that the eFP troops 'fulfil their defence-political purpose, namely reinsuring the allies and deterring a potential threat'. Also, Alois Karl (CSU) underlined that no crisis is isolated, which is why Germany should engage in the eFP battalion in Lithuania. The common denominator of these justifications are apparent: deterrence should prevent Germany being dragged into war.

5.2.2 Responsibility, allyship and multilateralism

Another category that can be identified from the data refers to multilateralism, allyship, and responsibility. These are connected with each other, as the reason for taking responsibility is often displayed as commitment to the allied Baltic countries, which counts for a multilateral approach. The arguments in this category are clustered around two subgroups of arguments for that: commitment and deterrence. Commitment from treaty obligation and out of conviction form one subgroup, and commitment to increase the credibility of allyship counts form the second. The latter provides for deterrence, as a strong and unified NATO is assumed to deter Moscow.

The data only shows politicians who make reference to binding commitment a few times. Germany is 'living up to its alliance commitment' by taking command of the Lithuanian battalion, according to Hardt. Felgentreu and Lorenz state that Germany is obliged to assist Lithuania, under the NATO treaty. These arguments are solid, but do not really carry the weight of personal, moral, and emotional justifications. That becomes clear as the data analysis shows that the lot of the arguments focus on commitment in terms of conviction: the belief that Germany has to engage in eFP because it is the right thing to do and because it strengthens Germany itself. 'It is about standing up for one another and making yourself strong together' in the words of Frei. Motschmann argued that the Baltic countries 'rely on us [Germany], on NATO, on the EU', as they are afraid of becoming a victim of Russia. This is repeated by Otte, who considered it 'responsible and necessary' to stand by the

Baltic states, 'out of the conviction of the ability to form alliances'. Germany 'has promised' to station a battalion as a visible sign of its readiness to defend, Karl added to this cluster of arguments. The necessity of standing by each other for an allyship to work is evident. That is what Nils Annen (SPD) points at when he argues that Germany has to develop an attitude to take concerns and fears seriously. Because 'otherwise the whole alliance will not work'. This conviction of, or belief in, allyship embodies a justification for Germany's engagement in eFP. Not only are they bound by treaty to help Lithuania, they are convinced that it is the right course of action, as the 'solidarity of this alliance [...] guarantees Germany's security also', as Annen put it. Annen went even further. He said that, through NATO, Germany can 'represent [its] interests in a democratic confederation of states, without the old fears and worries of German power, or superiority'. The belief in the NATO alliance thus not only provides for security, but serves as a political tool as well. Ingo Gädechens (CDU) underlines this by stating that Germany 'never acts alone, but always in harmony with [its] partners' for good historical reasoning. Also, Felgentreu referred to historical reasons by saying that the Federal Republic has 'sworn off German special routes once and for all'. Annen, Gädechens, and Felgentreu refer to Germany's historical burden in a way the PESCO case already showed. They practically present NATO as the alternative to *Alleingang*. Multilateralism over unilateralism. But there is another line or argument that contains historical reference. Lorenz called eFP participation a moral obligation, based on 'our own history'. Felgentreu elaborated a little more on that, by saying that the German people have a historical debt towards the Baltics, because of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact. With this 1939 pact, Hitler and Stalin agreed to divide-up Poland and the Baltic states. Hence, Felgentreu argued, Germany has a historical responsibility to take part in the eFP. In other words: Germany should regain their trust. 'Nothing worries the people there more than the idea that Germany and Russia shake hands over their heads', he promised. For Eckhard Pols (CDU) Germany has already made some progress in this matter. He argued that the Crimea crisis and the stationing of Russian rockets near the Baltic borders made German soldiers no longer 'being perceived as a threat', but instead being very welcome in Lithuania.

