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A FRESH LOOK AT FOREIGN POLICY
“CRISIS, ORDER, EUROPE” - ON GERMANY’S FOREIGN POLICY PRIORITIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES (BY FOREIGN MINISTER FRANK-WALTER STEINMEIER)

I had decided to pursue a process of self-examination regarding the prospects of German foreign policy when I took on the position of German Foreign Minister for the second time in December 2013. We launched this process exactly a year ago, in February 2014, when we introduced the project “Review 2014 – A Fresh Look at Foreign Policy” by posing two deliberately provocative questions to experts in Germany and abroad: What, if anything, is wrong with German foreign policy? What needs to be changed?

In the past twelve months we have discussed, disputed and grappled with these questions at dozens of debates and other events. Foreign policy experts around the world have taken part, as have thousands of members of the public from throughout Germany and many hundreds of employees of the Federal Foreign Office. We did not want to have an expert commission answer the question of Germany’s foreign policy responsibility and we did not want to negotiate the answer through an interministerial coordination process; we wanted to have a genuine discussion together – exploring views rather than truths, as it were. Foreign policy does not merely amount to clever positioning; it is, rather, a process of negotiation. It is not only about wanting to do the right thing; it is also about the ways and means, the right strategy and suitable instruments for attaining the goals we have set for ourselves. This process often involves difficult trade-offs and situations that are not black-and-white, but rather require choosing among several unsatisfactory options.

I am pleased that thanks to this project we have come significantly closer to fulfilling the goal we set ourselves when I took office, the goal of “a mature, enlightened discourse on the institutional framework within which our foreign policy actions should be anchored, a discourse on the level of responsibility that we will be able to take on in the next ten or 20 years and on where the limits of our capabilities lie”. This is not a task that can ever be completed or entirely fulfilled. But we have nonetheless succeeded in making the public more familiar with foreign policy issues and with the tools of diplomacy. I thank all those in civil society organisations and institutions who have supported and worked with us, and have at times fundamentally challenged us. And I am proud of the many members of the Foreign Service who have taken on this challenge themselves, and will continue to do so in the future. In my view the dialogue with the public is one of the key take-aways from the “Review 2014” process; we want to and will continue this dialogue beyond the bounds of this project – through traditional panel discussions, through modern online forums, and through the successfully tested negotiation simulations in which the trade-offs involved in foreign policy decisions can be experienced most immediately. Foreign policy does not only take place abroad: domestically, we need to seek understanding and approval for our actions; we need to explain, listen and learn. Foreign policy needs to be firmly anchored and supported at home so that it is able to have substance and impact beyond our borders.

The debates that took place through “Review 2014” were anything but academic. The raw
reality of the past year made major inroads into this process of self-examination. The situation in Ukraine spiralled out of control in February. The subsequent escalation and the Russian annexation of Crimea called into question the peaceful order in Europe in a way that had not been foreseen. In the shadow of this major crisis, we witnessed the rapid ascent of ISIS, were taken by surprise by the lightning-quick spread of the Ebola epidemic, and saw renewed escalation in the Middle East. One could also say, however, that these events prevented the discussions from becoming overly abstract. One can make all sorts of fine arguments about the proper limits of Germany’s foreign policy responsibilities; in the end, this responsibility always takes concrete forms. We have succeeded in some ways; in other ways we can and want to do better. The many suggestions, ideas and critiques that were generated through “Review 2014” offer us a wealth of material for this. But our experiences with the Review process have also demonstrated clearly that foreign policy is much more than good crisis management – and has to be much more, for the sake of our own interests too.

RECOGNITION AND EXPECTATION
It is not possible to reduce such a large number of contributions to a single common denominator. The issues are too multifaceted and complex; opinions and personal preferences are too divergent. All of the contributions are documented on the project website www.review2014.de. For all this diversity of responses, on the whole a high level of respect for German foreign policy has been evident not only in the experts’ answers, but also at the many public events held in Germany. Our country is valued for its worldwide commitment to the balancing of interests and peaceful conflict resolution, justice and the rule of law, and human rights and a sustainable economic model. The imprint of our broad-based cultural and educational policy abroad is visible in many of the experts’ contributions, as are the deep emotional connections in which we are investing through this policy. A survey that the Körber Foundation conducted on behalf of “Review 2014” demonstrated clearly how much the German people see their country as having a role in crisis prevention, human rights protection, mediation, and humanitarian aid. At the same time, it also

Weimar Triangle Foreign Ministers (France, Poland and Germany) seeking to negotiate a solution in Kyiv on 20 February 2014

“The real challenge for German foreign policy is triage: choosing where not to lead, leading where German leadership will make a real difference and staying out of situations where the German contribution will either be marginal or actively unhelpful.”

Michael Ignatieff · Harvard Kennedy School
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20.02.2014 · Kyiv · Ukraine
+++ Foreign Minister Frank-Walter Steinmeier and his Polish and French counterparts mediate an agreement between the Ukrainian Government and the Maidan opposition movement in order to end the bloodshed. +++

18.03.2014 · Moscow · Russia
+++ Annexation of Crimea: A treaty on the accession of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol to the Russian Federation is signed in the Kremlin. This step is contrary to international law and triggers the most serious crisis in Europe since the end of the Cold War. +++

15.04.2014 · Chibok · Nigeria
+++ Islamist militants belonging to the terror organisation Boko Haram kidnap 273 girls from a school in northeastern Borno. +++

WWW.REVIEW2014.DE

reveals that Germans’ views on foreign policy are anything but static: the younger generation has markedly different priorities than the older generations.

“It will not be sufficient simply to keep repeating familiar and tried and tested mantras. In a world undergoing sweeping change we have to ask ourselves the critical question as to whether the pillars on which these fundamental principles rest can still be relied upon to bear this weight.” – This was my point of departure in December 2013. If anything, our world has been changing even more quickly in the months since then. And so it perhaps comes as no surprise that despite all the recognition for our achievements to date, the expectations of what German foreign policy should achieve in the future are exponentially higher, especially abroad. A leading role for Germany is called for time and again: in Europe, on climate protection, and in multilateral organisations. Germany is asked to “revitalise Europe,” to “Europeanise Russia,” to “multilateralise America”. We are considered to be capable of all sorts of things, sometimes surely too much.

Where should we direct our energy? Where

“WHAT GERMAN FOREIGN POLICY COULD USE IS NOT A RADICAL OVERHAUL, BUT SUMMONING THE WILL TO SHAPE EVENTS WITH CONVICTION AND BY CHARTING A CLEAR AND DETERMINED COURSE.”

Hanns Maull · German Institute for International and Security Affairs (SWP)
do our interests lie? Where are our responsibilities? What is the “DNA” of German foreign policy? Where can our resources make a difference? Where do we need to improve if we are serious about what we are undertaking? What is important to our citizens, and what can we win them over to?

CRISIS, ORDER, EUROPE

The basic fixtures of German foreign policy have proven sound; we want to and will adhere to the closest partnership with France within a united Europe, and to the transatlantic alliance – not only regarding security issues, but also as closely connected transatlantic economic areas. Within this fixed framework, we must turn our attention to the three central challenges of crisis, order and Europe.

In our subjective perception, crisis is becoming a permanent condition. Mali and the Central African Republic, Crimea and eastern Ukraine, Syria, ISIS, Ebola – all within a single year. Crisis is not an exception to the rule within globalisation: it is a permanent epiphenomenon, sometimes even a product of globalisation. We must adapt ourselves better to this reality. Globalisation and digitalisation have entwined hundreds of millions of people in global value-added chains, and are fuelling rapid economic ascendance and the emergence of new socially engaged middle classes. At the same time, the globalisation of expectations and the tremendous growth in the mobilisation capacity of social initiatives and protests are placing governments around the world under enormous pressure to act and to prove their legitimacy. Governance is becoming more difficult everywhere, and political systems are becoming fragile. The number of fragile and failing states is increasing. Globalisation itself also fuels the forces of aggressive anti-globalisation. The human longing for identity and meaning in contexts that are as straightforward, clearly outlined, and timeless as possible is growing in parallel to the advancing dissolution of boundaries, and is directly counteracting it. Isolationism, nationalism, and absolutist religious or ethnic categories that lead to brutal, unbounded violence – whether terrorism or civil war – are

NOW IS A TIME TO PUT CRISIS PREVENTION CENTRE STAGE, MAKING IT A HALLMARK OF GERMAN POLICY.”

Louise Arbour · former United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

Federica Mogherini, High Representative of the European Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, and Foreign Minister Steinmeier answering questions from the press at the Berlin Foreign Policy Forum

25.05.2014 · Brussels · Belgium
+++ Europe elects a new Parliament, but it takes two months of intense negotiations before Parliament elects the Conservative Jean-Claude Juncker as the new President of the European Commission. +++

29.06.2014 · Iraq
+++ Terror group declares caliphate: In an audio message, “Islamic State in Iraq and Syria” (ISIS) proclaims its leader Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi caliph and leader for Muslims everywhere. The caliphate is to extend from northern Syria to eastern Iraq. +++

08.07.2014 · Israel/Palestine
+++ War starts in Gaza: Israel accuses radical Islamic group Hamas of the murder of three youths and launches massive air strikes in retaliation. Hamas responds with rocket fire into Israel. +++
often enough the result. Discussions with the German public have given me a sense of how strongly the German people register what is going on around them and what concerns they have about it – and how aware they are that the stable economic and political conditions that Germany enjoys are more the exception than the rule globally. This creates a special responsibility for us and challenges us to deal better with uncertainty and volatility.

Defusing crises early enough and countering them through a balancing of interests, mediation and prevention before the only option left for us is damage control needs to be one of the key interests and concerns of German foreign policy. We enjoy a high level of worldwide respect in this area. But Germany can do more to set international standards here – because we have a responsibility to use our resources on behalf of peace. We want to act earlier, more decisively and more tangibly – not only during acute crises, but also increasingly in the prevention and aftertreatment of conflicts. This also means we must hone our own tools, from early warning systems and scenario planning to new crisis management structures in the Federal Foreign Office to coordinated action among all German Government and civil society players. We will review how the United Nations can help more substantially with peacekeeping and peacebuilding. The use of military means to secure political solutions can be advisable or even unavoidable. We need to approach this question with due caution and restraint, but without ruling it out altogether. We do not know when or where the next crisis will erupt. But we do know that it will come. This will not only happen in remote regions of the world, but also very near to us or even within Germany. We need to be prepared for this; we need to strengthen our own resilience and capacity for resistance and reaction, and we need to broaden our range of crisis policy instruments.

“GERMANY SHOULD ACT AS A BRIDGE BETWEEN THE ESTABLISHED NORTH AND THE ‘RISING SOUTH’.”

