

The Most European Nation?

The German elite and people's perceptions on the enlacement of European Integration and German interests



Contents

Contents	2
Prologue A <i>Rechtsruck</i> goes through Europe	3
The European Echo.....	4
An elitist conception?	5
Where the elite meets the people.....	6
New perceptions	7
1 A first <i>Schritt</i>	9
Adenauer's part-nation.....	10
The West German consciousness	12
Ein Partner Westeuropas	14
2 A European future: East or West?.....	15
Renewing the European endeavour.....	16
A completely changed world.....	17
The other half	18
Identity issues.....	20
3 A case for reciprocity	21
Emotional politics	22
One good turn deserves another	23
Ein Kernziel deutscher Europapolitik	24
Good neighbours	25
Epilogue The most European nation?	28
Sources and bibliography.....	30
List of abbreviations.....	32
Appendix Review Report Marjon Riehl.....	33

Prologue

A Rechtsruck goes through Europe

When on the evening of Sunday 25 May the 2014 European Parliamentary election results were announced, Europe saw a heated discussion on the meaning of the outcome of the vote. Most prominently arose the question whether these results implied a choice 'for or against Europe', especially because the elections, timed in an altogether turbulent period for the Union, saw an impressive advancement of euroskeptic parties.¹ Even though most analysts agreed that Europe had taken a shift to the right, the meaning and consequences of this shift remain debated on. The German newspaper *Zeit* ventured to cast its judgment on this 'Rechtsruck'² in Germany, where 'jeder fünfte Wähler' voted 'für eine EU-kritische Partei',³ and where, at the same time, the *Bundeskanzlerin* has claimed that 'European policy is the same as [German] domestic policy.'⁴

Much of Germany's share of 'EU-kritische' votes can be attributed to Bern Lucke's 'Alternative für Deutschland' (AfD), which saw its effectiveness and impact increase through an advance of 7 out of 96 German seats in the European Parliament. Similarly to euroskeptic parties elsewhere, Lucke exclaims a popular desire for a 'Europe of nation states' as opposed to a 'federal Europe' that is held together by 'the Brussels bureaucracy'. Most importantly, however, the AfD directs its skepticism towards the euro, often emphasizing the 'potential future costs to Germany of underwriting multi-billion euro bailouts to Greece and other stricken eurozone members.'⁵

That this message has gained support only a few years after Polish Foreign Minister Radek Sikorski historically appealed to Germany to take the lead out of the Eurocrisis⁶ seems to imply a partial German unwillingness to do so. Philipp Ritz, chairman of the Junge Alternative underwrites this by his defense of the AfD: 'Doing

¹ Philip Oltermann, 'Germany: Merkel's CDU wins European election despite worst ever result' (version 25 May 2014), <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2014/may/25/germany-merkel-cdu-win-european-election> (10 June 2014).

² *Zeit*, 'Ein Rechtsruck geht durch Europa' (version 27 May 2014), <http://www.zeit.de/video/2014-05/3588923562001/europawahl-ein-rechtsruck-geht-durch-europa#autoplay> (10 June 2014).

³ Ludwig Greven, 'Die EU muss jetzt springen' (version 6 June 2014), <http://www.zeit.de/politik/deutschland/2014-06/europa-ulrich-beck-interview> (16 June 2014).

⁴ M. Segers, *Het waagstuk Europa. Nederland en de grote Europese vraagstukken van vandaag* (Amsterdam 2014, digital edition).

⁵ Stefan Wagstyl, 'Germany's anti-euro party AfD breaks national taboos' (version 22 May 2014), <http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/6a6705ac-db84-11e3-a460-00144feabdc0.html#axzz349kPPLCd> (16 June 2014).

⁶ In a 'remarkable speech in Berlin' on 28 November 2011, Radek Sikorski historically exclaimed: 'I demand of Germany that, for your sake and for ours, you help [the euro zone] survive and prosper. You know full well that nobody else can do it. I will probably be the first Polish foreign minister in history to say so, but here it is: I fear German powerless than I am beginning to fear German inactivity.' *Economist*, 'Poland's appeal to Germany' (version 29 November 2011), <http://www.economist.com/blogs/easternapproaches/2011/11/polands-appeal-germany> (4 June 2014).

something in the interests of Germany always led in the past to accusations of rightwing extremism. But the AfD does want policies which are for Germany.⁷ To a significant part of the German population, German and European interests, it seems, are no longer inevitably and obviously enlaced.

The European Echo

Previously, the enlacement of German and European interests had been rather taken for granted, ever since Germany's first *Bundeskanzler* Konrad Adenauer introduced and championed it in the form of *Westbindung*. Having inherited from the Allied drawing-board the 'first blueprint for the [Bundesrepublik Deutschland]' in the form of the *Frankfurter Dokumente* and the approved *Grundgesetz*,⁸ it became clear that if it were to exist, the BRD would have to live up to its appellation of *West Germany*. Konrad Adenauer, as Germany's first postwar Chancellor, thus took it upon him to bind 'West Germany militarily and economically to the West'⁹, for this seemed the only way in which to regain sovereignty for the Allied arrangement that the BRD was.

That this quest for sovereignty through *Westbindung* 'immediately' took a European turn can be ascribed to several developments.¹⁰ Not only was the 1948 Hague Congress on Europe the 'first major international meeting' where German representatives again seated 'as free and equal partners', but the consequent Council of Europe was the 'first body in which the West German State became a full and equal member'.¹¹ Dubbed by Adenauer as 'ein sehr wichtiger Schritt auf dem Wege zur Erlangung der Souveränität',¹² it was this latter development especially that established to the Chancellor the European turn as the route towards German recovery.

⁷ Ludwig Greven, 'Die EU muss jetzt springen' (version 6 June 2014), <http://www.zeit.de/politik/deutschland/2014-06/europa-ulrich-beck-interview> (16 June 2014).

⁷ Stefan Wagstyl, 'Germany's anti-euro party AfD breaks national taboos' (version 22 May 2014), <http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/6a6705ac-db84-11e3-a460-00144feabdc0.html#axzz349kPPLCd> (16 June 2014).

⁸ M. Segers, *Reis naar het continent. Nederland en de Europese integratie, 1950 tot heden* (Amsterdam 2013) 45.

⁹ A. Glees, *Reinventing Germany. German Political Development since 1945* (Oxford 1996) xxii.

¹⁰ Garton Ash describes the European turn as the first 'ladder out of the morass' that post-Yalta Germany was, claiming that the supposed second ladder was the BRD's connection with the United States. Adenauer is said to have 'repeatedly insisted on West Germany's need of the United States to counterbalance the Soviet Union in the centre of Europe'. T. Garton Ash, *In Europe's Name* (New York 1993) 21.

As Segers sets out, however, the United States European policy had revolted under the insight that 'the German issue wasn't an occupation issue, but a European question'. The United States' first and foremost priority was European unity and stability: 'priority was now the founding of a West German state to enable such West European unity, and buttress it politically, and ... economically.' M. Segers, *Reis naar het continent*, 44.

The United States ladder thus turned out to be more of a detour to the European turn.

¹¹ T. Garton Ash, *In Europe's Name*, 21.

¹² Konrad Adenauer, *Erinnerungen 1945-1953* (Stuttgart 1965) 465.

More fundamentally even, the European turn was enshrined in the *Grundgesetz*, in that it was drafted 'von dem Willen beseelt, als gleichberechtigtes Glied in einem vereinten Europe dem Frieden der Welt zu dienen'.¹³ This association of German and European interests quickly incorporated within West German politics, where over the next few decades could be heard the echo of *Bundespräsident* von Weizsäcker's words that 'to work by peaceful means for European unity is above all a matter for the Germans'.¹⁴ Accordingly, 'German foreign policy was always and simultaneously "European Peace policy"'.¹⁵

An elitist conception?

The West German political elite certainly has been identifying with this entanglement of German and European interests. Current Chancellor Angela Merkel has explained time and again the European policy equates German policy, while exuding to her fellow Germans that the BRD 'views European unity as a reason of its existence'.¹⁶ The most recent European Parliamentary election results make one wonder, however, to what extent this perception is, and was, shared by the German people. According to German Sociologist Ulrich Beck Heading, the European Parliamentary election results first and foremost uncover a German vote for 'ein Europe der Burger, nicht der Eliten',¹⁷ thereby implying that German citizens and German elite hold different perceptions on what 'European integration' should entail. Figures supporting this statement come from the 1996 Eurobarometer survey of the general population, which, when compared with the Top Decision-Makers Survey of elite attitudes towards European integration, reveal a Europe-wide elite-public gap of favourable perceptions on European integration. Strikingly, this elite-public gap is significantly larger in Germany than in other EU member states.¹⁸

Quite recently, it seems, the German people have failed to identify with the elitist agreement that 'the only opportunity left to Germany [after 1945] was to play the Western game, to be the most European nation among the Europeans, and to translate Germany's geostrategic position into political negotiating power.'¹⁹ If this holds true, and the German people indeed do not recognize their fate as enlaced within Europe, what implications does this have for the proffered role of German leadership out of the Eurocrisis? As Germany scholar Anthony Glees contends, anno 1996 'the German people themselves ... almost certainly still do not want the new role as the motor of European political change.'²⁰ The question that arises then, is how such a public mentality can be reconciled with the obvious endorsement that the

¹³ M. Segers, *Het waagstuk Europa*, digital edition.

¹⁴ Said by the sixth *Bundespräsident* Richard von Weizsäcker, from T. Garton Ash, *In Europe's Name*, 19.

¹⁵ Coined and oft repeated by Hans-Dietrich Genscher, from T. Garton Ash, *In Europe's Name*, 20.

¹⁶ M. Segers, *Het waagstuk Europa*, digital edition.

¹⁷ Ludwig Greven, 'Die EU muss jetzt springen' (version 6 June 2014), <http://www.zeit.de/politik/deutschland/2014-06/europa-ulrich-beck-interview> (16 June 2014).

¹⁸ S. Hix, *The Political System of the European Union* (London 2005) 165.

¹⁹ T. Garton Ash, *In Europe's Name*, 21.

²⁰ A. Glees, *Reinventing Germany*, xiii.