Gädechens added that, in an alliance, 'you have not only rights, but also obligations'. In order to be able to use a political tool as NATO, Germany has to deliver on its obligations. That this conviction is righteous, is argued by Lamers who said that Germany's involvement and leadership in NATO, and worldwide, is 'recognized and highly valued'. Hardt took a similar position by saying that Germany is 'one of the most reliable and strong partners in NATO', which is why it has taken the lead in the Lithuanian NATO battalion. If one estimates these superlatives to be factual, Lamers and Hardt evaluated Germany's turnaround to military leadership to be positive. The arguments and justifications described above point towards Germany as fulfilling its NATO duties - commitments,

either spurred by obligation and by moral, or strategic, conviction. It is important to recognize that allyship is not a relatively new policy for Germany to conduct. As mentioned earlier, Germany's post-war foreign, security, and defence policy was characterised by the strive for multilateralism and connectedness – although military force remained often untouched (Kundnani, 2011). As for the data used in this study, politicians consequently connected the (NATO) commitment to responsibility. This responsible allyship, which implies a pioneering role as well, actually provides for a new aspect of security and defence policy. Chapter 4 already showed that in the PESCO case. The majority of German politicians do not want to see their defence capabilities carrying NATO's proverbial *lanterne rouge* anymore.

Showing solidarity does not always have to be aimed at the receiver, but can be used to deter the aggressor. Engaging in eFP when members show their trust and solidarity with NATO, the credibility of the allyship increases, and it will make Moscow think twice before it crosses the borders of a NATO ally. Hahn showed that when pleading to 'react in order to demonstrate convincingly that alliance solidarity continues to be a top priority'. Otte also wanted to send the signal 'through loyalty to the alliance and reliability'. He described the eFP as a clear signal that 'we stand for one another', and 'don't leave our allies alone'. Hellmich made clear that Germany's soldiers played a part in efforts to 'strengthen, secure and consolidate the defence capabilities of NATO's allies'. It becomes evident that the parliament not only expects Germany to show solidarity and stand up for its allies, but to strengthen them as well. Trust is also important from a defence policy perspective, according to Felgentreu. Thanks to a feeling of trust in their allies, the Baltics have a solid basis to develop their defence policy. On the other side, NATO should 'leave no doubt' about its ability to defend itself, said Hardt. It is 'a sign of unity', Otte emphasized. Such messages are clearly designed to make the impression that Russia can be told to back off in fear of a united NATO.

It is remarkable to see how politicians use NATO as justifiable argument for German eFP participation. After all, the academic debate is in agreement on the explanation that Germany is taking lead in European military policy because of a certain distrust in the Atlantic defence cooperation. Felgentreu provides an answer of this apparent contradiction. He acknowledged that the Trump-government questions NATO's cohesion, but stated that it is therefore all the more important 'that we Europeans have decided to deepen our cooperation in the areas of security, armaments, and defence'. Felgentreu argues that common European security is being shaped at the very moment. 'Not to replace NATO, but to complement it', he said. As the analysis above shows: the majority of German politicians agree, and are willing to make their country lead the multilateral way.

5.3 - Conclusion

As already discussed at the start of this chapter, the eFP case provides a strong case in line of the scholarly discourse that explains Germany's turnaround to assertive military policy by external factors, in this case Russian (expansive) aggression. Such an explanation becomes clear from the first category as well, and proves significant. The majority of politicians want their military to engage in eFP in order to help defend the Baltic, EU, and German territories, and prevent a possible attack from Russia. Moreover, and important for this study, they want Germany to take on lead in this operation. However, similar to the PESCO case, there is need for a more nuanced view. It is not solely Russian aggression that led Germany to lead an eFP battalion. There are internal factors as well, which is demonstrated by the second category. The nuancing view on German engagement in eFP is embodied by references to responsibility, allyship and multilateralism. These arguments justify Germany's eFP partaking not only because of a Russian threat, but out of the need and will to show alliance solidarity. Taking responsibility to forge a strong and credible NATO serves to support allies, and deters Moscow as well. Eventually, it all points to the urgency felt to secure the survival of multilateralism. Hence, Germany is willing to take lead in such a military operation. If something becomes clear from the data, it is the sometimes unspoken fear for a crisis in which Germany has to use its military capabilities again, and, If the country needs to, its politicians will refuse to go at it alone. However, the parliament in Berlin says it will do everything it takes to prevent such a crisis – even take the lead.