Adekeye Adebajo · Centre for Conflict Resolution, South Africa

03.08.2014 · Sinjar · Iraq

+++ Kurdish Peshmerga forces withdraw from the town of Sinjar in northern Iraq. The UN reports that some 200,000 people have fled their homes following this advance by ISIS extremists. At the end of August, the German Federal Government decides to provide weapons. +++

08.08.2014 · Geneva · Switzerland

+++ The World Health Organisation (WHO) declares the Ebola crisis in the West African countries of Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leone an international health emergency. +++
But foreign policy cannot look only to crises. It cannot limit its focus to the most urgent things; it must also look at the long term and face the more arduous tasks. There is scarcely any other country as interconnected as Germany with the world beyond its borders. We depend on this interconnection, and we thrive on it. Germany has seized many of the opportunities of globalisation. We have forged new ties with emerging countries and groups. We live off our intensive exchange of ideas, people, products and information with other countries. The more rule-bound these exchanges are, the better for us. That is why working on behalf of a just and peaceful international order that is lasting and resilient even in the face of dynamic changes, and that can offer responses to the great issues of the future, from climate change to eradicating poverty, is in the ultimate interest of German foreign policy. The world is changing around us. The road to embark upon is being debated not only in Germany and Europe, but also in the United States and many other countries. In some places, there is pressure on the existing order. Its parameters are changing, most prominently due to the unprecedented rise of China. The tectonic plates of world politics are shifting, and we must look not only to the tensions being discharged at the edges of these plates. The pressure of globalisation is also eroding the established order, calling it into question, fragmenting it through parallel structures and regionalism, and challenging it through new issues such as cyber foreign policy and the Internet, where “unruliness” can have unpredictable and chaotic consequences. Germany must define its own contributions to the preservation and regrounding of international structures of order more precisely. We must reflect thoroughly on how we can protect precious public goods: the oceans,
space, the Internet. The task is to find the right mixture of strengthening indispensable and proven structures such as the United Nations and – as necessary – developing new elements of order and new international regimes, in order, for example, to counteract the arms build-up that is rampant in many places. How can we develop a foreign policy that looks very far ahead and that makes long-term investments in order, in international institutions and in prudent strengthening of international law? What partners can we win over, and what partners must we win over? What do we have to offer to make our experiences with, for example, a sustainable and resource-efficient economy into a German foreign policy “brand” that can set standards worldwide?

And finally, Europe: European integration remains the foundation of all German foreign policy. Yet here too the challenges have changed, and we must translate our old certainties into new answers.

Firstly, we must do everything possible to prevent the emergence of a dangerous strategic dilemma in which Germany believes itself to face a choice between its international competitive strength in the world of globalisation on the one hand and the future of European integration – especially the cohesion of the Economic and Monetary Union – on the other hand. We must enable Europe to benefit from our strength, for we benefit from Europe’s strength. We as the strongest country must invest in this Europe, for we are only strong through Europe. Secondly, we must resist the foreign policy temptation that arises from the present strength of Germany’s position. When Germany is asked by Washington, Moscow and Beijing to play an especially privileged role, in very different ways and yet almost in unison, we can take it as a compliment, yet we must always turn it in a European direction in order not to seriously overextend our limited capabilities. We want to cultivate good and viable relations with important partner countries. But when it comes to shaping globalisation, Germany is only capable of acting within a European framework. A positive and productive role for Germany in international politics exists only in and through Europe. But how are we to translate this “European imperative” of German foreign policy into our daily action? How do we anchor the “European reflex” in our initiatives and our daily business?

Broadcast journalist Cherno Jobatey speaking with Foreign Minister Steinmeier at the Facebook Berlin Talk

VIDEO
Facebook Talk Berlin with Foreign Minister Steinmeier

24.09.2014 · New York · USA
+++ The 69th session of the United Nations General Assembly opens against the backdrop of global crises: the rise of the ISIS terror group, the conflict in Ukraine and the Ebola epidemic in West Africa. +++

27./28.09.2014 Hong Kong · China
+++ Tear gas and pepper spray are used to disperse protests in Hong Kong. The demonstrators demand free elections and political reforms for the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region. +++

09.11.2014 · Berlin · Germany
+++ Germany commemorates the fall of the Berlin Wall 25 years ago. To mark the anniversary, Berliners celebrate with an art installation recreating the route of the Wall through the capital with thousands of balloons. +++
FOR A MORE EFFECTUAL FOREIGN SERVICE

Despite assumptions to the contrary, there is a strong case for democratic, rule of law-based systems being better able to withstand the growing pressures of the globalised world than many authoritarian regimes. They are more robust than even we ourselves have sometimes given them credit for. But we must give up the illusion that we can hinder or defuse every crisis in the modern world through prevention or resolute intervention. Along with our awareness that our foreign policy influence is grounded above all in our innovative strength and the attractiveness of our model of society – with its particular balance of freedom, security, prosperity and the rule of law – insight into the limits of our own possibilities is a necessary part of a wise foreign policy in the twenty-first century.

We need a realistic vision of peace that can withstand contradictions without losing its confidence or its capacity for responsible action. The global interconnectedness of our country, which has long been vital to our prosperity and security, allows us neither to perceive ourselves as an island nor to claim to be a revolutionary force in global politics. This does not suggest any relativism of our values. But the firmness of our own understanding of our values must be bound to realities and their mutability – including in terms of our domestic communications about foreign policy.

In the interest of a long-term peace policy too, we cannot wish for revolutionary upheavals. Above all, we have to look at evolutionary forms of change: in a strategy for peace in the twenty-first century, foreign policy is at the same time prevention, crisis diplomacy and patient support for transformation. It is the gradual crafting of elements of a viable, peaceful and just international order – integrated into an ever-closer union of Europe in which Germany also fulfils its responsibility in the form of negotiated leadership. The world of tomorrow offers great opportunities for our country and for every one of our citizens. Germany has something to offer to help shape this future world in a positive way, through self-confidence, equanimity and modesty.

Our country will only be able to make such a contribution if it maintains a more effectual Foreign Service and closely coordinated collaboration among all foreign policy players, including those outside the Federal Foreign Office. We must look beyond the question “Are we doing the right thing?” to ask the

24.11.2014 · Vienna · Austria
+++ The negotiations on the Iranian nuclear programme in the Palais Coburg end without any final agreement. The deadline for an agreement is extended until 30 June 2015. +++

17.12.2014 · Washington, USA and Havana, Cuba
+++ The Presidents of Cuba and the USA announce on television that diplomatic and economic relations between their two countries are to be revived after 60 years of antagonism and estrangement. +++

01.01.2015 · Geneva · Switzerland
+++ Germany takes over the Presidency of the UN Human Rights Council. Goals include responding more quickly to human rights violations around the world and consolidating opportunities for civil society involvement. +++
“THE CURRENT CRISIS IN UKRAINE SHOWS JUST HOW IMPORTANT A EUROPE THAT SPOKE WITH A UNIFIED VOICE ON VITAL ISSUES WOULD BE. FUTURE HISTORIANS WILL LIKELY CONCLUDE THAT AN INTERIM PHASE ENDED IN 2014.”

Heinrich August Winkler · historian

follow-up question “Are we doing it in the right way?” We want to orient our structures and processes more consistently towards the major challenges of crisis, order and Europe. We want to communicate better, operate better, and better mobilise the resources that are available to us. We want to become better at networking, in Germany and with the European External Action Service and other players in Brussels. I have spoken to my staff about this, and they have generated some important suggestions together in many ideas workshops and discussion forums.

The project “Review 2014 – A Fresh Look at Foreign Policy” has been an unprecedented exercise in working out a new orientation in a dramatically changing world. We do not want to lose the momentum that we have gathered. That is why in the coming weeks and months we will be launching a package of measures for concrete changes. Our conclusions from the “Review 2014” process will not end there, though. Neither our critical dialogue with experts and the public nor our self-critical look at our own work will end with our conclusions. Both processes will be carried on continuously in the future in order to repeatedly readjust our work to global challenges and always think afresh about foreign policy so that we can keep improving our foreign policy.
THE STORY OF THE “REVIEW 2014” LOGO

Taking a different look at the world is also part of “Review 2014 – A Fresh Look at Foreign Policy”. That is why we have selected a logo that depicts the world from a different angle than the world maps we are accustomed to, and thus inspires reflection.

World maps are not only a tool for orienting ourselves better, they also influence our view of the world; they affect how we interpret it and where we locate Germany. And all world maps must make compromises, for they all face the challenge of translating a globe onto a flat surface.

This map was designed by Richard Buckminster Fuller in the 1950s and shows the world from an unusual perspective: the continents are arranged contiguously, without any visual distortions in their sizes. Buckminster Fuller intended for this to show the continents and countries in their commonality as one world.

This unusual depiction forces us to reconsider our conventional reference points such as North-South and East-West. Germany’s position, too, suddenly looks quite different.

VIDEO
Trailer „Review 2014 – A Fresh Look at German Foreign Policy“
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REVIEW 2014 — A FRESH LOOK AT FOREIGN POLICY — SEEING THE WORLD THROUGH DIFFERENT EYES
The starting point was a question mark: “In a world that is still searching for a new order 25 years after the end of the East-West confrontation and the demise of a black-and-white order that had prevailed for decades, German foreign policy has no choice but to call itself into question. And this also means calling into question the certainties to which we have grown even more accustomed than we are to the old Paternoster lift circling round out there in the lobby. Indeed I believe that the question mark should always be a part of foreign policy.” This critical appraisal does not come from an academic or a critical journalist, but rather from the German Foreign Minister himself.

With these words, Frank-Walter Steinmeier opened the conference that launched the Review process and started a yearlong discussion unlike anything that the venerable Federal Foreign Office had undertaken in its almost 150 year history. This made clear that the question mark was the focus. “Review 2014” was not intended to yield instructions or proclamations of truth. Rather, the Minister was interested in a self-critical dialogue that called established certainties into question in order to explore the right path together.

Steinmeier conducted nearly a dozen of the Review events himself; he sought to set an example for his employees by doing so. The “Review 2014” experiment’s focus was on opening-up to the German public, readiness to discuss controversial topics, and an attempt to reach target groups beyond the traditional foreign policy circles. Representing German policy abroad is the bread-and-butter of a diplomat’s daily work. But when diplomats seek understanding for the everyday craft of foreign policy and are expected to handle critical questions and controversial discussions in doing so in Germany, many of them are charting new territory.