European project has received among the German elite. Moreover, having lived up to its appellation, the German *Bundesrepublik* has been 'about as solid a bourgeois liberal democracy as you can find on earth.'²¹ Thus, at some times at least, the BRD elite that has been championing European integration must have enjoyed the majority of the people's electoral support.

It therefore follows that in offering an explanation to what seems to have changed recently, we need to set out the development over time of both the German elite and people's perception on European integration, and, more importantly the reconciliation German interests with this project. When have the German elite and people been in line on European integration, and when have they diverged? Moreover, what have been the motivations for such concords or discords? And, ultimately, how can we extend these findings to the present-day situation?

Where the elite meets the people

To answer these questions, this paper will compare the German people and elite on European integration and its enlacement with German interests by means of recounting their discourses in the *Bundestag* ratification debates of several landmark treaties of European integration. The creation of the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC), the establishment of the European Atomic Energy Community (EURATOM) and an associated Economic Community (EEC) and the founding of the European Union (EU) will serve as focal points in an analysis of the 'ensembles of ideas, concepts, narratives, or categories'²² that both the *Bundeskanzler* and the *Abgeordneten*, respectively the elite and people, have formulated and perceived European integration and its German enlacement to be.²³

The choice of these key events as the background of a discursive analysis of German elite-people contestations of European integration is steered by the significance of these events for the European project, but even more so by the timing of these events in relation to massive political changes in Germany. Whereas the creation of the ECSC occurred in the aftermath of the founding of the BRD, EURATOM and the EEC were established in the wake of the entry into force of the

²¹ T. Garton Ash, 'The New German Question' (version 15 August 2013), <http://www.nybooks.com/articles/archives/2013/aug/15/new-german-question/> (2 June 2014).

²² Sternberg defines discourses as 'ensembles of ideas, concepts, narratives, or categories through which meaning is given to social as well as physical phenomena'. C. Schrag Sternberg, *The Struggle for EU Legitimacy. Public Contestation 1950-2005* (New York 2013), 2.

I use the term 'discourses' in accordance with this definition.

²³ In focusing on the *Bundestag* ratification debates, the elite perception is held to be the perception of the *Bundeskanzler*, whereas the *Abgeordneten*, as they should, represent the people. I recognize that Parliamentarians could, under some definitions, be counted as elite. Nonetheless, I feel that a comparative analysis based on the *Plenar Protokolle* is able address academically the elite and people's perceptions on European integration in it focuses on the sole platform on which both these classes have systematically discussed, argued, agreed and disagreed on the entanglement of German interests in European integration. This not only lends for a sense of continuity (of time and quality), but also trumps other available primary source material in that it provides for a qualitative rather than quantitative analysis of popular attitudes towards European integration.

Deutschlandvertrag.²⁴ Most notably, of course, the founding of the European Union has been presented in harmony with the reunification of Germany. Because of this coinciding of European integration progress and German political changes, these events serve brilliantly in highlighting the elite and people's discourses not merely on European integration, but more specifically on the entanglement of European integration and German interests.

Quite naturally, this specific emphasis on the reconciliation of European and German interests has steered the research of this thesis towards the comparative analysis of the Bundestag ratification debates. Following the 'two-level game' theory of political scientist Robert Putnam, the ratification marks the moment at which the tentative treaties gear from the international to the domestic dimension, from heads of state to people's representation. It is at this moment that 'domestic interests' and the way they are (or aren't) served in the treaties come under scrutiny, which appoints by nature these ratification debates as the starting point of an analysis of the enlacement of German domestic interests in the European framework.²⁵

New perceptions

This gearing between dimensions marks the difference of this thesis as compared to other research into public and elite discourses on European integration. In their own right, these discourses have recently received quite some attention.²⁶ As European integration researcher Claudia Sternberg rightfully points out, however, the available literature 'quantifies, categorizes, and causally explains popular attitudes to matters European', which makes 'this research ... fundamentally limited to the questions asked in the polls'.²⁷ More importantly, such research is typically contemporarily focused, and thus fails to provide insight in the over-time development of discourses on European integration. Moreover, as the focus in much of this research lies with either the public or elite attitude towards European integration, the opportunity to exude on when and how these concord and discord is oft missed. Through a 'non-quantitative, interpretive textual analysis' Sternberg herself attempts to provide insight in the dynamics of the construction and contestation of elitist and public discourses on European integration.²⁸ However, because her analysis aims to 'historically reconstruct changing discursive landscapes of competing ideas on what constitutes legitimacy in the case of the EU', she focuses 'on the *content* of discourses rather than the actors advancing them'.²⁹

²⁴ M. Segers, *Reis naar het continent*, 317.

²⁵ R. Putnam, 'Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games', *International Organization* 42 (Summer, 1988) 427-460, 434.

²⁶ In her introduction, Sternberg refers for an overview of such research to S. B. Hobolt 'Public Opinion and Integration', in E. Jones, A. Menon and S. Weatherill (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of the European Union* (Oxford 2012) 716-33.

²⁷ C. Schrag Sternberg, *The Struggle for EU Legitimacy*, 7-8.

²⁸ *Ibidem*, 8.

²⁹ *Ibidem*, 2-3

It is through my focus on both the actors *and* their content that I attempt to address the lacuna of literature on the contestation or otherwise between German elite and mass attitudes towards European integration. A well-balanced comparison such as presented in this paper will not only shed light on both discourses, their historical development and their relation to each other, but will also enable a clearer understanding on the differing perceptions of German interest in European integration anno 2014 and beyond. Before we get there, however, first we need to go back in time.

1

A first Schritt

It is February 1945 when Red Army Marshal Georgy Zhukov's march on Berlin signals the definite turn of the tides on the once seemingly invincible German Führer.³⁰ It is at this time that President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Prime Minister Winston Churchill and General Secretary Joseph Stalin reconvene their negotiations on future postwar Europe, once again placing the continent on the drawing-board. At what will later be referred to as the Yalta conference (4 - 11 February), the Big Three proceed their bargaining on Central Europe, crowning their agreement on the Polish post-war borders earlier in Tehran with the decision to, after the war, divide up aggressor Germany and its capital Berlin among the allied forces.³¹ ³² Within post-war geopolitical realities, this supposed provisional solution would soon prove to be rather more permanent.³³ Insurmountable ideological disagreements between the Western allies and the Soviet Union implied the continuation into the foreseeable future of the initially temporary division of Germany, and with it the division of Europe.

Despite - or because of - the gradually emerging concretization of the provisional solution, the European fissure and its German fault-line remained a trap especially to the American Allies. Seeking to (economically) rebuild post-war Europe by offering economic aid in the form of Marshall's European Recovery Program, the Americans were attempting to bolster the continent against the communist danger and Soviet threat. Yet the German Problem and its provisional status within Yalta continued to pose a barrier to Western cooperation and unity. That was, until one of Marshall's advisers managed to turn the case round, defining the German problem not as a question of (Allied) occupation, but as a European question.³⁴ Viewing the issue not from a divided Germany, but from West-European unity, enabled not only the neutralization of the German threat through its encapsulation in (West European) unity, but also presented the engine to what was to be the European economic recovery.³⁵

It is within these visions of West-European unity that the *Frankfurter Dokumente*, the first 'drafts' for the *Bundesrepublik Deutschland* (BRD) that was to buttress European unity politically and economically, came into being on 1 July 1948.³⁶ When in 1949 the *Grundgesetz*, which was rooted within the same vision, was

³⁰ Michael Ivanovich Traktuyev, 'The Red Army's Drive into Poland', in: Sir Basil Liddell Hart (ed.), *Purnell's History of the Second World War* (Hatfield 1981), vol.18, 1920-1929.

³¹ U.S. Department of State, 'MILESTONES: 1937-1945: The Tehran Conference, 1943', <http://history.state.gov/milestones/1937-1945/tehran-conf> (30 April 2014).

³² W. Hitchcock, *The Struggle for Europe. The turbulent history of a divided continent, 1945 to the present* (New York 2003) 19.

³³ T. Garton Ash, *In Europe's Name*, 1.

³⁴ M. Segers, *Reis naar het continent*, 44.

³⁵ *Ibidem*.

³⁶ M. Segers, *Het waagstuk Europa*, digital edition.

approved and the first free elections had been held in the West-German state, the *Weststaatsgründung* of the BRD was complete.³⁷ European unity had become the state's *raison d'être*: if it were to exist, the BRD would have to live up to its appellation of *West Germany*.

Adenauer's part-nation

That the BRD as a state was a provisional arrangement was most painfully clear to its first *Bundeskanzler*. Christian Democrat Konrad Adenauer had found himself the head of state of a partitioned Germany that, after 1945, was not only physically and morally degraded, but, still being occupied by the Allied Forces, also 'totally deprived of sovereignty'.³⁸ Besides the physical and moral restoration of the BRD, Adenauer thus sought, first and foremost, the 'recovery of sovereignty'. Quite straightforwardly, Adenauer's design became to 'persuade' the Western powers to 'grant the Federal Republic the status of equal partner,' thereby removing 'the formal barriers to equality as soon as possible'.³⁹ The direction that this courting of Western powers should take was laid down before the German *Bundestag* on 20 September 1949, when Adenauer – quite in line with the context of the BRD's founding – exclaimed that one of the 'main themes of his domestic policy' was 'to take part in the measures to promote European integration.'⁴⁰

It was in character, therefore, that when the French minister of Foreign Affairs Robert Schuman proposed to manage jointly and democratically the French and German (and other nations wishing to join) Coal- and steel industries in a supranational European institution, he was met with Adenauer's enthusiasm.⁴¹ Adenauer's welcoming of a plan towards the regional integration of continental West Europe was hardly unexpected, seeing as this envisagement 'corresponded to ideas he had held ever since Weimar times'⁴² that such continental grouping was the 'best guarantee' for the 'freedom and stability' of West Europe and 'die große Hoffnung' for Germany and Europe.⁴³ Despite it being about economic matters, the German Chancellor thus very clearly defined Schuman's plan as 'eminently political',⁴⁴ and consequently greeted the revolutionary proposal towards supranational communality as 'einen entscheidenden Schritt zu einer engen Verbindung Deutschlands mit Frankreich und damit zu einer neuen, auf der Grundlage friedlicher Zusammenarbeit aufgebauten Ordnung in Europa.'⁴⁵

The great 'Hoffnung' for Germany that Adenauer saw contained in Schuman's plan originated both from Germany's past, and from the constitutional consequences

³⁷ M. Segers, *Reis naar het continent*, 46.