Chapter 6 – Conclusion

This chapter will provide the conclusion of the study. It proceeds by recalling the research questions and the aim of the thesis. Subsequently, the debates discussed in chapter 2 (literature review) will pass by, in order to regain grip on the positioning of the thesis subject. After that, the findings of the empirical chapters 4 and 5 will be discussed and interpreted. Eventually, a few options for further research are presented.

This thesis focused on how the German parliament, given their precarious national military history, justified Germany's leading partaking in PESCO and eFP, and how this explains Germany's current assertive external policy. The analysis tried to interpret this justification by identifying categories of arguments extracted from the data. Which arguments did the politicians use to justify their country's leadership in military projects? What did they actually say about it? The research questions that served as the basis for this study were (i) how is German leading engagement in PESCO and the eFP being represented and discussed in plenary debate by German parliamentarians, and (ii) how do these perceptions by German parliamentarians explain Germany's current position regarding foreign and defence policies?

From the literature review, it became clear that academics have similar thoughts on the course of the external policy of post-reunification Germany. From the moment reunification came into view, a direction of *Alleingang* was firmly rejected, and multilateralism and partnership were embraced. In the area of security and defence, Germany conducted a reluctant policy, anxious to use its military capacities. However, the country shifted its policy course. In 2014, Berlin took on a diplomatic lead in the Crimea crisis, in 2016 they initiated to renewal of the EU strategic policy, and its armed forces are currently taking the lead in several defence projects, such as PESCO and NATO's Enhanced Forward Presence. In trying to explain this shift towards assertiveness, scholars debated from different levels of analysis. Some looked at external factors, such as Brexit and Russian aggression, whilst others took the internal perspective of influential individuals such as Ursula von der Leyen or Angela Merkel. A gap in the literature could be found with regard to internal factors like parliament. How did they – as main legislator – perceived and justify an assertive Germany in military policies?

(i) How is German leading engagement in PESCO and the eFP being represented and discussed in plenary debate by German parliamentarians?

Five categories of arguments were identified from the parliamentary debates covering PESCO. The first category to be dealt with is defence. This category is consistent with the literature that explains German assertiveness by external factors – mainly threats. Russian aggression on the European

borders, USA's retreating movement in European security, and the UK leaving the EU are being employed as justification for Germany partaking in PESCO. The other categories, however, show that it should all be conceived more broadly and with more nuance. Three categories can be interpreted as ideological or moral justifications for Germany taking on a leading role: responsibility, strengthening of the EU, and enhancing NATO. According to various politicians, Germany carries the responsibility to secure freedom and peace. This responsibility derives from either being an international actor, the obligation as a member state of the EU, or out of historical and therefore moral debt towards partners. Another justification would be the need for Germany to safeguard the strengthening of the EU. Besides the unfailing belief in the European project that came to the front of the debates, this category consisted of arguments that plead for multilateralism. For many of the politicians, the EU is the only platform of conducting defence policies as it is multilateralist by definition. The alternative would lean towards the feared unilateralism. Objections logically focused on the loss of national sovereignty, but they were low in number. Justifications that focused on the enhancement of NATO followed the same line of argumentation: multilateralism.