At the beginning of November, Steinmeier gathered his employees together. Coming directly from Tegel Airport, just off an overnight flight from Jakarta, he went to the podium of the Weltsaal and invited audience members to come forward. Two empty chairs sat next to him; one after another, diplomats came forward to express their opinions about how foreign policy could be improved in very practical ways. “Our changed world must also lead to changes in the foreign service,” Steinmeier said. The employees of the Federal Foreign Office addressed the question of whether managing the world’s ever-numerous crises left them room for a creative foreign policy. “As a desk officer, can I even afford to be innovative?” one young employee asked, describing her daily workload. Another employee complained frankly, “We don’t have any channels for saying what’s going wrong.”

What does Steinmeier take away from his Review discussions? “It was an incredibly exciting and instructive year for me,” he says. “I was especially impressed by seeing how interested the German public is in foreign policy issues. This is of course particularly pronounced in a crisis year like last year. But it also shows that the stereotype of the Germans living in a bubble of privilege and wanting nothing to do with the outside world is patently untrue.”
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THE EXPERTS
THE EXPERTS’ DEBATE:
CHALLENGES TO GERMAN FOREIGN POLICY

It was an invitation to criticism and controversy: “What is wrong with German foreign policy? And what needs to be changed?” In February 2014, Frank-Walter Steinmeier wrote to more than 50 prominent experts in Germany and abroad, asking them for their views on Germany’s international activities. The question astonished some veteran diplomats: Do we really need this? they wondered. The experts, by contrast, were happy to pick up the ball. “Your self-critical question what is wrong with German foreign policy is itself a fine example of what is right with German foreign policy”, wrote Oxford Professor Timothy Garton Ash in his response to Steinmeier.

Since summer 2014, all of the experts’ answers have been presented on the “Review 2014” website, with analysis and comments. This is perhaps the first time that a foreign ministry itself has invited a critical appraisal of its policies, then made it available to the public (the authors are listed in an annex to this publication). Experts from Germany, from our partner countries, and from the new powers in the world have articulated their expectations and criticism, thereby sparking numerous comments and blog posts from expert circles and civil society.

The increased incidence of international conflicts and crises in the past year has strengthened public interest in German foreign policy and sparked many discussions. But this was often a matter of evaluating individual events rather than appraising their significance to our country’s framework of foreign policy interests. This framework has become shaky through the great international power shifts of the past decade, and now must be anchored and aligned anew – which is something a controversial public debate makes possible.

The challenges for German foreign policy that the experts have identified are numerous. Global power shifts are the starting point for most of the experts’ contributions: as emerging states are changing the international system, the importance of the “West” is declining. But the role of states themselves is changing in foreign policy in light of the growing significance of civil society and private business players on the international stage.

Germany is more globally interconnected than just about any other country in the world; this means that changes to the international system affect it all the more. It is clear to the experts that Germany must keep a watchful eye on geopolitical developments, analyse them and weigh them against its own interests,
Communicate this to the public both domestically and abroad, and assume responsibility in order to counter the new global “obscurity” with elements of order.

International expectations of Germany are high – too high at times. Germany is expected to “revitalise the European Union”, to “regain the role of model European”, and at the same time to advance “preventive stabilisation policy at the European periphery”. It is expected to be an “intercultural mediator” as well as “bridge” between the “wealthy North” and the “rising South”. It is expected to “Europeanise Russia” and to “multilateralise America”

Overall, most of the experts give decent marks to German foreign policy to date, but there is no shortage of criticism: Germany is said to react to crises too slowly, rather than assuming and acting out its role in the world; its strategic thinking is “poorly developed”; Germany is said on the one hand to pursue “unscrupulous realpolitik”, on the other to be “naïve and idealistic”, while its excessive emphasis on economic interests comes at the expense of strategic goals and shared European positions.

To the vast majority of those surveyed, what is wrong with German policy is not so much specific actions or omissions, but rather a perceived lack of predictability. Of course, Germany is expected to take on more global responsibility. At the same time, many observers appear to be uncertain about what Germany even wants internationally. The Federal Government is said to have long neglected to sufficiently seek the domestic public support that is indispensable to dependable foreign policy.

Both German and international experts voice these criticisms, and this critique is not limited to any particular geographical region, as a brief selection of excerpts shows: according to Anne-Marie Slaughter, German foreign policy is defined less by what it is than by what it is not. James Shikwati writes that Germany must lay bare its core interests in order not to appear to lack any interests of its own. According to Dmitri Trenin, Germany needs to overcome

“First, we live in a small, shrinking, interdependent world. Secondly, we will see the return of Asia. Thirdly, we will have to adjust ourselves to the end of two centuries of Western domination of world history.”

Kishore Mahbubani · National University of Singapore
the parochial thinking of its elites. Davood Moradian argues that Germany does not sufficiently communicate its foreign and security policy ideas and expectations. According to Hanns Maull, German foreign policy needs to be clearer, more transparent, more predictable and more reliable. Volker Perthes claims that gaps in the credibility of German foreign policy open up where normative expectations diverge from reality and are thus in many cases perceived as sheer rhetoric. According to Thomas Risse, in recent years the Federal Government has neglected to communicate what it wants clearly and explicitly. Pawel Swieboda writes that Germany has many faces – and this damages its power of persuasion.

The discrepancy between the public representation of German foreign policy and the reality of its orientation threatens to erode public support for it and to call into question its democratic and strategic credibility, according to Herfried Münkler. Lawrence Freedman argues that German domestic politics stand in the way of ambitious foreign policy. According to Kofi Annan, there is a growing gulf between the expectation of Germany’s allies and partners that it take on a larger role in international politics and Germany’s self-imposed limitations on its foreign policy, which the German public largely supports. Michael Ignatieff writes that the greatest challenge to the Chancellor and the Foreign Minister is maintaining the confidence and support of the public in a time when choices must be made not only between good alternatives, but also between bad alternatives.

“BOTH EUROPE AND THE WORLD AS A WHOLE EXPECT GERMANY TO SHOULDER A GREATER SHARE OF THE BURDENS OF LEADERSHIP, COLLECTIVE SECURITY, AND INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION.”
Kofi Annan · former Secretary-General of the United Nations

“COUNTRIES LIKE GERMANY THAT DEPEND ON AN OPEN AND LIBERAL WORLD ORDER MUST ALSO BE PREPARED TO PROVIDE THE RESOURCES NEEDED TO MAINTAIN THIS ORDER.”
Volker Perthes · German Institute for International and Security Affairs, SWP

“GERMANY MUST STATE CLEARLY WHAT ITS CORE INTERESTS ARE, SO AS NOT TO PRETEND THAT IT ACTS WITHOUT INTERESTS. IT IS THROUGH STATED CORE INTERESTS THAT GERMANY WILL BE IN A POSITION TO ENGAGE AFRICA FROM A CONSISTENT AGENDA.”
James Shikwati · Inter-Region Economic Network, Kenya

“COUNTRIES LIKE GERMANY THAT DEPEND ON AN OPEN AND LIBERAL WORLD ORDER MUST ALSO BE PREPARED TO PROVIDE THE RESOURCES NEEDED TO MAINTAIN THIS ORDER.”
52 contributions from 57 authors in 26 countries – international relations experts from around the world responded to Foreign Minister Steinmeier’s invitation, contributing their viewpoints to the Review debate. Depending on their geographical origins or fields of specialty, the experts offered a broad range of answers to the questions “What is wrong with German foreign policy?” and “What should be changed?” From political scientists and union leaders to journalists, from a former United Nations Commissioner to a historian to a former United Nations Secretary-General, all of these experts answered the Foreign Minister’s questions from their own very personal positions and thereby ensured an unusually broad range of perspectives – both geographically and in terms of content.

These two pages feature a global selection of the contributing authors with the titles of their respective articles.
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Moscow, Russia
DMITRI TRENIN
Carnegie Center
“Germany’s Need for a Global Role, and how to Embrace it – Germany has to lead: in the EU and beyond”

BEIJING, CHINA
FENG ZHONGPING
China Institute of Contemporary International Relations
“A pioneer group for Europe – Germany’s role is to make the European Union successful”

Kabul, Afghanistan
DAVOOD MORADIAN
Afghan Institute for Strategic Studies
“Germany: An Unsure Power in Conflicts – The thoughts about ‘perpetual peace’ remain relevant”

Warsaw, Poland
PAWEL SWIEBODA
demosEUROPA – Centre for European Strategy Foundation
“Beyond defence of the status quo – Military capacities and a strong anchorage in the EU”

Dschidda, Saudi Arabia
ABDULAZIZ SAGER
Gulf Research Center
“Time for a more activist Middle East policy – Gulf states don’t see a clear German foreign policy strategy”

Johannesburg, South Africa
ELIZABETH SIDIROPOULOS
South African Institute of International Affairs
“Germany’s Africa policy is ambivalent – Africa on its way to become a geopolitical power”

Istanbul, Turkey
FUAT KEYMAN
Istanbul Policy Center
“Tap the full potential of the partnership – Turkey can do a lot more for Europe!”

London, Great Britain
SIR LAWRENCE FREEDMAN
King’s College
“Germany’s soft-power model was successful for long. No more – Catching-up with international realities”

Berlin, Germany
DANIELA SCHWARZER
German Marshall Fund of the United States, GMF
“A multi-speed Europe and a more robust Euro – A stronger backbone for EU institutions”

Paris, France
FRANÇOIS GODEMENT
European Council on Foreign Relations, ECFR
“A strong European China policy is best for Germany – Going it alone no longer makes sense”

Athens, Greece
LOUKAS TSOUKALIS
ELIAMEP Hellenic Foundation for European and Foreign Policy
“The big European crisis can either make or break it! – Germany: a respectful and cooperative crisis manager?”

Jakarta, Indonesia
TOBIAS BASUKI
Centre for Strategic and International Studies
“Germany should lead an intercultural dialogue! – Preventing a ‘civilizational cleavage’”

Paris, France
FRANÇOIS GODEMENT
European Council on Foreign Relations, ECFR
“A strong European China policy is best for Germany – Going it alone no longer makes sense”

Warsaw, Poland
PAWEL SWIEBODA
demosEUROPA – Centre for European Strategy Foundation
“Beyond defence of the status quo – Military capacities and a strong anchorage in the EU”

BEIJING, CHINA
FENG ZHONGPING
China Institute of Contemporary International Relations
“A pioneer group for Europe – Germany’s role is to make the European Union successful”

Kabul, Afghanistan
DAVOOD MORADIAN
Afghan Institute for Strategic Studies
“Germany: An Unsure Power in Conflicts – The thoughts about ‘perpetual peace’ remain relevant”
There is one point that all the experts agreed on, from Singapore to Boston to Beijing to Jakarta: Germany needs to use its leadership to enable Europe to continue growing closer together and to remain internationally relevant. This is also a matter of its own interest, for Germany alone does not have enough clout to assert its interests and values at a global level, to successfully manage conflicts, or to strengthen international systems of order. Only in and through Europe does Germany bear enough weight to tip the scale.