³⁸ T. Garton Ash, *In Europe's Name*, 20.

³⁹ A. Glees, *Reinventing Germany*, 98.

⁴⁰ *Ibidem*, 101.

⁴¹ M. Segers, *Reis naar het continent*, 71.

⁴² A. Glees, *Reinventing Germany*, 103.

⁴³ *Ibidem*, 77.

⁴⁴ A. Glees, *Reinventing Germany*, 103.

⁴⁵ M. Segers, *Reis naar het continent*, 75.

the country bore as a result: 'Wir Deutschen', mused Adenauer in his memoirs, 'durften nicht vergessen, was sich in den Jahren von 1933 bis 1945 bei uns abgespielt hatten, welches Unglück durch die nationalsozialistische Regierung über die ganze Welt, insbesondere die Staaten Europas, hereingebrochen war.' The Germans, he concluded, 'mußten ... darüber im klaren sein, daß [sie] infolge des totalen Zusammenbruchs ohne Macht waren.' It was this war legacy which shaped most of all Adenauer's outlook on the BRD's foreign policy. '[U]m fortschreitend mehr staatliche Macht zu erlangen,' the BRD was to recognize that Europe's 'Vertrauen nur langsam, Schritt für Schritt, wiedergewonnen werden konnte'.⁴⁶ Such trust, the Chancellor maintained, could be established by binding the BRD into a European community such as the one Schuman had suggested.

It would be short-sighted, however, to conclude like some historians that this vision implied that the BRD's politics 'were always western, more than they were German.'⁴⁷ It was precisely in this participation in a West European community through the yielding of some of the 'traditional authority and powers of a nation-state', that Adenauer saw a way for the BRD to 'recover such authority and powers'.⁴⁸ Markedly, the Chancellor explained his conviction that through binding the BRD to European initiatives 'die Revision des Besatzungsstatuts, die bald fällig sei, viel großzügiger ausfallen werde'.⁴⁹ More specifically, German participation in the Schuman initiative would mark '[das] ersten Mal seit dem Zusammenbruchs' that the BRD 'als gleichberechtigte Vertragspartner mit ... anderen europäischen Staaten zusammen [tretet]',⁵⁰ and was thereby to enhance greatly the fledgling nation's geopolitical position. Thus developed the enlacement of German sovereignty with European integration as Adenauer's vision towards equal statehood for the part-nation that the BRD was.

As Schuman's initiative had been based first and foremost upon the orientation of the French and German economic relations towards peaceful cooperation, the Chancellor's endorsement of the plan opened the way to treaty negotiations in Paris. Being open to 'tous les pays attachés à un régime de liberté et conscients de leur solidarité',⁵¹ the French and Germans were joined in these negotiations by Italy and the Benelux, and by March 1951 the Six presented their draft treaty for the European Coal and Steel Community.⁵² With its signature on 18 April 1951, Europe's former adversaries France and the BRD, as well as the Benelux and Italy, embarked on what was to be 'ein neuer Abschnitt der europäischen

⁴⁶ Konrad Adenauer, *Erinnerungen 1945-1953* (Stuttgart 1965) 246.

⁴⁷ This contention is held by Anthony Glees, among others, in A. Glees, *Reinventing Germany*, 99.

⁴⁸ T. Garton Ash, *In Europe's Name*, 21.

⁴⁹ Konrad Adenauer, *Erinnerungen 1945-1953*, 331.

⁵⁰ *Deutscher Bundestag*, 184. Sitzung, Bonn, Freitag, den 11. Januar 1952, 7817.

⁵¹ M. Segers, *Reis naar het continent*, 75.

⁵² A. Glees, *Reinventing Germany*, 103.

Geschichte'.⁵³ Before this new phase of cooperation instead of contestation would be implemented, however, the treaty required national ratification.

The West German consciousness

In the BRD that task of ratification was handled by the *Erster Bundestag*, in which Adenauer's CDU/CSU had gained a majority of seats only narrowly.⁵⁴ Forming a coalition with the FDP and the DP, the first *Bundesregierung* was met with a strong socialist opposition. Following this division, at a first glance the *Bundestag* ratification debate of the ECSC treaty on 11 January 1952 seems to organize along these lines of *Regierung* and opposition: whereas *Abgeordneten* of the government parties one-by-one exclaimed their support of the treaty, the opposition dutifully accounted for its to be cast 'no'. The communists of the KPD spoke especially close to their scripts, claiming that the ECSC treaty was quintessentially 'ein Pakt der europäischen Kanonenkönige, Kriegsgewinnler und Kriegsverbrecher gegen die Völker Europa.'⁵⁵

A closer reading of the *Plenarprotokoll* reveals a whole lot more, however, and lets us shine a light upon the ways in which the *Abgeordneten* defined German interests in relation to the historical ECSC treaty. For if one thing springs out from the transcript of this tumultuous ratification debate, it is the vital importance that the *Abgeordneten* allotted to the European treaty's function to German interests. Most dramatically this manifested halfway through the debate, when the SPD stormed the pulpit behind which Adenauer had just explained that 'wenn sechs Länder zusammensetzen, da unmöglich etwas herauskommen kan, was allen bis zum letzten Rest gefällt.'⁵⁶ The Chancellor's notion that the international treaty might not maximally serve German national interests went down the Socialists' wrong throats.

Even though national interests were very clearly on the minds of all those present, the way in which German issues were defined in relation to the ECSC treaty differed greatly. Within these differences, however, there can be found a pattern according to which those definitions can be categorized along different themes. Most notably, in the presentation of either the 'Verflechtung' or 'Entflechtung' of German interests with the European treaty, themes of sovereignty, war debt and reunification are the most recurrent. The first two stand out in particular, as these are the exact themes along which Chancellor Adenauer had defined the enlacement of German interests and European integration.

Strikingly, though, the interpretation of the effects of the treaty on these themes seems diametrically opposed. On the one hand there is the agreement with the Chancellor's line of reasoning, as notably carried out by fellow party member Heinrich von Brentano, who maintains that the ECSC is the first 'Gemeinschaft' in which the BRD would participate as a 'Partner mit gleichen Rechten und gleichen

⁵³ Konrad Adenauer, *Erinnerungen 1945-1953* (Stuttgart 1965) 423.

⁵⁴ Wahlrecht, 'Ergebnisse der Bundestagswahlen' (version 27 October 2013), <http://www.wahlrecht.de/ergebnisse/bundestag.htm> (25 June 2014).

⁵⁵ *Deutscher Bundestag*, 184. Sitzung, 7792.

⁵⁶ *Deutscher Bundestag*, 184. Sitzung, 7817.

Pflichten.⁵⁷ The restoration of constitutional equality, he continues, is supposedly an inevitable result within the framework of the treaty. This contention gets support from the FDP, who wholeheartedly agree that the ECSC marks 'der Anfang einer europäischen Gemeinschaft von Gleichen unter Gleichen.'⁵⁸ Such exclams are taunted, on the other hand, by SPD's Erich Ollenhauer, who questions the treaty on the grounds that 'am Ausgangspunkt die staats- und völkerrechtliche Position des Bundesrepublik nicht klar gemacht [ist].'⁵⁹

This disputable status, the SPD leader concludes, disables him and his party to consider the ECSC treaty as a framework for a solution to the 'tragischen Abschnitt in der Geschichte' that was the first half of the twentieth century in Europe.⁶⁰ When Ollenhauer appeals to the *Bundestag* to vote against the treaty on the grounds that 'Europa und die Welt' should respect that 'dieses deutsche Volk und diese Bundesrepublik bei der Behandlung solcher internationaler Verträge in einer viel schwierigeren Position ist als irgendein anderes Land mit klaren staats- und völkerrechtlichen Beziehungen,'⁶¹ he is, however, dismissed by the CDU. As it is Germany that bears the onus to that tragic chapter in the European history, Von Brentano counters, it is Germany too that should abate Europe's 'tiefem Mißtrauen gegenüber dem deutschen Volk' by delivering 'einen Beweis für ihre europäische Gesinnung und für ihren Willen zur Gemeinschaft mit anderen Völkern.'⁶² The Christian Democrat takes it one step further, even, when in hindsight he envisions that the ratification of a Schumanplan 25 years back would have spared 'Millionen in den Jahren 1939 bis 1945'.⁶³ Looking ahead, his fellow party member Luise Rehling divines that, 'wenn es uns gelingt, hier zum ersten Mal die punktierten Ländergrenzen auszulöschen, dann wird es uns auch gelingen, die Tränen der Mütter in Europa zu trocknen.'⁶⁴

It is visions like these that won over doubtful opposing *Abgeordneten* like Hans Tichi from the BHE/GD towards framing the ECSC treaty as 'der erste und entscheidende Schritt für den Aufbau eines wirtschaftlich und politische freien Deutschlands und geeinten Europas'.⁶⁵ What exactly entails such a politically free Germany is not directly expounded on, but once again it becomes clear that, albeit diagonally, this German objective too is framed vis-à-vis European Integration. Von Brentano, in the one camp, is 'der festen Überzeugung daß die Zwangsläufigkeit der [europäische] Entwicklung ... uns weiterführen wird zu einer echten Integration der freien Völker Europas einschließlich eines freien ungeteilten Deutschland'.⁶⁶ The SPD

⁵⁷ *Deutscher Bundestag*, 184. Sitzung, 7804.

⁵⁸ *Deutscher Bundestag*, 184. Sitzung, 7799.

⁵⁹ *Deutscher Bundestag*, 184. Sitzung, 7799.

⁶⁰ *Deutscher Bundestag*, 184. Sitzung, 7797.

⁶¹ *Ibidem*.

⁶² *Deutscher Bundestag*, 184. Sitzung, 7815.

⁶³ *Deutscher Bundestag*, 184. Sitzung, 7809.

⁶⁴ *Deutscher Bundestag*, 184. Sitzung, 7827

⁶⁵ *Ibidem*.