The data on the Enhanced Forward Presence brought forward two categories in the analysis, both consisting of more than one determinant. The first category is formed by arguments that refer to deterrence and defence. Just as the defence category in the PESCO analysis, these justifications are consistent with the literature on external factors for explaining Germany's assertiveness. It therefore proved more interesting to analyse both eFP and PESCO, as the eFP case is different than the latter. eFP is primarily meant to answer an external threat, rather than primarily developing defence capabilities. Parliamentarians mainly focused on the fear from which the Baltic countries suffered, due to Russian military movement. In order to defend these countries for possible attack, the eFP was justified, according to them. Deploying soldiers ought to deter Russia was similarly justified, in order to prevent them from causing a military crisis. These defence efforts were therefore regarded as national German defence as well. An attack on the Baltics would mean an attack on Germany, according to some parliamentarians. With regard to the eFP case, a similar conclusion as with PESCO becomes apparent. External factors, in this case military threats, do matter in explaining Germany's current assertiveness on external policy. But here, there is also room for nuance. The second category consists of arguments referring to multilateralism, responsibility, and allyship. The data showed that parliamentarians justified Germany partaking in eFP on the basis of alliance solidarity, and the need for Berlin to take responsibility for that solidarity, hence Germany's role as coordinator of the Lithuanian Battalion. As already concluded in chapter 5, the urgency felt to engage in eFP can be described as the belief in a multilateralist approach.

(ii) How do these perceptions by German parliamentarians explain Germany's current position regarding foreign and defence policies?

This thesis shows that German parliamentarians indeed support Germany taking lead in military affairs based on the urgency to become able to defend both the national and European borders, like the literature suggest. However, ideological and moral reasons, such as responsibility and multilateralism, justified this policy shift as well, according to the data. So, the parliamentary perception of PESCO and eFP partaking show that Germany's current position can be explained by both defensive and ideological reasons. With a view to the academic debate, this thesis takes issue with Hellmann's view that domestic ideologies do not play a role. Based on the research in this thesis, I would argue the opposite. Ideological and moral reasons count for the majority of arguments in favour of leadership. Kunz therefore can be supported in her claim that ideological or moral reasoning for Germany's leadership are clearly to be found. Her theory that these ideological reasons are sooner to be found than those pursuing national interest is however difficult to support. Standing up for allies can be morally driven, but serves a national interest – preventing a war – as well.

I encountered some limitations during the research. Firstly, even though I searched the online database for more than one 'term' in order to find as many debates relating to the cases as possible, there could be more debates dealing with the cases. For instance, if a politician referred to such a case in other terms than the expected ones. Secondly, spoken contributions in parliament can be interpreted differently by readers. In order to provide transparency on that point, I quoted most of the statements. By doing so, the question of interpretation becomes pronounced, although it remains unsolved. Finally, this thesis gives insight in only one, albeit important, part of the parliamentary decision-making: the plenary debates. In committee debates, issues are dealt with on another parliamentary level. This study therefore gives no exhaustive report of the decision-making process in parliament.

For further research on this topic, it would be important for the width of the debate on internal factors to look at party specific alterations in the ideological justifications of Germany's current assertiveness in external policy. Especially for the CDU/CSU and SPD, who have been part of the government for a long time. Hellmann's view that ideology could not have played a role in Berlin's shift away from reluctance is not supported by my thesis, as my data shows a lot of ideological justification. However, more has to be done to elaborate on the question how these parties justified the reluctance of Germany in the early 2000s, for instance, and what can be found in election programs. Such analysis could offer another important piece to the puzzle of how the changing

international order is forcing Germany to engage in a policy area that many have wanted to stay away from for a long time.

Bibliography

Bull, H. (1982). Civilian Power Europe: A Contradiction in Terms? *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 1(2), 149-170.

Bulmer, S. & Paterson, W.E. (2013). Germany as the EU's reluctant hegemon? Of economic strength and political constraints. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 20(10), 1387-1405.

Bengtsson, M. (2016). How to plan and perform a qualitative study using content analysis. *NursingPlus Open*, 2, 8-14.

Biscop, S. (2017). European Defence: What's in the CARDS for PESCO? *Egmont Security Policy Brief*, 91, 1-6.

Blockmans, S. (2018). The EU's Modular Approach to Defence Integration: An Inclusive, Ambitious and Legally Binding PESCO? *Common Market Law Review*, 55, 1785-1826.

Burroughs, E. (2015). The Discourse of Controlling "Illegal Immigration" in Irish Parliamentary Texts. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 14(4), 479-500.