The “Review 2014” experts do not reject the notion of a leadership role for Germany; on the contrary, they welcome it and call for it. According to Tobias Basuki, the world does not fear a more active Germany, but rather considers it the best candidate for assuming more leadership in Europe. As a recognised leading power, according to Kishore Mahbubani, Germany could even alter the course of world history.

For successful and effective German foreign policy, Anne-Marie Slaughter writes, Germany needs to use its role as a key mediating power within the EU to the best of its abilities. One of the most important tasks for the German Government, according to Feng Zhongping, is to advance European integration and lead the EU to success. Harald Müller argues that the consolidation of the EU is the foremost task in securing a thriving environment for Germany. Above all, however, according to Timothy Garton Ash, more German leadership means leadership in the European Union. In a grave global political situation, Jan Techau writes, European integration is once again a critical issue for the future; if Germany does not invest in it now, Europe will see an unprecedented loss in significance. At a time when the work...
“Imagine that Europe is a football team. No single country can be the captain or the manager (those roles belong in Brussels), but the success of a great team can depend on one powerful player, often a midfielder like Zinedine Zidane, who not only knits together the whole team’s game but also inspires other players by his performance. This is how I would like to see Germany: as the Zidane of Team EU.”

Timothy Garton Ash · Oxford University

of European integration is being called into question more than ever before, Germany must work unwaveringly for the increased political and economic integration of the EU, according to Shimon Stein and Sylke Tempel.

But leadership is not easy for Germany, Thomas Risse argues: it means listening to one’s partners before developing one’s own position, and it means subordinating one’s own particular interests in favour of a shared European position. According to Michael Ignatieff, however, the true challenge for German foreign policy consists in developing the following categories out of the reconsideration of foreign policy that Foreign Minister Steinmeier has initiated: what problems does Germany have to solve, what problems does it just have to administrate, and what problems should it stay away from.

Foreign Minister Steinmeier opens the conference marking the launch of „Review 2014 – A Fresh Look at Foreign Policy”

VIDEO
Review 2014 –
The Opening Conference
In spring 2014, the Körber Foundation polled 1000 Germans about their attitudes towards foreign policy. The survey yielded interesting results, with the answer to the generally formulated question about greater foreign policy engagement finding especially broad resonance: 37% of respondents voiced their support for increased engagement, while 60% called for restraint.

At second glance, however, the numbers yielded a more differentiated picture: despite the general support for restraint, there are concrete situations in which the overwhelming majority supports more engagement: humanitarian assistance, diplomatic negotiations, projects to strengthen civil society, promotion of disarmament and arms control, and assistance with building up state structures and training police and security forces. The attitude of restraint relates above all to military intervention and arms shipments. The survey results are, then, a strong mandate for greater diplomatic engagement!

WHERE SHOULD GERMANY BE ENGAGED?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1994</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian assistance</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diplomatic negotiations</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects to strengthen civil society</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion of arms control and disarmament</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training police and security forces</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance in building up state institutions</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial assistance to poor regions</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking in refugees</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting other countries’ military interventions without direct military participation</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military operations by the Bundeswehr</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplying arms to allied countries</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures listed in percent
totals below 100% due to “don’t know” or “no answer” responses
Military? In Principle No, but...

The German people have an especially high degree of baseline scepticism regarding military intervention. But there too they are prepared to decide otherwise in individual cases: the public backs international missions in defence against a direct threat as well as missions to save human lives or prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. Opinions in this area are neither monolithic nor unchanging, and different generations set very different priorities. The majority of survey respondents under the age of 29 would support an intervention for humanitarian reasons even without a UN mandate, while an average of 66% of respondents from all age groups would oppose it.

“WE IN GERMANY MUST HOLD A DEBATE ABOUT THE FACT THAT HUMAN RIGHTS AND PEACE IN THE WORLD DO NOT COME FOR FREE AND CANNOT BE ATTAINED THROUGH RESTRAINT IN FOREIGN POLICY. GERMANY MUST REDEFINE ITS FOREIGN POLICY ROLE IN THE WORLD AS AN ECONOMIC POWER. WE NEED TO INSTIL GREATER ENTHUSIASM FOR FOREIGN POLICY ISSUES IN YOUNG PEOPLE, WHO ARE MORE OPEN TO GREATER INTERNATIONAL ENGAGEMENT BY GERMANY, BUT DO NOT (YET) HAVE ENOUGH INTEREST IN THESE ISSUES.”

Thomas Paulsen · Körber Foundation

DEPLOYMENT OF GERMAN TROOPS ABROAD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When peace and security in Europe is directly threatened</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For humanitarian purposes, e.g. to ensure supplies to regions in crisis</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In order to prevent genocide</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>+5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In order to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>+5*</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In order to take part in internationally agreed peacekeeping operations</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When allies are directly threatened</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>+4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ensure access to vital natural resources or trade routes</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>+4*</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To implement an internationally agreed economic embargo against an aggressor</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1994: In order to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons

Source: “Intervention or restraint?” Results of a representative survey by TNS Infratest market research on behalf of the Körber Foundation.

Figure listed in percent totals below 100% due to “don’t know” or “no answer” responses. Figures in brackets represent change in comparison to 1994.
REVIEW PHASE 2 THE PUBLIC
CONVERSATION WITH THE PUBLIC: MORE OPENNESS, MORE DEBATE

“It was a heated debate – including angry hecklers,” the Neue Osnabrücker Zeitung reported on 15 July 2014. Patricia Flor, Head of the Directorate-General for the United Nations and Global Issues at the Federal Foreign Office, had travelled to Osnabrück the day before to hold a discussion with members of the public. The title of the talk, “Germany and the Responsibility to Protect – are we ready for more engagement?” may sound abstract. But the public quickly applied it to real problems: the situations in Libya and Syria, and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

“Don’t Palestinians have a right to protection?” one participant asked, while another complained, “Aren’t we talking about war too much? Shouldn’t we instead think more about how we can create peace?” Patricia Flor offered a counterpoint: “99.9% of German foreign policy has nothing to do with the military side,” she said, adding that this was often misjudged by the media and the public because “good news is no news”.

The series of public events in “Review 2014 – A Fresh Look at Foreign Policy” aimed to discuss difficult and controversial topics openly with people in Germany. At more than 60 public forums, panel debates, conferences and simulation workshops, Foreign Minister Steinmeier and many representatives of the Federal Foreign Office presented their own positions for discussion and engaged with citizens’ critiques and questions. This departure from the traditional lecture in favour of experimenting with new formats was intended to underscore that this was not a matter of lecturing the public, but rather of thinking together about our country’s role and responsibilities in the world.

So why go to all this trouble? As Patricia Flor explained it in Osnabrück, “Sustainable foreign policy is only possible if it is broadly rooted in society.”

“In recent years the German government has failed to clearly communicate what it wants. As a result, it has put at risk the internal political support that its foreign policy requires, and caused serious misunderstandings abroad, for example during the Euro crisis.”

Thomas Risse - Free University Berlin
In Dresden and Freiburg, visitors called for more understanding for Russia. In Munich, there were emotionally charged discussions of Germany’s relationship with Israel, while guests in Hamburg questioned German policy towards Syria: “Human rights are being violated and the world is on fire. So what’s the problem, why can’t we do anything about it?” one person asked. Relations with the United States were also a topic at many of the discussions, with many members of the public criticising NSA surveillance: “One expects a certain level of protection from the Federal Government,” one member of the public complained. Germany’s arms exports policy was also criticised frequently, with many attendees showing fundamental scepticism towards military operations and arms deliveries. In individual cases, however, they weighed the available options carefully. In Bad Hersfeld, for example, when the delivery of weapons to the Kurdish Peshmerga for their fight against the Islamic State came up. “One noticed that it was not an easy decision,” a school pupil noted after the discussion with Minister of State Michael Roth.

The public criticised foreign policy a lot, but they also expressed appreciation – above all for the unexpected openness of the Federal Foreign Office: “The fact that the Federal Foreign Office is getting out of Berlin to hold discussions with the public is something totally new,” one young participant said in praise. There was no overlooking the fact that people came not only to listen, but also to join in the conversation.

So what is a foreign ministry to make of this feedback? As Frank-Walter Steinmeier put it at a public discussion in Hamburg in September 2014, “The real challenge is to vouch for our own decisions and convince others about them.” That, he said, is precisely why it is important not to simply make difficult decisions in cabinet meetings and then announce them on the news: “Instead, we need to campaign for our convictions and share the content of our decisions at many events.”

“IT IS IMPORTANT TO DISCUSS FOREIGN POLICY MORE IN SOCIETY AT LARGE AND TO PROVIDE MORE INFORMATION ABOUT IT, FOR FOREIGN POLICY IS A CLOSED BOOK TO MOST PEOPLE.”

Jörg Armbruster · former correspondent, ARD broadcasting service

“THE STRATEGIC COMMUNICATION TASK FOR NETWORK-ORIENTED FOREIGN POLICY IS TO ENCOURAGE DIALOGUE AND EXCHANGE BETWEEN DIFFERENT PLAYERS AND TARGET GROUPS AND TO AVOID LAPSING INTO (MONOLOGICAL) FOREIGN POLICY PROPAGANDA.”

Oliver Will · Die Strategiemanufaktur

State Secretary Stephan Steinlein in a discussion with students at the Prinzessinnengarten in the Kreuzberg district of Berlin

VIDEO
Review 2014 Live – Impressions
SHADES OF GREY IN DIPLOMACY: “HOW WOULD YOU DECIDE?”

Peter Wittig brought along the topic that had been making his life difficult since he assumed office in Washington in spring 2014 as the German Ambassador to the United States: reporting on NSA surveillance had tarnished transatlantic relations. How should the Federal Government deal with this? In August 2014, Wittig discussed this issue with 30 participants in a simulation workshop in Potsdam.

This event was part of a new series that the Federal Foreign Office was experimenting with in the “Review 2014”, entitled “How would you decide?” In a sort of situation room, the public was supposed to experience foreign policy up-close like diplomats do every day in some 200 missions abroad. Difficult questions had to be answered under intense time pressure – sometimes just like they would be at a crisis task force.

Interested members of the public who were not involved with foreign policy in their professions were invited to the events. Why is this important for the Federal Foreign Office? Diplomacy today is faced with increasingly complex questions, which traditional foreign policy alone struggles to answer. This is true of the topic of the NSA, and also of cyber foreign policy and the threat posed by epidemics. Developing new approaches and solutions requires creativity and innovation. An outside perspective can help with this – including the perspective of experts from other contexts.