⁶⁶ *Deutscher Bundestag*, 184. Sitzung, 7810.

fraction, in the other camp, holds fast to its conviction that any such developments in an international framework require the preceding of 'sichere Grundlage hinsichtlich die deutschen staatrechtlichen und völkerrechtlichen Stellung.'⁶⁷

Ein Partner Westeuropas

The majority of the *Bundestag*, however, sided with Adenauer on the issue, agreeing with the Chancellor that on account of their consent to the ECSC treaty the German geopolitical position would vastly improve, and 'diese Zunahme an politischem Gewicht ist ein sehr wesentliches Moment bei dem Ringen um die deutsche Einheit.'⁶⁸ Surprisingly, however, it is this improvement of the German geopolitical position first and foremost, rather than the possible consequent German reunification that the *Abgeordneten* define as 'das nationale deutsche Interesse'⁶⁹ that benefits from an enlacement with European integration. It seems that the 'genius' that is attributed to Adenauer for his vision that the 'emergence of Germany as a political force had to be identified with the pattern of cooperation that was established in the Western world', should be attributed as well to the majority of his *Bundestag*.⁷⁰

Like the Chancellor, the *Abgeordneten* had recognized that, 'despite being about economic matters', Schuman's plan was 'eminently political'.⁷¹ This is most notable in the themes along which the parliamentarians defined the German interests in the ECSC treaty: a discussion centered on German economic interests in the treaty was conspicuous by its absence. Rather, it was based on the supposed consequence of the approval of the treaty that 'der Allieerten' would view them as 'der Partner Deutschland - denn wir sind ein Partner Westeuropas geworden!'⁷² that with 232 'Ja' against 143 'Nein'⁷³ votes the *Bundestag* ratified the *Gründung der Europäischen Gemeinschaft für Kohle und Stahl*.

Despite this convincing enlacement of German power political interests with European integration, however, the BRD's geopolitical position would remain an issue for the years to come, and would prove again to be a major theme in the run up to the ratification of Europe's next *Schritt* towards integration: the European Atomic Energy Community and an associated Economic Community.

⁶⁷ *Deutscher Bundestag*, 184. Sitzung, 7798.

⁶⁸ *Deutscher Bundestag*, 184. Sitzung, 7819.

⁶⁹ *Deutscher Bundestag*, 184. Sitzung, 7795.

⁷⁰ W. E. Paterson, 'The Chancellor and Foreign Policy', in Stephen Padgett (ed.), *Adenauer to Kohl. The Development of the German Chancellorship* (London 1994) 127-56, 142.

⁷¹ A. Glees, *Reinventing Germany*, 103.

⁷² *Deutscher Bundestag*, 184. Sitzung, 7818

⁷³ *Deutscher Bundestag*, 184. Sitzung, 7836.

A European future: East or West?

Regardless of its revolutionary nature, it had become clear quite early on that merely the European Coal and Steel Community could not abate German – and European – geopolitical uncertainties. This had crystallized most painfully already in the summer of 1950, when the North-Korean invasion of its southern counterpart demonstrated once again the realities of the Cold War, and elucidated how poorly equipped West-European cooperation was towards its vagaries.⁷⁴ If the Korean war was any indication of the strife that befell part-nations, a parallel situation in which the West German state should be attacked by their East-German adversaries would leave the BRD and its newly found West-European community ill-prepared. As the intended Patron, this was a thorn in the eye of the Americans especially. In an attempt to prime the European continent and its fledgling West German state against such scenarios, the Americans thus brought to the fore once again the extremely touchy subject of West-German rearmament.

Even though any such attempts towards the rearmament of the BRD were to take place within the U.S.-led NATO, it was the French government that initiated the European Defence Community (EDC) as the *European* framework in which to make possible this rearmament. Within yet another radical envisagement of European cooperation, the French proposed for national army units to be placed under the authority of a supranational institution, to be managed by a European minister of defence. Such a construction, it was thought, would not only prepare the continent against the communist threat, but would simultaneously bridle the historically feared German armed forces.⁷⁵ This embedding of German rearmament within European integration turned the EDC initiative into the prerequisite of the entry into force of the *Deutschlandvertrag*, the treaty that was to provide for the international rehabilitation of the BRD.⁷⁶

The decisive breakthrough for the BRD's sovereignty failed to materialize, however, when in August 1954 the French themselves defeated the EDC in their National Assembly.⁷⁷ Two years after the ratification of the ECSC, it seemed, continental Europe was not ready for yet another ground-breaking step towards integration. It was at this moment that the United Kingdom, which had up to then remained on the sidelines of European initiatives, entered the stage with a more traditional solution to the geopolitical problem that was the BRD.⁷⁸ Proposing to widen the Brussels Treaty by remolding it into the West European Union (WEU), the British intergovernmental initiative facilitated West German admittance into NATO,

⁷⁴ M. Segers, *Reis naar het continent*, 86-87.

⁷⁵ *Ibidem*, 88.

⁷⁶ *Ibidem*.

⁷⁷ T. Garton Ash, *In Europe's Name*, 21.

⁷⁸ M. Segers, *Reis naar het continent*, 103.

and therewith the international rehabilitation of the *Bundesrepublik*.⁷⁹ With the ratification of the WEU and the *Deutschlandvertrag* in May 1955, the BRD became 'a sovereign state in almost every regard'.⁸⁰ A decade after the war, West Germany was again 'among equals in West-Europe and the West'⁸¹, or pretty much so anyway.

With this recovery of sovereignty, Adenauer's *Westbindung* had maintained its credibility, and the BRD could finally shake off some of its constitutional insecurities and restlessness. From that moment onwards, 'any moves' on the West German part were 'only to bring about even greater Western integration'.⁸² Vitally, and strikingly, such moves were oft undertaken with France, the ally that had effectively halted West-German rehabilitation a few years earlier. In Adenauer's Europe, however, West European solidarity remained a priority, a necessity even. 'Ohne die politische Einigung würden die einzelnen Völker Europas untergebene der Supermächte sein,'⁸³ which meant that the protection of the 'cultural values of the Occident'⁸⁴ required such continental solidarity, based first and foremost upon continuous French-German reconciliation.

Renewing the European endeavour

In light of Adenauer's European vision, it came as no surprise that when the wheels of European integration had started spinning again, the Chancellor welcomed its newest initiatives as an opening towards the political unification of the continent. Although the plans towards the European Atomic Energy Community (EURATOM) and an associated European Economic Community (EEC) came from the Benelux rather than the prized French-German axis,⁸⁵ their supposed consequential deepening of continental cooperation struck a right chord with the BRD statesman. That EURATOM and especially the associated EEC were mostly of 'wirtschaftlicher Natur' did not alter Adenauer's positive reception of the initiatives: 'Das Ziel war, Schritt für Schritt die Einigung Europas zu erreichen, und zwar zunächst durch eine Integration auf wirtschaftlichem, dann auf politischem und schließlich auf militärischem Gebiet.'⁸⁶

More decisively, EURATOM and the EEC seemed the furthest-reaching initiatives that the predominantly euroskeptic atmosphere in both Paris and Bonn would allow. The earlier 'Scheitern' of the EDC had not only smoothed the way for French critics of the European project, but had also facilitated 'distinct reservations'

⁷⁹ A. Glees, *Reinventing Germany*, 114.

⁸⁰ Ibidem. The main exceptions towards full sovereignty remained the West German acceptance of the 'rights of Western Allied Forces in West Germany and Berlin and their right to determine the circumstances of German unity.'

⁸¹ M. Segers, *Reis naar het continent*, 106.

⁸² A. Glees, *Reinventing Germany*, 117.

⁸³ Konrad Adenauer, *Erinnerungen 1955-1959* (Stuttgart 1967), 13.

⁸⁴ M. Segers, *Reis naar het continent*, 107.

⁸⁵ Ibidem, 108.

⁸⁶ Konrad Adenauer, *Erinnerungen 1955-1959*, 16.

of the BRD's economics minister Erhard towards further sectorintegration.⁸⁷ In an attempt to appease both these dissenting voices, the next step towards European integration was therefore the proposal of a French-favoured Atomic Community, in association with an Erhard-favoured European common market. Nevertheless, when these proposals were discussed at the 1955 Messina conference of ECSC ministers of foreign affairs, their premature defeat seemed impending anyway due to a lack of enthusiasm among the French and German delegations. It was only through suggesting an 'étude préalable' that the Benelux initiators could scheme around the early floundering of their integration plans.⁸⁸ This compromise of an intergovernmental committee studying the proposals turned out to be a decisive step towards the drafting of the EURATOM and EEC treaties.

When these treaty negotiations threatened to go awry once again because of French-German disagreements over the details of the common market, Adenauer decided to step in. In anticipation of another EDC scenario, the Chancellor had thus far abstained from speaking out his support of the negotiated initiatives. However, not planning on letting petty economic quarrels bog his visions of a politically unified continent, Adenauer signaled his favourable attitude towards EURATOM and the EEC through reconciling the West German wallet with French interests.⁸⁹ Attending his French counterpart President Guy Mollet to the BRD's willingness to pay for the salvation of European integration, the consequent agreement between both gentlemen facilitated the signature of both EURATOM and the EEC – in the form of the Rome treaties – on 27 March 1957.⁹⁰ After their decisive two-man show, Adenauer had now to defend at home the result of his and Mollet's contriving.

A completely changed world

To the West German Chancellor, his motives for plotting with the French president were self-evident. 'Wollten wir Europäer in der völlig veränderten Welt nicht untergehen,' Adenauer maintained, 'so mussten wir aus der veränderten Situation die notwendige Schlussfolgerung ziehen: Der Zusammenschluss Europas war absolut zwingend.'⁹¹ Within the changed geopolitical and geo-economical reality not a single European country – 'auch ein wiedervereinigtes Deutschland nicht' – 'würde für sich allein weder in der Weltwirtschaft noch in der Weltpolitik eine Rolle spielen können, weil es allein viel zu schwach hierzu sein würde.'⁹² Only the 'Zusammenfassung zu einem gemeinsamen europäischen Wirtschaftsraum' could in the long run assure European competitiveness against 'anderen Wirtschaftsgebieten auf der Erde.'