Council of the European Union (CFSP) – Council Decision 2017/2315 of 11 December 2017 establishing permanent structured cooperation (PESCO) and determining the list of participant Member States. Accessed on 24 May 2020. Available from: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32017D2315&from=DE>

Duke, S.W. (2019). The Competing Logics of EU Security and Defence. *Survival*, 61(2), 123-142.

European Council (EC) – Notification on PESCO of 13 November 2017. Accessed on 3 May 2020. Available from: <https://www.consilium.europa.eu/media/31511/171113-pesco-notification.pdf>

European Union External Action Service (June 2016). Shared vision, common action: A stronger Europe—A global strategy for the European Union's foreign and security policy. Accessed on 18 April 2020. Available from:

https://europa.eu/globalstrategy/sites/globalstrategy/files/regions/files/eugs_review_web_0.pdf

European Union External Action Service (November 2019). Permanent Structured Cooperation (PESCO) – factsheet. Accessed on 18 April 2020. Available from:

https://eeas.europa.eu/sites/eeas/files/pesco_factsheet_november_2019.pdf

German Federal Ministry of Defence (2016) White Paper 2016 on Security Policy and the Future of the Bundeswehr (Berlin: Federal Ministry of Defence, Germany). Accessed on 28 May 2020. Available via: <https://issat.dcaf.ch/download/111704/2027268/2016%20White%20Paper.pdf>

Godzimirski, J.M. (2019). Explaining Russian reactions to increased NATO military presence. *Norwegian Institute of International Affairs Policy Brief*, 16, 1-4.

Haftendorn, H. (2006). *Coming of Age. German Foreign Policy since 1945*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Hellmann, G. (2017). Deutschland, die Europäer und ihr Schicksal. Herausforderungen deutscher Außenpolitik nach einer Zeitenwende, *Zeitschrift für Staats- und Europawissenschaften*, 15(2), 329-346.

Howorth, J. (2017). EU-NATO cooperation: the key to Europe's security future. *European Security*, 23(3), 454-459.

Hyde-Price, A. (2015). The "sleep-walking giant" awakes: resetting German foreign and security policy. *European Security*, 24(4), 600-616.

Jacoby, W.G. (2000). Issues Framing and Public Opinion on Government Spending. *American Journal of Political Science*, 44(4), 750-767.

Kempin, R. & Kunz, B. (2017). France, Germany, and the Quest for European Strategic Autonomy: Franco-German Defence Cooperation in A New Era, *Notes du Cerfa*, 141, 1-31.

Krotz, U. & Schild, J. (2018). Back to the future? Franco-German bilateralism in Europe's post-Brexit union. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 25(8), 1174-1193.

Kundnani, H. (2011). Germany as a Geo-economic Power. *The Washington Quarterly*. 34(3), 31-45.

Longhurst, K. & Miskimmon, A. (2007). Same Challenges, Diverging Responses: Germany, the UK and European Security, *German Politics*, 16(1), 79-94.

Paterson, W.E. (1993). 'Muss Europa Angst vor Deutschland haben?'. In R. Hrbek (ed.), *Der Vertrag von Maastricht in der wissenschaftlichen Kontroverse*. Baden-Baden: Nomos, 9-18.

Paterson, W.E. (2011). The Reluctant Hegemon? Germany Moves Centre Stage in the European Union. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 49, 57-75.

NATO (1997). Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security between NATO and the Russian Federation. Available from:

https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_25470.htm?selectedLocale=en

Gordon, M.R. & Lubold, G. 'Trump to Pull Thousands of U.S. Troops From Germany'. *The Wall Street Journal*, 5 June 2020. Available from: <https://www.wsj.com/articles/trump-directs-u-s-troop-reduction-in-germany-11591375651>.

Stoltenberg, J. (2017). Doorstep speech at the EU Foreign Affairs Council meeting on November 23rd in 2017. Available from: https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/opinions_148840.htm

Tocci, N. (2016). The making of the EU Global Strategy. *Contemporary Security Policy*, 37(3), 461-472.

Tocci, N. (2018). Towards a European Security and Defence Union: Was 2017 a Watershed? *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 56, 131-141.