Those sitting in the situation room in Potsdam were not experts from the Federal Foreign Office, the Federal Chancellery, the Federal Intelligence Service and the Federal Criminal Police Office. Rather, they were a mixture of people familiar with the United States, students, young entrepreneurs, and computer experts, all of whom had gathered together at the ultramodern Hasso Plattner Institute. It soon became clear to them that the issue was not black-and-white, but rather was a matter of weighing and balancing different interests. Conflicting goals had to be reconciled and new creative approaches to difficult foreign policy problems had to be found. There was more than one possible answer; opinions differed when it came to the NSA. Only about half of the participants, for example, decided in a fictional scenario presented by Ambassador Wittig that the German Foreign Minister should visit the United States even though it would spark indignation at home. In turn, the participants were much more in agreement that transatlantic relations needed to gain new momentum – the more divisive question was how.

“THE FEDERAL FOREIGN OFFICE STILL SEES ITS RELATIONSHIP WITH CITIZENS AT HOME AS A MORE OR LESS UNIDIRECTIONAL ONE. FUTURE GERMAN DIPLOMACY WILL GET THINGS ‘MORE RIGHT’ IF SOCIETY WILL BE SEEN AS A RESOURCE FOR DIPLOMACY.”

Jan Melissen · Clingendael Institute for International Relations, The Hague
At the end of the simulation the participants had a clearer sense of the difficult trade-offs among individual interests and options. One participant who had asked critically at the beginning of the event, “How realistic a foreign policy decision-making situation can this simulation ever be?” said at the end, “There were good ideas that came out of this.”

As for Ambassador Wittig, he said he would be going back to Washington with interesting suggestions, including visa-free travel for students, German-American town hall meetings, and joint cabinet sessions.

The conversation opened with an accusation. A handful of students were sitting in Frank-Walter Steinmeier’s office, and two of them spoke up: When the Foreign Minister spoke of “more responsibility”, they said, he was bringing a “moralising tone into foreign policy”. Steinmeier saw it differently: terms could “always be misused”, he said, but what he understood by responsibility was an obligation: “We cannot shirk the task of asserting our influence in those places where we have influence.”

The students had won an essay competition as part of “Review 2014”, answering the question “What should German foreign policy do in the future, and what goals should it pursue in doing this?” More than 50 students submitted essays. One wrote about the “question of German identity”, another about “guiding principles for cyber and environmental foreign policy”. One essay contained concrete recommendations for dealing with autocrats. Another contest participant wrote, “Developing a foreign policy compass is indispensable to providing a political foundation for the minutiae of undeferrable crisis management.” And many called for “more European foreign policy!”

So what kind of people take the trouble to voluntarily write three pages about German foreign policy in the last two weeks of the university semester? One might easily assume most of the participants were political science students, with perhaps a few history or law

“PODIUMS ARE IN THE END MOSTLY THE REALM OF POLITICIANS. THAT’S WHY IT WOULD BE A VERY WELCOME DEVELOPMENT IF ADMINISTRATION FIGURES HAD MORE OF PRESENCE THERE.”

Philippe Lorenz · Swiss think tank “foraus – Forum on Foreign Policy”

“OUR GENERATION WANTS TO LEAD GERMANY TO MORE OPENNESS AND HONESTY IN ITS FOREIGN POLICY ACTIVITIES SO THAT WE CAN ACT AS A RELIABLE AND TRUSTWORTHY PARTNER AT HOME, IN EUROPE, AND IN THE REST OF THE WORLD.”

Livianne Smukalla · student in Frankfurt am Main
students with an interest in foreign policy. But this assumption would be incorrect: Media studies and linguistics students took part in the competition, as did a psychology student, literature students, business students, a computer science student and even a medical student.

A jury selected the ten best entries and posted them on the “Review 2014” website, where they were submitted to a vote. The competition was heated, with the essays garnering more than 10,000 votes in total from website users in summer 2014 before the five winning pieces were selected. The prize: an hour with the Foreign Minister in Berlin.

All the work was worth it, concluded the two students from Magdeburg who were able to present their essay, “Against a Policy of New German Responsibility”, to the Minister in person and discuss their ideas with him directly: “I was surprised at how openly he talked with us”, one of them said.

“THE WORLD DOESN’T NEED A PATERNALISTIC GERMANY. THE FOCUS OF OUR FOREIGN POLICY CONSIDERATIONS SHOULD BE NOT ON ASSUMING RESPONSIBILITY FOR OTHERS, BUT ON WORKING TOWARDS A WORLD WHERE DISADVANTAGED PLAYERS ARE FINALLY ABLE TO TAKE ON RESPONSIBILITY FOR THEIR OWN ACTIONS.”

Hanna Pfeifer and Kilian Spandler · political science students in Magdeburg and Tübingen

"THE SHIFT TO RENEWABLE ENERGY CAN BE UNDERSTOOD AS A RESOURCE OF GERMAN FOREIGN POLICY. IT’S BEING WATCHED AROUND THE WORLD WITH INTEREST AS A PILOT PROJECT. AS LONG AS IT IS UNDERWAY, GERMANY IS RECEIVING INCREASED ATTENTION, WHICH SHOULD BE USED TO RAISE AWARENESS OF CLIMATE ISSUES."

Michael Puntschuh · student in Dresden
THE “REVIEW 2014” EVENTS
(A SELECTION)

“KÖRBERFORUM: A FRESH LOOK AT FOREIGN POLICY”
Hamburg · 3 September 2014
Foreign Minister Frank-Walter Steinmeier
Moderation: Thomas Paulsen (Member of the Board of the Körber Foundation)

“CRISES AND CONFLICTS IN OUR NEIGHBOURHOOD – WHAT RESPONSIBILITY SHOULD GERMANY TAKE ON?”
Bad Hersfeld · 16 September 2014
Minister of State Michael Roth in a conversation with sixth-form school pupils from the Modellschule Obersberg
Moderation: Kai Struthoff (Managing Editor, Hersfelder Zeitung)

“BAD TIMES FOR ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT?”
Bonn · 4 September 2014
Ambassador Christoph Eichhorn (Deputy Federal Government Commissioner for Disarmament and Arms Control), Prof. Conrad Schetter (Director for Research, BICC)
Moderation: Alexander Drechsel (Deutsche Welle) in cooperation with the Bonn International Centre for Conversion (BICC)

“UKRAINE, RUSSIA AND THE WEST – BETWEEN WAR, PEACE AND SANCTIONS”
Freiburg · 18 November 2014
Gernot Erler (Member of the German Bundestag, Federal Government Coordinator for Intersocietal Cooperation with Russia, Central Asia and the Eastern Partnership Countries, former Minister of State), Rainer Lindner (Executive Director of the Committee on Eastern European Economic Relations, BDI Federation of German Industries), Andreas Umland (Senior Research Fellow, Institute for Euro-Atlantic Cooperation, Kyiv)
Moderation: Thomas Fricker (Badische Zeitung) in cooperation with the Colloquium Politicum at the University of Freiburg

“PEACE – BUT HOW?”
Heidelberg · 25 July 2014
Rüdiger König (crisis response commissioner and former Ambassador to Afghanistan), Philipp Rotmann (Associate Director of the Global Public Policy Institute Berlin), Franziska Brantner (Member of the German Bundestag, Chair of the Subcommittee on Civilian Crisis Prevention)
Moderation: Sören Sgries (Rhein Neckar Zeitung)

“RESPONSIBILITY AND OPENNESS – WHERE DOES OUR ‘CULTURE OF WELCOME’ BEGIN?”
Stuttgart · 20 October 2014
Foreign Minister Frank-Walter Steinmeier, Bilkay Öney (State Commissioner for Integration, Baden-Württemberg), Ergun Lümali (Deputy Chairman of the General Works Council, Daimler AG), Johannes Kärcher (Chairman of the Supervisory Board, Alfred Kärcher) and Njeri Kinyanjui (owner of Hottpott Sauces in Reutlingen)
Moderation: Anna Koktsidou (SWR International) together with the Institute for Foreign Cultural Relations (ifa)
“25 YEARS AFTER THE END OF THE COLD WAR: NEW GLOBAL ORDER OR ENDLESS CRISES?”
Rostock · 4 December 2014
Clemens von Goetze (Head of Political Directorate-General 3)
with the Rostock Higher Regional Court and the Rostock Navy Command

“GERMANY’S ROLE IN EUROPE: MORE RESPONSIBILITY, MORE STRESS, MORE FINESSE?”
Frankfurt an der Oder · 25 November 2014
Martin Kotthaus (Head of the European Directorate-General) and Jürgen Neyer (Dean of Faculty of Social and Cultural Sciences)
with the European University Viadrina

“HOW WOULD YOU DECIDE? AT A DIPLOMATIC POST IN KENYA”
Dresden · 18 August 2014
Ambassador Andreas Peschke
together with YOUNG DGAP and the Global Shapers

“INTERVENE OR STAY OUT? GERMANY’S ROLE IN THE WORLD”
Erfurt · 3 December 2014
Thomas Bagger (Head of Policy Planning), Michael Haspel (Evangelische Akademie Thüringen) and Gert Weisskirchen (Willy Brandt School of Public Policy)
with the Evangelischen Akademie Thüringen and the Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung

“HUMAN RIGHTS AND REALPOLITIK: AT CROSS-PURPOSES?”
Nuremberg · 11 July 2014
Patricia Flor (Head of the Directorate-General for the United Nations and Global Issues), Barbara Lochbihler (MEP and former Secretary General of Amnesty International Germany)
Moderation: Alexander Jungkunz (Deputy Editor-in-Chief, Nürnberger Nachrichten)

“WHAT IS WRONG WITH GERMAN FOREIGN POLICY, AND WHAT SHOULD BE CHANGED?”
Munich · 4 July 2014
State Secretary Markus Ederer in conversation with students in Munich
REVIEW
PHASE 3
THE FEDERAL FOREIGN OFFICE
DIPLOMATS IN A FISHBOWL

The library reading room, just before 11 a.m. on Friday morning. Some 50 members of Federal Foreign Office staff in Berlin have gathered for a discussion of an unfamiliar kind. The props that otherwise structure debate here at Werderscher Markt are missing. There is no stage, no agenda, and no speaking notes.

"WE NEED THE RIGHT MIX OF MODESTY AND DETERMINATION TO SHAPE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENTS"

This is an experiment. Several rows of chairs have been set out, with a moderator and two experts placed at the front. Next to them are two empty chairs. Anybody can go up and become part of the panel for a few minutes, express their views and contribute to the discussion. Communication experts call this technique a "fishbowl". For the diplomats, it was uncharted territory. But at least the topic of debate was familiar: "Have crises become the new norm? What does this mean for the Federal Foreign Office?" The subject was popular as many diplomats feel that crisis management now dominates their everyday work. And yet, at least initially, many hesitated to step up and occupy one of the empty chairs.