⁸⁷ W. E. Paterson, 'The Chancellor and Foreign Policy', 143.

⁸⁸ M. Segers, *Reis naar het continent*, 116.

⁸⁹ *Ibidem*, 128.

⁹⁰ *Ibidem*, 129.

⁹¹ Konrad Adenauer, *Erinnerungen 1955-1959*, 13.

⁹² Konrad Adenauer, *Erinnerungen 1955-1959*, 266.

Despite such framing of the situation in economic terms, Adenauer very clearly defined these treaties, too, as eminently political.⁹³ The German and European 'Hauptaufgabe', he surmised, is the 'Schaffung der politischen Union',⁹⁴ and even though EURATOM and the EEC treated European 'Zusammenschluss' decidedly economically, Adenauer believed that such economic integration would eventually bring about 'das Ziel' of the political unification of Europe.⁹⁵ The same thing had happened, after all, 'im vorigen Jahrhundert' when the tariffunion brought about 'eine wirtschaftliche und schließlich eine politische Einheit' in Germany.⁹⁶ So even if Adenauer 'beurteilte den Beschluß von Messina mit geteilten Gefühlen' because of its omission of an intended political union, his belief in the unifying qualities of an economic community led him to support both the EEC and EURATOM anyway.⁹⁷ Every 'Schritt' towards European integration was one in the right direction, after all.

That Adenauer by now was planning the BRD's future along the European roadmap caused him to redefine German problems and interests accordingly. Most notably, he argued that German 'Wiedervereinigung' should be treated 'nicht als nationales, sondern als gesamteuropäisches Problem',⁹⁸ thereby upscaling not merely the problem of the German division, but also its solution. Effectively, this was an extension of the 'deutschen Europapolitik', as defined by Adenauer half a decade earlier in response to Schuman's radical proposal towards the ECSC. Then, the Chancellor had argued that the participation in this initiative would be beneficial for eventual negotiations towards unity because of its consequential increase of the German 'politischem Gewicht'.⁹⁹ Five years later, however, Adenauer mused that it would be the 'das Gewicht eines einigen Europas' that was to turn any such negotiations in the favoured direction.¹⁰⁰

The German statesman was convinced: the way ahead was European, and the next stop was the ratification of the Rome treaties. To his *Zweiter Bundestag*, however, this route was not always as self-evident, and neither was the direction.

The other half

When on 5 July 1957 the *Abgeordneten* came together for the *dritte Beratung* on the EEC and EURATOM treaties, the atmosphere couldn't have been more different than at the ECSC ratification debate. Whereas back then Adenauer had been met by a strong SPD opposition, he seemed to have won over their support this time. Erstwhile coalition partners from the FDP, however, now sat defiantly on the other side of the table. Aside from shifts in the internal *Bundestag* relations, what was

⁹³ Similarly to the ECSC treaty, as described in chapter 1.

⁹⁴ Konrad Adenauer, *Erinnerungen 1955-1959*, 30.

⁹⁵ Konrad Adenauer, *Erinnerungen 1955-1959*, 273.

⁹⁶ Konrad Adenauer, *Erinnerungen 1955-1959*, 274.

⁹⁷ Konrad Adenauer, *Erinnerungen 1955-1959*, 30.

⁹⁸ Konrad Adenauer, *Erinnerungen 1955-1959*, 252.

⁹⁹ *Deutscher Bundestag*, 184. Sitzung, 7819.

¹⁰⁰ Konrad Adenauer, *Erinnerungen 1955-1959*, 253.

strikingly different now as opposed to five years earlier, was the tone of the debate. These *Abgeordneten* seemed to have done with dramatics, not only in their reactions to one another – no more storming of the Chancellor, neither rudely interrupting other *Abgeordneten* – but most decisively in framing the debate itself. Back then, the necessity of the so-dubbed first *Schritt* towards Europe was explained, or at least understood, from a frame of German war-debt and the constitutional consequences that the country bore as a result. A *Schritt* and a *Deutschlandvertrag* later, any such feelings of German atonement for its rampant history remained remarkably absent. Rather, it was the ‘europäische Zukunft’ that the *Abgeordneten* spoke of.¹⁰¹

That not everyone agreed on what the European future entailed, was hardly a surprise. The theme on which this disagreement pivoted, however, definitely was. In discussing ‘die großen Ziele’ of European unification, there clearly formed two camps. *Abgeordneten* from the CDU and SPD, on the one hand, positively welcomed ‘die Entstehung der Europäischen Wirtschaftsgemeinschaft und der Europäischen Atomgemeinschaft’ as ‘das bedeutsamste Ereignis ... das die europäische Politik seit Jahren zu verzeichnen hat.’¹⁰² Across the table, on the other hand, *Abgeordneten* from the FDP and GB/BHE decidedly received these treaties ‘nicht als europäische Angelegenheit’, since ‘dazu bedürfte es eben eines erheblich größeren Kreises.’¹⁰³ In fact, they added, the treaties would facilitate the ‘Zusammenschluß eines Kleinst-europas’ which would consequently hinder ‘die Bildung eines Gesamteuropas.’¹⁰⁴

Such stark opposition from the FDP towards EEC and EURATOM took the other *Abgeordneten* rather by surprise. If the FDP opposed Western European integration initiatives, ‘warum haben Sie denn der EVG zugestimmt?’ Abg. Mommer asked, voicing the confusion of many a colleague in the *Bundesregierung* parties. Evidently, ‘weil es sich um eine ganz andere Angelegenheit handelte,’ FDP partyleader Dr. Margulles replied. ‘Heute sind wir frei, damals waren wir noch besetztes Land.’¹⁰⁵ With the freedom that the *Deutschlandvertrag* had brought, the FDP argued, the BRD no longer needed to depend on a confined Western European community, and should look instead over its tight borders.¹⁰⁶ The *Bundesregierung*, on the other hand, interpreted the *Deutschlandvertrag* as an affirmation of *Westbindung*, and maintained instead that the BRD’s first and foremost focus should remain on Western European integration. Clearly, coalition and opposition were diametrically opposed on what definition of Europe they were meant to unify.

The antithesis that becomes apparent puts the *Bundesregierung* and the SPD on the one side, defining ‘das Ziel Europa’ as regional and western, with the opposition on the other side envisioning instead the unification of the entire continent, including the ‘forgotten’ eastern half. This seemingly topographical disagreement addresses in

¹⁰¹ *Deutscher Bundestag*, 224. Sitzung, Bonn, Freitag, den 5. Juli 1957, 11315.

¹⁰² *Deutscher Bundestag*, 224 Sitzung, 11315.

¹⁰³ *Deutscher Bundestag*, 224 Sitzung, 11322.

¹⁰⁴ *Deutscher Bundestag*, 224 Sitzung, 11326.

¹⁰⁵ *Deutscher Bundestag*, 224 Sitzung, 11322.

¹⁰⁶ *Deutscher Bundestag*, 224 Sitzung, 11326

fact the political and ideological assumptions underlying the aspirations to unify Europe, as well as the supposed political maneuverability of the BRD through its rehabilitation two years earlier.

Identity issues

It is through such visions concerning the nature of European integration and the BRD's maneuverability within this context that the *Abgeordneten* finally touched upon the enlacement of German interests with the European project. Particularly, they addressed the supposed effects of ratifying EEC and EURATOM vis-à-vis Germany's most fundamental issue, its apportionment and geopolitical division, along similar lines of 'east versus west'. As such, the opposition asked how the *Bundesregierung* 'sich den Wiedervereinigungsmöglichkeiten vorstellt ... wenn die Bundesrepublik Deutschland bereits jahrelang in die europäische Staatenföderation ... eingeschmolzen ist.'¹⁰⁷ They themselves contended that 'die beiden Teile Deutschlands durch den Beitritt Westdeutschlands zu dieser westeuropäischen Gemeinschaften weiter auseinanderleben.'¹⁰⁸ The West German future, they maintained, needn't necessarily be western, as such an orientation reneged the BRD's eastern counterpart, and therewith possibilities towards reunification of both parts German.

The majority of the *Bundestag* did not agree, however. They had seen the workings of Adenauer's *Westbindung*, and they were convinced of its relevance. Hadn't the BRD been rehabilitated within a Western (European) framework? DP *Abgeordnete* Dr. Elbrächter spoke for many when he explained his conviction that 'der Zusammenschluß zu einem Europa unser spezielles Anliegen erleichtern wird ... weil wir dann gemeinsam mit Europa zusammen mit die freien Westen im Grunde genommen ein gleichwertiger Verhandlungspartner sind.'¹⁰⁹

Even though most *Abgeordneten* consequently followed the *Bundesregierung* into voting in favour of both EURATOM and the EEC - thereby passing these treaties successfully -, the ratification debate had very clearly set out that despite agreeing on 'die Einigung Europas', the *Bundestag* could not agree on what Europe to unify. Any such vision of the to be unified continent depended on an idea of how to address Germany's most fundamental issue, its division. It had been rather straightforward to enlance West German interests within a Western Europe, but that entanglement became a lot more problematic when taking into account the interests of the other German, and the other European half. With that, the EEC/EURATOM ratification brought to the fore a dichotomy of identity that was to remain a struggle for the BRD for at least another four decades.

¹⁰⁷ *Deutscher Bundestag*, 224 Sitzung, 11328.

¹⁰⁸ *Deutscher Bundestag*, 224 Sitzung, 11324.

¹⁰⁹ *Deutscher Bundestag*, 224 Sitzung, 11330.