Van Der Valk, I. (2003). Right-Wing Parliamentary Discourse on Immigration in France. *Discourse and Society*, 14(3), 309-348.

Wagner, W. (2005). From vanguard to laggard: Germany in European security and defence policy. *German Politics*, 14(4), 455-469.

Appendix I: List of Sources

Date of debate	Document number	Source
22 June 2016	Plenarprotokoll 18/178	Plenary debate on 75th anniversary of Germany's invasion of the Soviet Union
7 July 2016	Plenarprotokoll 18/183	Plenary debate on No transfer of Bundeswehr soldiers to Lithuania
7 September 2016	Plenarprotokoll 18/186	Plenary debate on Budget proposal 2016-2020 Ministry of Defence
23 November 2016	Plenarprotokoll 18/202	Plenary debate on Budget proposal 2016-2020 Ministry of defence - continuation of debate
19 January 2017	Plenarprotokoll 18/212	Plenary debate on Foreign Policy Impact of US Troop Relocations to Eastern Europe Atlantic Resolve
20 January 2017	Plenarprotokoll 18/213	Plenary debate on Annual report 2015 Ministry of Defence
1 June 2017	Plenarprotokoll 18/237	Plenary debate on the Annual review 2016 of the military commissioner
29 June 2017	Plenarprotokoll 18/243	Plenary debate on Federal government Disarmament Report
30 June 2017	Plenarprotokoll 18/244	Plenary debate on Governmental regulations to prevent conflict and crises
21 November 2017	Plenarprotokoll 19/2	Plenary debate on Continuation of army participation Sea Guardian Mediterranean
12 December 2017	Plenarprotokoll 19/4	Plenary debate on Continuation of army participation in Afghan training mission with NATO
13 December 2017	Plenarprotokoll 19/5	Plenary debate on PESCO budget
19 January 2018	Plenarprotokoll 19/8	Plenary debate on Two percent rule of NATO
22 January 2018	Plenarprotokoll 19/9	Plenary debate on 55 years Elysée-Treaty (2) - done

22 February 2018	Plenarprotokoll 19/14	Plenary debate on European Council meeting & plenary debate on developments in Middle East
23 February 2018	Plenarprotokoll 19/15	Plenary debate on Enhancing EU's ability to act on foreign affairs
2 March 2018	Plenarprotokoll 19/18	Plenary debate on Nuclear equipment
21 March 2018	Plenarprotokoll 19/22	Plenary debate on Governmental statement on security & plenary debate on Governmental statement on defence
16 May 2018	Plenarprotokoll 19/32	Plenary debate on Federal budget for Ministry of Foreign Affairs & plenary debate on Federal budget for Ministry of Defence
28 June 2018	Plenarprotokoll 19/42	Plenary debate on EU Council on NATO summit
12 September 2018	Plenarprotokoll 19/48	Plenary debate on Budget 2020 for Ministry of Foreign affairs
8 November 2018	Plenarprotokoll 19/61	Plenary debate on The rejection of the two percent NATO metric
17 January 2019	Plenarprotokoll 19/74	Plenary debate on State of play EU and Ger-FR special bond
4 April 2019	Plenarprotokoll 19/92	Plenary debate on 70 Year NATO
5 April 2019	Plenarprotokoll 19/93	Plenary debate on Equipment exports to Yemen war
12 April 2019	Plenarprotokoll 19/96	Plenary debate on Role of EU in the world
9 May 2019	Plenarprotokoll 19/98	Plenary debate on Enhancing the Bundeswehr

16 May 2019	Plenarprotokoll 19/101	Plenary debate on Treaty on cooperation between Germany and France
27 June 2019	Plenarprotokoll 19/107	Plenary debate on Losing citizenship upon entering a terrorist organisation
11 September 2019	Plenarprotokoll 19/111	Plenary debate on Budget 2020 for Ministry of Foreign affairs
27 November 2019	Plenarprotokoll 19/130	Plenary debate on Budget 2020 for Ministry of Defence