The Friday discussions took place over a period of six weeks. Each was attended by around 50 participants from all directorates-general. A wide range of issues were covered. As well as examining ways of dealing with the "new complexity" in international politics, the diplomats held open debates on the demands of a modern corporate culture, on modern knowledge management and on new forms of cooperation across organisational divides.

"SHAPING INTERNATIONAL ORDER IS ALSO A FORM OF CRISIS PREVENTION."

The fishbowl discussions were only one of the techniques tried out during the Review. Others included "gallery walks", in which diplomats discussed critical comments and suggestions from foreign policy experts and members of the public displayed on posters at stations along a demarcated route. Online discussions and an "ideas workshop" with input from small groups rounded off the debate, in which over 1000 members of staff in Germany and at the missions abroad participated. In contrast to the numerous public events, this was a purely in-house affair, allowing people to talk completely openly about workflows and procedures. Particularly noticeable was the willingness to question routines and to look for innovative approaches, for example with respect to crisis management.

"It must be our goal to be even quicker off the mark and to co-define policy in crisis situations. That means identifying trouble spots early and actively preventing crises," said one participant. The diplomats had some specific proposals to this end: increased use of
mediation to help prevent conflicts, the use of scenario planning to improve early warning, and better pooling of the pertinent skills available in-house.

“We need great staying power, even when the media spotlight has already moved on,” said another participant, describing the FFO’s determination to shape international developments. The network of missions abroad should be better used to this end, another diplomat urged. “No other ministry has our insight into societal changes and power relations in all world regions. Our finger is on the pulse and we have the ability to translate implications of local developments into our political reality.”

But opinions did of course differ on a variety of issues. Are diplomats too cautious or is the FFO more creative than one would think? Is there an overwhelming “culture of obedience” which all too often stifles dissension? Do FFO staff waste time on routine tasks or is most of their work indispensable? These and similar questions were the subject of vigorous, frank and fruitful debate. Many people wish for better feedback on their work, and to have more time and scope for strategic debate and more involvement outside the confines of their own divisions. Most people agreed that the FFO had to manage crises better and sometimes had to respond more quickly to sudden political developments. Others stressed their view that the FFO must not, through all the crises, neglect Germany’s long-term interest in a functioning international system. This was, they said, “as vital as oxygen” for a country so embedded in the world as Germany.

IDEAS WORKSHOP

The idea originated one lunchtime, when a small group of young diplomats were in the canteen discussing their work. “I joined the Foreign Service because I’m really into foreign policy,” one woman said, “And now I’m so snowed under with routine business that I hardly have time for fundamental foreign policy considerations.”

The group registered a joint contribution for the ideas workshop established as part of “Review 2014”. Diplomats from the Economic Directorate-General, the Personnel Section and experts on Africa and Asia jointly elaborated a project proposal addressing the questions: How can the Federal Foreign Office concentrate more on the areas in which Germany makes a difference? What areas are those? “Urgent is the enemy of the important,” one participant reported: “We want to create more freedom for unusual ideas.”

A Market Place for Ideas – Participants of various ideas workshops present their projects and discuss ways of implementing their proposals
Many diplomats are occupied with such thoughts. The Review process has given them a forum to share their proposals with colleagues and to work out how they might be implemented. The organisers were surprised by the uptake. More than forty project proposals were submitted and more than 200 diplomats took part. Proposals came from all over the world, from Rio de Janeiro, Kaliningrad and Chisinau, as well as from Washington and, of course, Berlin. The project groups invested a lot of free time and energy in the Review. “We always met at lunchtime, discussed the issues and divided up the work,” one participant told us. “We weren’t always of the same opinion, but ultimately it was our conversations on precisely the points we disagreed on that were the most useful.” The group made specific proposals on how to gain more time for strategic issues: priorities should – with the help of a moderated external process – be set even more clearly, and the value-added from traditional dialogue formats, for example, regularly scrutinised.

A team of diplomats at the Embassy in Washington considered how the Federal Foreign Office could become an even better platform for German interests abroad. A good half of the desk officers in Washington are not from the FFO, but from other Federal Ministries such as the Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy and the Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. When addressing new foreign policy challenges such as pandemics, cybersecurity and climate change they thought it was a definite advantage for experts from various subject areas to work together, and that the ministries should cooperate more closely abroad and at home to benefit accordingly. Other colleagues came up with elaborate ideas on how to improve promotion prospects for particularly high-achieving officials, and another working group made practical proposals on reducing administrative burdens in the embassies’ consular sections.

Once the ideas workshop was closed, the groups presented their proposals, not by giving lectures or providing handouts, but using flip charts. At a “market place of ideas”, they sought to persuade their colleagues (and the state secretary) to incorporate their proposals into the “Review 2014” outcomes.

“WE MUST CLEARLY DEFINE OUR INTERESTS AND PRIORITIES. WE MUST ALSO IDENTIFY WHAT IS LESS IMPORTANT AND JETTISON BALLAST.”

“We need to open up time and space for innovation away from the office routine, more dialogue with non-FFO people, and new formats for meetings and decision-making.”
ONLINE DISCUSSIONS

One wall of the FFO Policy Planning Staff’s meeting room is covered by a huge world map, the other by a board of graphs and sticky notes. This is normally where foreign policy strategies are drawn up. But today cables and monitors dominate. The room has become the control centre for one of Review 2014’s biggest experiments.

FFO staff around the world can connect in an online debate in real time – just like a chat. The organising team can see how many people are participating in the global debate on one of the monitors. Just a few to start off, then a dozen, two dozen, and finally over 120.

The moderator enters the first question: How should the Federal Foreign Office deal with a changing international system and the rise of new players?

The sun was rising in Mexico City, the Embassy in Tehran was about to close. The first, hesitant answers came slowly in. “Difficult question,” one participant wrote. “It’s hard to put it into a couple of sentences.” But then the debate gradually gained momentum. “All this crisis management must not make us forget our long-term objectives,” another contributor said.

The debate was anonymous, everyone could give free rein to their ideas – or their frustrations. In small virtual groups, statements made by other participants were evaluated on a scale from “definitely agree” to “definitely disagree”. An algorithm identified the theses with the highest agreement rates, and the most popular were automatically forwarded to the other groups for renewed debate. Such structured discussions were hoped to be better than simple surveys at revealing diplomats’ thoughts on how to make the Federal Foreign Office even fitter for the future.
Staff were above all concerned with European policy. How can the FFO make Germany’s European policy even better? For many colleagues, relying on our own strengths was high on the list. “We don’t only know our EU partners’ positions. We also know the reasons behind them and the crucial levers we have to use in negotiations,” one participant noted.

The Federal Foreign Office could act as the “Federal Government’s Europe Skills Centre”. “Together, as the EU, we have clout in the world – the Ukraine crisis shows how important joint action is,” another participant noted.

But exchange between the Federal Foreign Office and the European External Action Service would need to be even better, FFO officials would have to develop a kind of “European reflex”.

The constraints of the format encouraged people to be precise and succinct. The online discussion put a support officer in Berlin in a group with an ambassador in Latin America and a press officer in Asia – and made them swap views quickly, in clear, direct statements, giving unambiguous evaluations.

“FOREIGN MINISTRIES HAVE TO LEAD BY EXAMPLE AND PERSUASION.”

“WE MUST TAKE CARE THAT WE DO NOT SIMPLY BECOME A GREAT BIG CRISIS RESPONSE CENTRE. WE MUST HAVE THE TIME TO SHAPE OUR LONGER-TERM RELATIONS WITH KEY COUNTRIES AND REGIONS.”
REALITY MEETS “REVIEW 2014”

When reports of the spread of the Ebola virus multiplied in the summer of 2014, the wheels started turning at the Federal Foreign Office, routinely and inexorably. A crisis taskforce was established, the embassies in the affected countries reported round the clock to Berlin, the situation in Sierra Leone, Guinea and Liberia was discussed almost daily at the FFO Directors’ Meetings. The authorities painstakingly examined and improved the available means of removing infected or at-risk German nationals from the danger zone.

Nevertheless, at the end of October Foreign Minister Steinmeier stated self-critically that his ministry had not been “sufficiently prepared for the dynamism of the epidemic”. What had happened? The Federal Foreign Office had indeed taken prudent action to assist and protect German nationals in the region – but it was late in addressing the fatal impact a collapse of public services, with all associated disastrous consequences, could have on half a continent. Ebola was for too long treated above all as a problem for German nationals. Germany’s responsibility as a leading European power with global interests was not properly recognised.

Problem noted, corrective action taken. Foreign Minister Steinmeier recalled the crisis-proven ambassador Walter Lindner from South America and made him the Federal Government’s Ebola commissioner. Lindner led efforts to better coordinate the aid efforts to stabilise the affected countries and to fight the disease, thus increasing their effectiveness. At the European level, the Minister launched a “white helmet” initiative, so that medical help can be provided more quickly in future epidemics. Germany thus took tangible, determined action, albeit rather late in the day.

When asked to name the greatest challenge faced by politics, British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan once said, “Events, dear boy, events”. This conclusion was shared by the “Review 2014”. Apart from the expectations voiced and proposals submitted by the experts, the public and members of staff, it was above all the facts on the ground that produced a strong impulse for change. It was not just Ebola that kept German foreign policy on its toes, but also the Ukraine crisis, the rise of ISIS and the Gaza conflict.

In view of these events, the project “Review 2014 – A Fresh Look at Foreign Policy” needs to be more than an innovative process to restore our own confidence in the present state and future direction of German foreign policy. It must also be a launchpad for the Foreign Service to draw conclusions for its own work. Here, too, there are no final answers. Our world is constantly changing, and so we must constantly adapt and reconsider. However, we do want to extract a definite impetus for change from the debates and ideas of the past year – to ensure that we not only take a fresh look at foreign policy, but also make it better.

“DIGITISING COMMUNICATION SHOULD BE GIVEN A VERY HIGH PRIORITY; ONLINE COMMUNICATION MUST NOT BE CONSIDERED AN INSIGNIFICANT BY-PRODUCT OF PUBLIC DIPLOMACY, A FORM OF OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY FOR THE YOUNGEST MEMBER OF EMBASSY STAFF.”

Karl Jurka · Political adviser and lobbyist in Berlin, Paris and Vienna
FOR A BETTER FOREIGN POLICY

“Crisis, Order and Europe” – this short list highlights the challenges to and conflicting priorities of German foreign policy. But are we as well prepared for them as we could be? For a better foreign policy, the Foreign Service wants to perform its everyday work more effectively, communicate more extensively and mobilise its resources more efficiently. We have thus produced a package of detailed proposals for a more effectual Foreign Service, to be implemented over the next eighteen months.