A case for reciprocity

Even though the years after the 1957 ratification debates were far from uneventful – both for matters German and European – the emphasis of our analysis requires us to fast-forward through the following decades, until we arrive at a particularly momentous Thursday in November, 1989. It is at 18.57 on this 9th of November that the East Berlin SED party boss, Günter Schabowski, ‘sofort, unverzüglich’ changed the course of German, European, and World politics, when he effectively opened, by mistake, the concrete solidification of the German division that was the Berlin Wall.¹¹⁰ In the run-up to this tipping point in (East) German events, the BRD had been attempting to come to terms with the tension that had emerged between further West European integration and the search for closer ties with Eastern Europe – particularly with their communist counterpart – while the rest of the world, rather than problematic, had begun to view the initially provisional division of Germany as a permanent, and in fact, convenient solution to the German problem.¹¹¹

Despite decades of reconciliation and integration, the fall of the Berlin Wall and therewith the reemergence of a possibly united Germany mentally catapulted the European continent ‘back to 1945’,¹¹² resurfacing European fears of a German colossus ‘too big and powerful to be balanced by the other Continental powers.’¹¹³ Obviously, things had changed since the end of the World War. Over the course of European integration, the West European states had become dependent on their West German ally and community member as much as the BRD had become dependent on Europe. As the French writer François Mauriac had iconically put it, however, ‘we love Germany so much that we are glad there are two of them.’¹¹⁴

In the chaos ensuing the fall of the Wall, for a short time it seemed that Europe would be granted its wish for the continuance of two Germanies. As the Dutch Ambassador to East Berlin wrote near the end of November 1989, the attempts of the *Deutsche Demokratische Republik* (DDR) to reform economically and politically towards a democratically legitimized state fed the hope that the German division, which had been ‘so beneficial for European stability,’ could become definite.¹¹⁵ It soon became apparent, however, that the Dutch ambassador, and with him many others, had rejoiced too quickly. In their enthusiasm towards the possible

¹¹⁰ Duitslandweb, ‘Chronologie November 1989: De aanloop naar de val van de muur’ (version 10 May 2014), <http://www.duitslandweb.nl/dossiers/overzicht/25-jaar-na-de-val-van-de-muur/chronologie-val-van-de-muur/november-1989.html> (11 June 2014).

¹¹¹ T. Garton Ash, *In Europe's Name*, 24.

¹¹² M. Segers, *Reis naar het continent*, 116.

¹¹³ Daniel Johnson, ‘The folk memory that makes Germany reluctant to act over the euro’ (version 10 November 2011), <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/germany/8881740/The-folk-memory-that-makes-Germany-reluctant-to-act-over-the-euro.html> (5 June 2014).

¹¹⁴ T. Garton Ash, *In Europe's Name*, 24.

¹¹⁵ As quoted from the Dutch Ambassador to East Berlin, Egbert Jacobs, in M. Segers, *Reis naar het continent*, 243.

solidification of the German division, they overlooked a decisive character in the form of Helmut Kohl.

Emotional politics

On 28 November, barely three weeks after the fall of the Berlin Wall, the Christian Democratic West German Chancellor took the initiative in the chaos that had eschewed the deconstruction of Germany's most visible sign of division by launching his so-called 'ten points programme' towards the reunification Germany.¹¹⁶ Kohl's ten points initiative had started out as a characteristically cunning policy mixture that was 'partly a response to developments inside East Germany,' partly 'prompted by the questions of a Soviet emissary,' and partly 'designed to improve the Christian Democrats standing in the opinion polls,' but turned into a passionate plight when, just before Christmas, the Chancellor was greeted in Dresden by 'huge, patriotic crowds literally packing the rooftops and crying out for unity.'¹¹⁷ Once emotionally involved, Kohl became a fierce fighter for Germany's most fundamental cause.

Despite the Chancellor's newfound compelling drive for overcoming the German division, however, he remained sensitive towards European qualms concerning German reunification. And for good reason. The last thing Kohl wanted was to rouse the historically based European 'Mißtrauen gegenüber dem deutschen Volk.'¹¹⁸ Moreover, in living up to his nickname of 'Adenauer's grandson',¹¹⁹ upon his ascension to chancellorship Kohl had similarly defined the unification of Europe as 'das große Ziel'¹²⁰ of his political career.¹²¹ Characteristically, such European aspirations had unfurled especially after the Chancellor's emotional reconciliation with the contemporary French President, François Mitterrand. Mitterrand's spontaneous hand at the seventieth commemoration of the First World War at Verdun had deeply touched Kohl, signifying for him a 'transformation' of their countries' 'political friendship' into a 'friendship between both peoples', and consequently 'unleashing' within the Chancellor his inner 'European'¹²²

Maybe Kohl indeed was a 'Teutonic Romanticist' who could 'utilize his emotions and ... tears', as the Dutch prime minister and fellow Christian Democrat Ruud Lubbers had cynically remarked.¹²³ Nevertheless, it was in combining these emotionally based convictions that the Chancellor followed the 'consensual maxim' of West German policy up to 1989 that German unity could 'only be achieved by

¹¹⁶ Duitslandweb, 'Chronologie November 1989: De aanloop naar de val van de muur' (version 10 May 2014), <http://www.duitslandweb.nl/dossiers/overzicht/25-jaar-na-de-val-van-de-muur/chronologie-val-van-de-muur/november-1989.html> (11 June 2014).

¹¹⁷ T. Garton Ash, *In Europe's Name*, 346.

¹¹⁸ *Deutscher Bundestag*, 184. Sitzung, 7815.

¹¹⁹ M. Segers, *Reis naar het continent*, 213.

¹²⁰ Konrad Adenauer, *Erinnerungen 1955-1959*, 273.

¹²¹ W. E. Paterson, 'The Chancellor and Foreign Policy', 151.

¹²² M. Segers, *Reis naar het continent*, 221.

¹²³ As quoted from the former Dutch prime Minister Ruud Lubbers, in M. Segers, *Reis naar het continent*, 221.

peaceful means' and with the 'agreement [and] support of Germany's neighbors.'¹²⁴ Overcoming the German division, Kohl argued, 'must, and could' take place within the framework of the European community.¹²⁵

One good turn deserves another

So it came about that, when the European 'peace of Yalta' was stirred by the fall of the Berlin Wall and Chancellor Kohl's subsequent ten point brinkmanship, the chilled relations on the continent were relieved through the 1989 Strasbourg resolution which declared German reunification and European integration 'two sides of the same coin'. That this coin turned out to be the common European currency was somewhat of a bitter pill to swallow for the West Germans, proud as they were of their strong and stable *Deutsche Mark*. It had become clear, however, that the BRD's agreement to the preparatory Intergovernmental Conference (IGC) on the Economic and Monetary Union (EMU) – so desired by the French – was the price for the Strasbourg confirmation of the German right to self-determination, and therewith, effectively, reunification.¹²⁶ The enlacement of *Wiedervereinigung* with European integration thus became the catalyst to precisely this process.

On account of the now imminent EMU, the German Chancellor stood his grounds that monetary unification should be accompanied by a political counterpart. Having received the effective 'go' on a common currency, Mitterrand was quite prepared to accommodate Kohl in this wish, and the 'two friends' called for the commencement of a second IGC – towards a European Political Union (EPU).¹²⁷

In the mean time, German reunification was fast approaching. Having consolidated earlier already the support of United States President George Bush, the EC's (slightly parsimonious) consent to German self-determination only left the Soviets to be dealt with. Even though the Soviet Union's opposition to German unity had been 'one of the great "givens" of post-war politics', the empire's 'gathering internal weakness' led it increasingly to move away from that position.¹²⁸ Crucially, the German Chancellor would help the Union's General Secretary, Mikhail Gorbachev, to work out the 'logic of this weakness in a way' which would 'not immediately precipitate a coup by hardliners'. In geopolitical logics, it turned out, billions of *Deutsche Mark* and dollars go a long way. The BRD's massively increased bilateral support to the SU could even abate Soviet objections over a unified Germany's membership to NATO and thereby, in a large part, paved the way for Gorbachev's accord to German reunification.¹²⁹

¹²⁴ T. Garton Ash, *In Europe's Name*, 347.

¹²⁵ A. Glees, *Reinventing Germany*, 242.

¹²⁶ M. Segers, *Reis naar het continent*, 244.

¹²⁷ *Ibidem*, 245.

¹²⁸ W. E. Paterson, 'The Chancellor and Foreign Policy', 153.

¹²⁹ Duitslandweb, 'Internationale goedkeuring: hereniging 1989-1990', http://www.duitslandweb.nl/naslagwerk/Geschiedenis/Hereniging_x003a_+1989-1990/Internationale+goedkeuring.html (24 June 2014).

The DDR's first (and only) free elections on 18 March 1990 had seen the impressive victory of the East-German CDU. Having aligned with several smaller parties in the *Allianz für Deutschland*, the Christian Democrats had strongly supported a swift route to *Wiedervereinigung*. The East-German message in choosing these advocates for reunification was evident. Combined with the Allied assent to Kohl's ten point programme, the election results cleared the road towards a united Germany, which was officiated on 3 October 1990. From now on, the BRD's constitution would apply to the entirety of Germany.¹³⁰ As would soon appear, this included too the German constitution's references to its countries duty '[um] als gleichberechtigtes Glied in einem vereinten Europa dem Frieden der Welt zu dienen'.¹³¹ After all, it was this preamble with which Kohl, now Chancellor of a united Germany, justified his contribution to the successful conclusion of the EMU and EPU IGC's in December 1991. Moreover, when two months later Kohl signed the Maastricht Treaty, the document that recorded legislatively both unions, he pronounced his conviction 'daß with diesem Vertragswerk von Maastricht dem Ziel der Präambel unseres Grundgesetzes ein entscheidendes Stück näher kommen.'¹³²

Ein Kernziel deutscher Europapolitik

After the signing of the Maastricht Treaty, Kohl was rather pleased with himself. In less than three years, the Chancellor had managed to solve Germany's most fundamental issue, its division, in such a way that it was tied up with one of the largest *Schritts* towards European integration. With this enlacement of German interests and the European project, he had delivered on his promise that 'die deutsche Einheit und die europäische Einigung zwei Seiten ein und derselben Medaille waren.' Consequently, 'Maastricht war der Beweis dafür, dass das vereinte Deutschland seine Verantwortung in und für Europa aktiv wahrnahm.'¹³³

To the Chancellor, that 'Verantwortung' was very much historically based. Anyone who could not see this historical basis, 'muß schon die Spanne der Geschichte dieses Jahrhunderts durchschreiten.'¹³⁴ Clearly, similarly to his role-model Adenauer, Kohl pointed towards former German atrocities and the consequent atonement that befell his nation as the reason that 'es vor allem an der Bundesrepublik [liegt], das Überleben der europäischen Einigungswerkes zu sichern.'¹³⁵ The deeper integration between the 'Mitgliedstaaten der Europäischen Gemeinschaft' that made 'ein Ausbrechen und einen Rückfall in nationalstaatliches

¹³⁰ Duitslandweb, 'Vrije verkiezingen en eenwording: hereniging 1989-1990', http://www.duitslandweb.nl/naslagwerk/Geschiedenis/Hereniging_x003a_+1989-1990/Vrije+verkiezingen+en+eenwording.html (24 June 2014).

¹³¹ M. Segers, *Het waagstuk Europa*, digital edition.

¹³² *Deutscher Bundestag*, 126. Sitzung, Bonn, Mittwoch, den 2. Dezember 1992, 10832.

¹³³ Helmut Kohl, *Erinnerungen 1990-1994* (München 2007), 385.

¹³⁴ *Deutscher Bundestag*, 126. Sitzung, 10832.

¹³⁵ Dieter Buhl 'Zwölf im Zwist. Der Zug nach Maastricht steht auf dem Abstellgleis (version 13 November 1992)', <http://www.zeit.de/1992/47/zwoelf-im-zwist> (27 May 2014).

Denken ... unmöglich' had been 'ein Kernziel deutscher Europapolitik.'¹³⁶ Differently from his predecessor, however, Kohl owed his neighbours more than history. After all, 'ohne die feste Einbindung der Bundesrepublik Deutschland in die europäische Integration wäre ... die friedliche Vereinigung unseres Vaterlandes so schnell nicht möglich gewesen.'¹³⁷

Was it this feeling of being indebted to the European Community that made Kohl overlook the Maastricht Treaty's possible shortcomings, such as, for instance, a weak basis for the German-desired political Union? Even though the Treaty's 'Vertragsteil über die Politische Union' had 'vorgezeichnet ... der Weg zur Vollendung der Europäischen Union,' the Chancellor 'hatte [sich] vielleicht noch deutlichere Fortschritte [vorgestellt].'¹³⁸ Despite such musings, however, Kohl maintained that 'das wichtigste war, in Maastricht zum Ziel zu kommen'.¹³⁹ Even if that meant that he had to give in on a political union, an aspect of European integration that had been championed fervently previously by his 'grandfather' Adenauer, and recently by himself. The Maastricht Treaty was, after all, 'ein Kompromiß'.¹⁴⁰

It was characteristic of the Treaty's ratification debate in the *Bundestag* that such a notion could count on approval and applause. Forty years earlier, when explaining that the ECSC treaty was a compromise that might not maximally serve German national interests, enraged *Abgeordneten* had instead stormed Adenauer's pulpit.

Good neighbours

When the *Bundestag* convened on 2 December 1992 to ratify the Maastricht Treaty on the European Union, it became apparent just how much was different as compared to the earlier ratification debates. With German reunification and the consequential adage of East German *Bundesländer* to the Federal Republic, the *Bundestag* too had grown in size. Despite this numeral increase, among its 568 *Abgeordneten* there existed a rare moment of near-unanimous agreement: 543 of them would vote in favour of ratification of the EU.

Distinctively, many of them would do so based on a reasoning similar to the Chancellor's. CDU/CSU *Abgeordnete* Peter Kittelmann, for example, started off his speech in favour of ratification by citing the (by now famous) preamble of the German *Grundgesetz* that defined as the state's 'Ziel' to serve as 'gleichberechtigtes Glied' in a unified Europe 'dem Frieden der Welt'.¹⁴¹ Even if that line had been in the *Grundgesetz* since its design in 1949, it seemed to have been put there only just:

¹³⁶ Helmut Kohl, *Erinnerungen 1990-1994*, 385.

¹³⁷ *Deutscher Bundestag*, 126. Sitzung, 10824.

¹³⁸ Helmut Kohl, *Erinnerungen 1990-1994*, 387.

¹³⁹ *Ibidem*.

¹⁴⁰ *Deutscher Bundestag*, 126. Sitzung, 10823.

¹⁴¹ *Deutscher Bundestag*, 126. Sitzung, 10811.

whereas it had not been uttered once in the previous ratification debates, it was being cited several times in relation to the EU. Somewhat more clarity on the mysterious popularity of the constitutional preamble comes from SPD *Abgeordnete* Heidemarie Wieczorek-Zeul, who explained that, since 'Europa hat zur deutschen Einheit ja gesagt; wir sagen ja zur europäischen Einigung'.¹⁴² For the Germans, clearly, what goes around, comes around.

Even more so than the Chancellor, however, the *Abgeordneten* applied this maxim of quid-pro-quo to contemporary rather than historical events. Whereas Kohl's speech in favour of the *Bundestag's* ratification of the EU still centred decisively on German responsibilities due to 'die Spanne des Geschichte dieses Jahrhunderts',¹⁴³ many *Abgeordneten* argued instead that it was the recent surges of neo-Nazism and racially targeted violence that required the German 'Fortführung zum Ziel einer Europäischen Union'.¹⁴⁴ Reasoning aside, however, it was clear that the majority of the *Abgeordneten* shared the Chancellor's view that 'die unwiderrufliche Einbindung unseres Landes in überstaatliche Strukturen ... ist das beste Mittel auch gegen übersteigerten Nationalismus'.¹⁴⁵ The goal was thus, very clearly, 'ein europäisches Deutschland' rather than a 'deutsches Europa', as only the former would turn the Germans into 'ein Volk Nachbarn'.¹⁴⁶

Similarly to the EEC/EURATOM debate, the question that arose in response to this notion, was whose good neighbour the Germans envisioned to be. This time, however, the view that the integration of Europe should not apply to 'nur einen Teil davon'¹⁴⁷ failed to grasp the *Bundestag*. Even if the EU Treaty indeed failed to provide the 'ehemals sowjetisch dominierten Staaten'¹⁴⁸ with a clear perspective towards stability, the recent geopolitical upheavals had changed so much the relationship between the formerly distinctive East and West, that to most *Abgeordneten* there existed no longer an antithesis between further West European integration and the search for closer ties with Eastern Europe.

In truth, especially when compared to the earlier ratification debates of ECSC and EEC/EURATOM, the entire EU ratification debate was rather absent of antitheses. Perhaps even strangely so, as the commencement of the EMU component of the treaty would entail the giving up the so-cherished Deutsche Mark. As European integration historian Mathieu Segers contends, the absence of *Abgeordneten's* disgruntlement on this subject can be explained due to the Germans' understanding that 'the history of Auschwitz and Yalta demanded this offer for the sake of the European peace.'¹⁴⁹ Based on the ratification debate, however, it seems more likely that the *Abgeordneten's* meek acceptance of EMU and its consequences

¹⁴² *Deutscher Bundestag*, 126. Sitzung, 10813.

¹⁴³ *Deutscher Bundestag*, 126. Sitzung, 10824.

¹⁴⁴ *Deutscher Bundestag*, 126. Sitzung, 10811/10813

¹⁴⁵ *Deutscher Bundestag*, 126. Sitzung, 10819.

¹⁴⁶ *Deutscher Bundestag*, 126. Sitzung, 10813.

¹⁴⁷ *Deutscher Bundestag*, 126. Sitzung, 10819.

¹⁴⁸ *Deutscher Bundestag*, 126. Sitzung, 10822.

¹⁴⁹ M. Segers, *Reis naar het continent*, 269.

can be explained by their increasingly steadfast belief in the economic and monetary benefits of European integration. After all, 'was, wenn nicht Europa ... soll sonst einen Wachstumssprung, soll sonst Wachstumsspielräume in Europa und damit auch für die deutsche Volkswirtschaft eröffnen?'¹⁵⁰

Besides the faith in the assertion that the German 'Wohlstand gründet sich auf der europäischen Zusammenarbeit,'¹⁵¹ there existed a large deal of faith in the trustworthiness of the European institute. Chancellor Kohl was largely followed in his contention that 'die Kriterien für die Qualifikation der einzelnen Länder zur Wirtschafts- und Währungsunion sind auf unser Betreiben so streng gefaßt worden, daß nur diejenigen Mitgliedstaaten an der Währungsunion werden teilnehmen können, die den Willen und die Fähigkeit zu einer strikten Stabilitätspolitik bewiesen haben.'¹⁵² Even if they would turn out to be awfully wrong within two decades, such convictions show that the contemporary *Abgeordneten* ratified the Treaty towards the European Union from the belief that European integration had been, and would continue to be, in the best German interests.

¹⁵⁰ *Deutscher Bundestag*, 126. Sitzung, 10839.

¹⁵¹ *Deutscher Bundestag*, 126. Sitzung, 10811.

¹⁵² *Deutscher Bundestag*, 126. Sitzung, 10826.

Epilogue

The most European nation?

Has European integration indeed benefited German interests? Fast forwarding one last time, we arrive back right where we started from. Together with the rest of Europe, the German people have just cast their vote in the 2014 European Parliamentary elections, and the ballot boxes are not necessarily in favour of the EU. Even if the structures flowing from European integration have given Germany an 'unbeatable advantage' economically and financially,¹⁵³ the German perception has increasingly become that German interests aren't served within the European framework. At the same time, Chancellor Angela Merkel has continued to maintain that European unity is 'a reason' of the BRD's 'existence'.¹⁵⁴ How have the German elite and people's perception on the enlacement of German interests within the European framework become so diverted?

In search of an explanation for this apparent discrepancy, we have set out the development over time of both the German elite and people's perception on European integration. Pivoting this analysis around the ratification debates of the ECSC, EEC/EURATOM and EU has allowed us to emphasize especially the way in which both the elite and people define the relationship between European integration initiatives and German interests. Strikingly, even if the ratification of these treaties took place within the time-span of four decades, the way in which the enlacement of German interests with the European project was developed uncovers decisively several recurrent themes. In the first ten years of European integration initiatives, most notably the presentation of either a 'Verflechtung' or 'Entflechtung' of German interests with the European treaty features themes of sovereignty and reunification. Quite surprisingly, in the face of the economic nature of both the ECSC and EEC, an economic theme is both times conspicuous in its absence, either being completely neglected or effectively sidelined.