BETTER CRISIS ANTICIPATION, ENLARGED DIPLOMATIC TOOLKIT

Present crises like in eastern Ukraine and Ebola, as well as potential crises and conflicts, are increasingly becoming our daily business, the new norm. We have to improve our toolkits for prevention, for early warning, for crisis management. We have to build the necessary reserves so that we can respond quickly and meaningfully. The structures within the Federal Foreign Office need to be pooled and strengthened to this end. The Federal Foreign Office already has a state-of-the-art Crisis Response Centre that helps German nationals in need anywhere around the globe. In the future, our political crisis capabilities and instruments will be pooled in a bespoke directorate-general, which will optimise our management of crises in comprehensive foreign policy terms. It will bring together experts to identify, prevent and combat crises. They will work with a mix of traditional and modern foreign policy tools, pursuing a networked approach. The new Directorate-General will unite seasoned negotiators, experts for conflict mediation and experienced reconstruction workers. It will manage the money that diplomats in crisis regions will use to prevent the collapse of state structures or to help build new institutions. A “crisis pool” will be created to ensure the rapid and flexible deployment of diplomats to crisis areas or their assignment to particularly busy units, to task forces or project teams. Within the Federal Government we will examine how we can lend the United Nations more substantial support in its worldwide peacekeeping efforts. The Centre for International Peace Operations (ZIF) will be strengthened in order to professionalise the deployment of civilian German crisis workers on international missions. In this way, Germany’s civilian capacities in areas from crisis prevention to conflict settlement and post-conflict peacekeeping will be enhanced and the basis for our greater participation in European and international peace missions improved.

A NEW IMPETUS FOR A JUST AND PEACEFUL INTERNATIONAL ORDER

It is not only in emergencies that the Federal Foreign Office wants to perform better. In order to protect its long-term interests, Germany has for decades been investing considerable energy in establishing and enlarging multilateral institutions such as the UN, NATO, the EU and the OSCE. But the international order is changing as global power centres shift and new influential technologies take hold. The Federal Foreign Office must adapt its structures and policies to help shape these processes of change by strengthening those elements conducive to international order. In this context, the Federal Foreign Office will call on the Federal Government to create a state secretaries committee on issues pertaining to the international order, similar to the
RELEX Group of the European Commission.
By assuming greater responsibility in international organisations, such as chairing the OSCE in 2016, or holding the presidency of the UN Human Rights Council or the G7 or G20, Germany can also contribute to shaping international order. In addition, we will give prominence to foreign policy instruments such as international legal cooperation and rule-of-law promotion as a trademark of German foreign policy. Selbsteinbindung (voluntary involvement) is a defining characteristic of German foreign policy, and not just within established organisations. Multilateral treaties and mechanisms make an indispensable contribution to maintaining peace and security, above all in the field of arms control and disarmament – see the negotiations on the Iranian nuclear programme. We want to strengthen this multilateral competence, by establishing a directorate-general for issues pertaining to the international order.

ANCHORING THE “EUROPEAN REFLEX” MORE FIRMLY IN GERMAN DIPLOMACY

European integration is the prime lesson from Germany’s history and the foundation on which German foreign policy is built. If German diplomacy is to play a defining role in the future, too, it will do so through joint initiatives and ideas that result in joint European action. Germany will therefore make an active contribution to the future European Foreign and Security Policy strategy and closely dovetail its elaboration with the process of drafting Germany’s next White Paper. Germany’s present strength places special demands on the “European conduct” of German foreign policy – recognised leadership is built on trust, the power of persuasion and generosity. We want to anchor the “European reflex” more firmly in all foreign policy fields by taking appropriate staffing and structural measures, and ensure yet closer links with the institutions in Brussels. In all our undertakings within the Foreign Service and across the Federal Government, we shall from the outset give systematic consideration to their impact on our EU partners.

MORE ROOM FOR STRATEGIC REFLECTION

The world’s “new complexity” makes it all the more vital to have greater room for strategic reflection. Constant review of our analyses and the foundations of diplomatic action is needed. The Foreign Service is kept very busy with urgent tasks and acute crises. But at the same time the need for strategic vision is growing. More room for strategy – this demand is indeed meant literally. The Federal Foreign Office does not intend to abolish conventional workflows and routines, but instead wants to optimise them and, where necessary, make structures less rigid. An on-going well-structured and professionally moderated process of defining priorities, room and time for strategic thought, regular brainstorming sessions on underlying, cross-cutting issues at top level, and the use of modern scenario and forecasting methods are all part and parcel of this. We also want to encourage the use of joint strategic forecasting by the Federal Government. We will likewise endeavour to learn more systematically from past experience and enhance our evaluation practices.

“RISING EXTERNAL EXPECTATIONS ON THOSE RESPONSIBLE FOR FOREIGN AND GLOBAL POLICY CAN EASILY LEAD TO A KITCHEN-SINK APPROACH: HELP SHAPE THINGS A BIT EVERYWHERE, BE A BIT PRESENT EVERYWHERE, TRY NOT TO DISAPPOINT ANYONE. AD HOC-ISM IS, HOWEVER, THE OPPOSITE OF STRATEGIC ACTION.”

Dirk Messner · German Development Institute, DIE
BETTER COMMUNICATION

As Germany’s clout increases, so too does interest in Germany’s foreign policy debates. Greater diplomatic responsibility brings a growing need to explain our actions, to foster understanding and solicit support. Germany’s foreign policy is built on trust at home and abroad. We now face a huge challenge to get our message across, both in Germany and internationally. The Foreign Service’s communication structures and processes must be redefined – giving special attention to online formats and the digital media. The aim is not to do more PR, but to explain and listen. The Federal Foreign Office wants to become more receptive to stimuli from within and without, to signals from the Bundestag and civil society, to the scepticism and concerns of the public, to the contributions and ideas of other foreign policy players. The types of discussion tried out during the “Review 2014” process, such as simulations, Internet fora and other debating methods will become regular fixtures. They will be supplemented by another new format, the citizens’ conference, the first of which is to be held in 2015.

GREATER OPENNESS AND MORE NETWORKING

The Foreign Service must be more open if it is to address new issues and challenges better and ensure foreign policy is more firmly anchored in German society. In particular, it should better reflect the growing diversity of German society. At the same time, the Foreign Service must extend its networks and transform itself into a hub in the variegated world of modern diplomacy. Greater use should be made of information and ideas from civil society, academia and think tanks, and networking should be improved at all levels of the Service. The Federal Foreign Office and its missions abroad are the platform on which the many components of German foreign policy should be integrated and moulded into a coherent whole.

BETTER MOBILISATION OF RESOURCES

More input and expertise from outside are however only one side of the coin. The Foreign Service staff around the globe, their minds, their knowledge, their international experience, their negotiating skills, their abilities of strategic thought and action, their diligence and assiduity even where living conditions are not easy, these are the true capital of the Federal Foreign Office. Given the scarcity of available resources and foreseeably increasing demands, we want to better mobilise this capital. Greater emphasis will be put on leadership and personal responsibility. Information will be shared better. Modern matrix management for increased cooperation between directorates-general is likewise part of the “Review 2014”’s mobilisation programme, as are improvements in internal communication and efforts to create better career development prospects for particularly high-achieving members of staff. The over 200 German missions abroad will be even more closely involved in decision-making processes and the everyday formulation of German foreign policy.

“WE MUST NOT PROCLAIM THE IMPORTANCE OF HUMAN RIGHTS IN OUR SPEECHES AND THEN BACK DOWN WHEN ASKED TO SHARE A LITTLE OF OUR PROSPERITY.”

Selmin Çalışkan · Amnesty International

“IT IS WIDELY ACCEPTED THAT FOREIGN BUNDESWEHР DEPLOYMENTS, AND MILITARY FORCE IN GENERAL, ARE THE MEANS OF LAST RESORT. BUT THE PRIMARY CIVILIAN OPTIONS ARE Seldom SUFFICIENTLY EXAMINED OR DEVELOPED.”

Bernd Bornhorst · Association of German Development NGOs, VENRO
OUR EXPERTS

Adekeye Adebajo  Executive Director of the Centre for Conflict Resolution (CCR) in Cape Town
www.ccr.org.za

Kofi Annan  Former Secretary-General of the United Nations, Chairman of the Board of the Kofi Annan Foundation in Geneva
www.kofiannanfoundation.org

Louise Arbour  Former United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
www.ohchr.org

Tobias Basuki  Researcher at the Department of Politics and International Relations at the Centre for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) in Jakarta
www.csis.or.id

Brahma Chellaney  Professor for Strategic Studies at the Centre for Policy Research in New Delhi
www.cprindia.org

Sir Lawrence Freedman  Vice-Principal of King’s College London
www.kcl.ac.uk

Timothy Garton Ash  Professor of European Studies at the University of Oxford
www.ox.ac.uk

François Godement  Head of Asia Program of the European Council on Foreign Affairs (ECFR) Director for Strategy at the Asia Centre in Paris
www.centreasia.eu

Charles Grant  Director of the Centre for European Reform (CER) in London
www.cer.org.uk

Jean-Marie Guéhenno  President of the International Crisis Group (ICG) in Brussels
www.crisisgroup.org

Sebastian Heilmann  President and founding director of the Mercator Institute for China Studies (MERICS) in Berlin
www.merics.org

Arnd Henze  Journalist and correspondent for ARD-Television
www.ard-hauptstadtstudio.de

Reiner Hoffmann  President of the German Trade Union Confederation (DGB)
www.dgb.de

Brian Hocking  Senior Visiting Fellow at the Clingendael Institute and visiting professor at the College of Europe in Bruges
www.clingendael.nl

Zhou Hong  Director of the Institute of European Studies at the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (CASS)
http://ies.cass.cn/en

Michael Ignatieff  Canadian historian and former politician; Professor at Harvard Kennedy School
www.hks.harvard.edu

Robert Kappel  Senior Research Fellow at the GIGA Institute for African Studies in Hamburg
www.giga-hamburg.de

Markus Kerber  Director General and Member of the Presidential Board of the Federation of German Industries (BDI)
www.bdi.eu

Fuat Keyman  Professor of International Relations at Sabanci University and Director of the Istanbul Policy Center
www.ipc.sabanciuniv.edu/en

Joachim Krause  Director of the Institute for Security Studies at the Christian-Albrechts-University in Kiel
www.ispk.uni-kiel.de

Anne-Marie Le Gloannc  Senior Research Fellow at the Centre for International Studies and Research (CERI) in Paris
www.sciencespo.fr/ceri