Even if both the elite and people during these debates defined German interests within Europe, differing visions on what that Europe should entail led both times to a discord of support of the treaties. Overall, however, both the Chancellor and majority of *Abgeordneten* recognized that Germany's history and consequential provisional states required an axiom of europeanness. They agreed, thus, that it should be the BRD's directive to be the 'most European among Europeans'. Saliently, this leitmotif continued to resonate into the EU ratification debate, even if by then Germany's 'issues' of sovereignty and division had been adequately dealt with. The continuous European resonance can be explained, however, by contemporary Chancellor Kohl's definitive enlacement of German reunification and European integration as 'two sides of the same coin.' It was, after all, the Chancellor's pronouncement of this entanglement that truly opened the way towards both

¹⁵³ Kornelius, S., *Angela Merkel. The Chancellor and her World* (export edition; Hamburg 2013), 8.

¹⁵⁴ M. Segers, *Het waagstuk Europa*, digital edition.

German and (further) European unification. Consequently, the *Abgeordneten* felt that, now that Europe had facilitated German reunification, they should in turn facilitate the further unification of Europe.

As it turns out, up until 1992 both the German elite and people embraced German interests within Europe. When reunification had concluded Germany's unsettled status, however, the German people began to feel like they were finally back to normality and equality. Now that Germany's most fundamental issues of sovereignty and unification had been dealt with, to the German people the obvious political benefits of the European framework dimmed decisively. Having shown before already a rather lackluster interest in the economic aspects of European integration – even if these turn out to favour massively German economic interests – as a result, the people's perceived pressure to be so European lessened, despite having committed to an ever more integrating Europe. Precisely because of this commitment, the Chancellor, on the other hand, has to maintain a favourable attitude to European integration, consequently forcing the Statesman to continue to lead the 'most European [nation] among Europeans ... Even if its inhabitants no longer decisively adhere to it.

Sources and bibliography

Digital archive

Drucksachen und Plenarprotokolle des Bundestages - ab 1949
<http://pdok.bundestag.de/>

Published primary sources

Helmut Kohl, *Erinnerungen 1990-1994* (München 2007).

Konrad Adenauer, *Erinnerungen 1945-1953* (Stuttgart 1965).

Konrad Adenauer, *Erinnerungen 1955-1959* (Stuttgart 1967).

Mediasources

Buhl, D., 'Zwölf im Zwist. Der Zug nach Maastricht steht auf dem Abstellgleis (version 13 November 1992)', <http://www.zeit.de/1992/47/zwoelf-im-zwist> (27 May 2014).

Duitslandweb, 'Chronologie November 1989: De aanloop naar de val van de muur' (version 10 May 2014), <http://www.duitslandweb.nl/dossiers/overzicht/25-jaar-na-de-val-van-de-muur/chronologie-val-van-de-muur/november-1989.html> (11 June 2014).

Economist, 'Poland's appeal to Germany' (version 29 November 2011), <http://www.economist.com/blogs/easternapproaches/2011/11/polands-appeal-germany> (4 June 2014).

Garton Ash, T., 'The New German Question' (version 15 August 2013), <http://www.nybooks.com/articles/archives/2013/aug/15/new-german-question/> (2 June 2014).

Greven, L., 'Die EU muss jetzt springen' (version 6 June 2014), <http://www.zeit.de/politik/deutschland/2014-06/europa-ulrich-beck-interview> (16 June 2014).

Johnson, D., 'The folk memory that makes Germany reluctant to act over the euro' (version 10 November 2011), <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/germany/8881740/The-folk-memory-that-makes-Germany-reluctant-to-act-over-the-euro.html> (5 June 2014).

Olterman, P., 'Germany: Merkel's CDU wins European election despite worst ever result' (version 25 May 2014) <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2014/may/25/germany-merkel-cdu-win-european-election> (10 June 2014).

U.S. Department of State, 'MILESTONES: 1937-1945: The Tehran Conference, 1943', <http://history.state.gov/milestones/1937-1945/tehran-conf> (30 April 2014).

Wagstyl, S., 'Germany's anti-euro party AfD breaks national taboos' (version 22 May 2014), <http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/6a6705ac-db84-11e3-a460-00144feabdc0.html#axzz349kPPLCd> (16 June 2014).

Wahlrecht, 'Ergebnisse der Bundestagswahlen' (version 27 October 2013), <http://www.wahlrecht.de/ergebnisse/bundestag.htm> (25 June 2014).

Zeit, 'Ein Rechtsruck geht durch Europa' (version 27 May 2014), <http://www.zeit.de/video/2014-05/3588923562001/europawahl-ein-rechtsruck-geht-durch-europa#autoplay> (10 June 2014).

Bibliography

Garton Ash, T., *In Europe's Name* (New York 1993).

Glees, A., *Reinventing Germany. German Political Development since 1945* (Oxford 1996).

Hitchcock, W., *The Struggle for Europe. The turbulent history of a divided continent, 1945 to the present* (New York 2003).

Hix, S., *The Political System of the European Union* (London 2005).

Ivanovich Traktuyev, M., 'The Red Army's Drive into Poland', in: Sir Basil Liddell Hart (ed.), *Purnell's History of the Second World War* (Hatfield 1981), vol.18, 1920-1929.

Kornelius, S., *Angela Merkel. The Chancellor and her World* (export edition; Hamburg 2013).

Paterson, W.E., 'The Chancellor and Foreign Policy', in Stephen Padgett (ed.), *Adenauer to Kohl. The Development of the German Chancellorship* (London 1994) 127-56.

Putnam, R., 'Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games', *International Organization* 42 (Summer, 1988) 427-460.

Schrag Sternberg, C., *The Struggle for EU Legitimacy. Public Contestation 1950-2005* (New York 2013).

Segers, M., *Reis naar het continent. Nederland en de Europese integratie, 1950 tot heden* (Amsterdam 2013).

Segers, M., *Het waagstuk Europa. Nederland en de grote Europese vraagstukken van vandaag* (Amsterdam 2014, digital edition).

List of abbreviations

AfD	Alternative für Deutschland
BHE	Bund der Heimatvertriebenen und Entrechteten
BRD	Bundesrepublik Deutschland
CDU	Christlich Demokratische Union Deutschlands
CSU	Christlich-Soziale Union
DDR	Deutsche Demokratische Republik
DP	Deutsche Partei
EC	European Commission
EC	European Community
ECSC	European Coal and Steel Community
EDC	European Defence Community
EEC	European Economic Community
EMS	European Monetary System
EMU	Economic and Monetary Union
EPU	European Political Union
EU	European Union
EURATOM	European Atomic Energy Community
FDP	Freie Demokratische Partei
GD	Gesamtdeutscher Block
KPD	Kommunistische Partei Deutschlands
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
SED	Sozialistische Einheitspartei Deutschlands
SPD	Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands

Appendix

Review Report Marjon Riehl

1. De interne consistentie van de BA-thesis

Naar aanleiding van vraagtekens bij Segers' bewering dat de Nederlandse participatie in de Europese verdragen van de jaren '90 te verklaren is door de Duitse deelname, wordt in de inleiding van de thesis als hoofdvraag gesteld in hoeverre de Nederlandse Europapolitiek in de jaren 90 te verklaren valt vanuit een volgen van Duitsland. Deze vraag, alsmede de initiële vraagtekens bij de stelling van de onderhevigheid van de Nederlandse Europapolitiek aan de Duitse economie, komen voort vanuit de observatie dat bij de analyse van de Nederlandse Europapolitiek in de jaren '90 de ratificatiedebatten in de Tweede Kamer buiten beschouwing zijn gelaten.

Dat de analyse van deze ratificatiedebatten antwoord zal moeten geven op de hoofdvraag is een goed te volgen lijn redentatie. Waarom echter specifiek voor de focus op het Stabiliteits- en Groeipact en het Gemeenschappelijk Buitenlands en Veiligheidsbeleid (GBVB) is gekozen, wordt niet uiteengezet. Vanuit de lijn van de eerder genoemde verklaring van Nederlandse verstrengeling met Duitse economische belangen is de keuze voor het SGP te herleiden, maar het dusdanige belang van het GBVB voor de relatie tussen Duitsland en de Nederlandse standpuntbepaling is niet duidelijk.

Op basis van de korte conclusie die de thesis tot nu toe kent, heb ik de conclusie getrokken dat het Nederlandse belang bij het SGP en het GBVB enerzijds een continentale, en anderzijds een Atlantische oriëntatie van de Europapolitiek ontbloomt. Deze tegenstelling moet, logischerwijs, verder worden uitgewerkt in de conclusie, maar zou voor de verduidelijking en verscherping van de argumentatie juist ook al in de inleiding en de tussenliggende hoofdstukken moeten worden aangehaald.

2. De externe consistentie van de BA-thesis

Wat betreft de bewijsvoering wordt deze vooral gestoeld op primair materiaal, in de vorm van de verslagen van de Tweede Kamerdebatten over de ratificatie van de Europese verdragen. De rechtvaardiging van de keuze voor dit bronnenmateriaal (en met name de focus die hierin wordt gezocht) zou nog wel beter uiteengezet kunnen worden. Waarom zijn juist deze parlementaire verslagen tekenend voor Nederlandse Europapolitiek (en haar al dan niet verbondenheid met de Duitse economie)?

3. Specifieke vragen en opmerkingen

In de inleiding wordt er opgeworpen dat 'tot op de dag van vandaag door een groot deel van de Nederlanders' de toenmalige Nederlandse regeringen wordt aangerekend dat zij de Europese verdragen van de jaren '90 hebben geratificeerd. Waar komt deze bewering vandaan? Is dit een gut-feeling, of kan deze bewering

worden gestoeld op bronnen? Als dat laatste het geval is, kan het interessant zijn om uiteen te zetten wat de implicaties van de conclusie van de thesis zijn voor zulks sentiment.

NB: de vraagtekens die achter de geboortejaren van Kohl, Lubbers en Delors – welke allemaal nog leven – lijken een soort verkapselde bedreiging aan het adres van deze personen ;-)

4. Eventuele tips/advies ter verbetering van het paper

De thesis zoals die nu is, bevat enkele moeilijk lopende formuleringen, die het gevolg lijken te zijn van het aanpassen van de zinnen. Loop je definitieve versie daarom nog eens zorgvuldig na met oog op taal!