Wolf Lepenies  Member of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Cultural Foundation and former director of the Berlin Social Science Center (WZB)
www.kulturstiftung-des-bundes.de

Maria Soledad Loaeza  Professor of Political Sciences at the Center of International Studies at El Colegio de México
www.soledadloaeza.com

Sverre Lodgaard  Senior Research Fellow and former Director of the Norwegian Peace Research Institute (PRIO) and the Norwegian Institute for Foreign Affairs (NUPI)
www.english.nupi.no

Kishore Mahbubani  Professor of Public Policy at the National University of Singapore
www.nus.edu.sg

Hanns Maull  Until 2013 Professor for Foreign Policy and International Relations at the University of Trier, Senior Fellow at the German Institute for International and Security Affairs (SWP) in Berlin
www.swp-berlin.org

John J. Mearsheimer  Co-director of the Program on International Security Policy at the University of Chicago
http://mearsheimer.uchicago.edu

Jan Melissen  Senior Research Fellow at Clingendael Institute of International Relations, The Hague
www.clingendael.nl

Dirk Messner  Vice-Chair of the German Advisory Council on Global Change (WBGU) and Director of the German Development Institute (DIE) in Bonn
www.die-gdi.de
Davood Moradian Director General of the Afghan Institute for Strategic Studies (AISS) in Kabul  
www.aiiss.af

Harald Müller Executive Director of the Peace Research Institute Frankfurt (PRIF)  
www.hsfk.de

Herfried Münkler Professor for Political Theory at the Humboldt University in Berlin  
www.sowi.hu-berlin.de

Volker Perthes Director of the German Institute for International and Security Affairs (SWP) in Berlin  
www.swp-berlin.org

Shaun Riordan Senior Visiting Fellow at the Clingendael Institute and Head of Economics and Theory of Knowledge at the International College Spain in Madrid  
www.clingendael.nl

Thomas Risse Director of the Center for Transnational Relations, Foreign and Security Policy at the Freie Universität Berlin  
www.polsoz.fu-berlin.de

Eberhard Sandschneider Director of the Research Institute, German Council on Foreign Relations (DGAP) in Berlin  
www.dgap.org

Abdulaziz Sager Chairman of the Gulf Research Center (GRC) in Jeddah  
www.grc.net

Wolfgang Schwarz Former Research Fellow at the Institute for International Policy and Economy of the GDR, publisher of “Das Blättchen”  
www.das-blaettchen.de

Daniela Schwarzer Director of the Europe Program at the German Marshall Fund of the United States (GMF) in Berlin  
www.gmfus.org

Paul Sharp Senior Visiting Fellow at the Clingendael Institute, Professor of Political Science at the University of Minnesota Duluth (US)  
www.clingendael.nl

James Shikwati Director of the Inter Region Economic Network (IREN) in Nairobi  
www.irenkenya.com

Elizabeth Sidiropoulos Chief Executive of the South African Institute of International Affairs (SAIIA) in Johannesburg  
www.saia.org.za

Carlos Ivan Simonsen Leal President of the Getúlio Vargas Foundation, Graduate School of Economics in Rio de Janeiro  
www.epge.fgv.br/en

Anne-Marie Slaughter Former Head of Policy Planning at the US State Department, President of the New America Foundation in Washington, DC  
www.newamerica.org

Shimon Stein Senior Research Fellow at the Institute for National Security Studies (INSS), former Israeli ambassador to Germany  
www.inss.org.il

Constanze Stelzenmüller Robert Bosch Senior Fellow at the Brookings Institution in Washington, DC  
www.brookings.edu

Paweł Świeboda President of the Board of demosEUROPA – Centre for European Strategy Foundation in Warsaw  
www.demoseuropa.eu

Jan Techau Director Carnegie Europe in Brussels  
www.carnegieeuropa.eu

Sylke Tempel Editor-in-chief of “Internationale Politik”  
www.internationalepolitik.de

Nathalie Tocci Deputy Director of the Institute of Foreign Affairs (IAI) in Rome  
www.iai.it

Dmitri Trenin Director Carnegie Moscow Center  
www.carnegieendowment.org

Loukas Tsoukalis President of the ELIAMEP Hellenic Foundation for European and Foreign Policy in Athens  
www.eliamep.gr/en

Kudrat Virk Senior Researcher at the Center for Conflict Resolution (CCR) in Cape Town  
www.ccr.org.za

Almut Wieland-Karimi Director of the Center for International Peace Operations (ZiF) in Berlin  
www.zif-berlin.org

Heinrich August Winkler Historian, until 2007 Professor of Modern History at the Humboldt University Berlin  
www.geschichte.hu-berlin.de

Michael Wolffsohn Historian and publicist, until 2012 Professor for Modern History at the Universität der Bundeswehr in Munich  
www.wolffsohn.de

Feng Zhongping Vice President of the China Institute of Contemporary International Relations (CICIR) in Beijing  
www.cicir.ac.cn
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 May 2014</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>Opening conference “Review 2014 – A Fresh Look at Foreign Policy”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 July 2014</td>
<td>Munich</td>
<td>“Authoritarian systems on the path to victory? New challenges for German foreign policy”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 July 2014</td>
<td>Munich</td>
<td>“What is wrong with German foreign policy, and what should be changed?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 July 2014</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
<td>“Non-intervention in Syria: negligent or the only alternative?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 July 2014</td>
<td>Nuremberg</td>
<td>“Human rights and realpolitik at cross-purposes?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 July 2015</td>
<td>Osnabrück</td>
<td>“Osnabrück Peace Forum: Germany and the Responsibility to Protect – are we prepared for more engagement?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 July 2014</td>
<td>Heidelberg</td>
<td>“Peace – but how?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 August 2014</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>“We grill the State Secretary: Current questions in German foreign policy”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 August 2014</td>
<td>Dresden</td>
<td>“How would you decide? At a diplomatic post in Kenya”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 August 2014</td>
<td>Düsseldorf</td>
<td>“How would you decide? At a diplomatic post in Indonesia”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 August 2014</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>Ambassadors Conference “Review 2014 – A Fresh Look at Foreign Policy”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 August 2014</td>
<td>Potsdam</td>
<td>“How would you decide? At a diplomatic post in the United States”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 August 2014</td>
<td>Potsdam</td>
<td>“Transatlantic relations under strain?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 August 2014</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>Open Day at the Federal Foreign Office, public Review forum with the Foreign Minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 September 2014</td>
<td>Bonn</td>
<td>“Bad times for arms control and disarmament?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 September 2014</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>“Shooting for peace”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 September 2014</td>
<td>Essen</td>
<td>“Mercator EssensZeit: German foreign policy under scrutiny”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 September 2014</td>
<td>Brussels</td>
<td>“A Fresh Look at German Foreign Policy”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 September 2014</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>“The role of foreign cultural and educational policy in the toolset of modern diplomacy”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 September 2014</td>
<td>Bad Hersfeld</td>
<td>“Crisis and conflicts in our neighbourhood – what responsibility should Germany take on?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 September 2014</td>
<td>Düsseldorf</td>
<td>“Foreign is domestic – the Goethe-Institut as a bridge to Germany”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 September 2014</td>
<td>Dresden</td>
<td>“Russia and the West – what next?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 September 2014</td>
<td>Dresden</td>
<td>“How would you decide? At a diplomatic post in Moscow”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 September 2014</td>
<td>Ulm</td>
<td>“Companies in global transformation – the interplay of business and world politics”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 and 4 October 2014</td>
<td>Hanover</td>
<td>Review stand at the Federal Government tent on the Day of German Unity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 October 2014</td>
<td>Brandenburg an der Havel</td>
<td>“Open campus: A Fresh Look at German Foreign Policy”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 October 2014</td>
<td>Frankfurt am Main</td>
<td>“Schools abroad, cultural projects, cultural mediators”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 October 2014</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>“A Fresh Look at German Foreign Policy”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 October 2014</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>“Facebook Berlin Talk: #Review2014”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 October 2014</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>“The Spanish View on German Foreign Policy”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 October 2014</td>
<td>Munich</td>
<td>“European Foreign and Security Policy and the new tensions with Russia”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 October 2014</td>
<td>Warsaw</td>
<td>“Polish Perceptions of German Foreign Policy”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 October 2014</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>“Good Governance made in Germany – training leaders for the global South”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14 October 2014 · Rome
“The Germany Europe Needs”

15 October 2014 · Berlin
“Meaningful Heritage – New Challenges for Cultural Policy”

16 October 2014 · Augsburg
“Hopes and fears in Libya: A collapsing state on the Mediterranean?”

16 October 2014 · Frankfurt am Main
“17th Frankfurt Encounter: Responsibility, leadership and restraint – Germany’s foreign policy role in flux”

16 October 2014 · London
“Reviewing German Foreign Policy in a Changing Europe”

19 October 2014 · Berlin
“We, the Nibelungen/workshop talk”

20 October 2014 · Stuttgart
“Responsibility and openness – Where does our ‘Culture of Welcome’ begin?”

20 October 2014 · Stuttgart
“Foreign policy under scrutiny – Germany’s role in the world”

21 October 2014 · Saarbrücken
“How would you decide? At a diplomatic post in Paris”

21 October 2014 · Chemnitz
“Intervene or stay out? Germany’s role in the world”

22 October 2014 · Sofia
“What does German foreign policy in the 21st century mean?”

23 October 2014 · Bonn
“Renaissance or reform in transatlantic relations?”

23 October 2014 · Leipzig
“Belarus – terra incognita for the EU”

24 October 2014 · Munich
“The artist’s studio abroad – foreign cultural policy and artist-in-residence programmes”

24 October 2014 · Munich
“German foreign policy and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict”

24 October 2014 · Madrid
“The role of German foreign policy in a crisis-stricken North Africa”

27 October 2014 · Ludwigshafen
“Women’s human rights: the global reality”

30 October 2014 · Dortmund
“Qatar as a global player striking a balance between tradition and modernity”

30 October 2014 · Mainz
“Sustainable development for everybody – but how?”

4 November 2014 · Berlin
“Germany’s interests in European policy”

10 November 2014 · Munich
“Africa as a continent of opportunity?”

11 November 2014 · Berlin
“Reviewing German and European Foreign Policy”

18 November 2014 · Freiburg
“Ukraine, Russia and the West – between war, peace and sanctions”

21 November 2014 · Berlin
“The Role of Germany in European Foreign Policy”

24 November 2014 · Bremen
“Russia, Germany and Europe – what next?”

25 November 2014 · Frankfurt an der Oder
“Germany’s role in Europe: More responsibility, more stress, more finesse?”

25 November 2014 · Königstein im Taunus
“Elections in Tunisia – poster child of political transformation in the Arab world?”
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