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INTRODUCTION

New global challenges and current transatlantic tensions require diverse approaches to political interaction. Enhanced cooperation and coordination are essential for a wide range of issues from international terrorism and the proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD), to dealing with HIV/AIDS, energy, and environmental concerns. However, traditional ways of thinking about politics, still rooted in the political culture of the Cold War with a focus on intergovernmental relations, seem to prevail in today’s art of policymaking. Upholding the principles of sovereignty, state actors experience limits to their political power and the way in which they implement their own foreign, security, and development policy. These limits are not restricted to exercising influence over international and national developments (i.e. security frameworks or democratization efforts) but also exist in cases of political crisis or diplomatic stalemate.

The crisis over Iraq illustrates once again the limits of traditional policymaking. It is seen as one of the biggest challenges in transatlantic relations since World War II and there was concern that the crisis could have serious spillover effects to other areas such as trade and finance, with long-term consequences. Even though the effects were less dramatic than expected, the next difficult situation might be just around the corner.

Alternative ways of thinking and new practices must be developed with respect to the transatlantic agenda. Following from this, additional safeguards must be put in place so that such a crisis can be averted in the future. Here, the role of non-state actors and transnational networks becomes exponentially important as an additional pillar and force of foreign policy. How can non-state actors and transnational networks be better used to effectively support or counterbalance governmental policies?

THE AIM OF THE STUDY

This paper assesses whether a unique instrument of German foreign policy—German political foundations—might be a tool to bridge the gap between national politics and new global political challenges. The activities of the political foundations both inside and outside of Germany have a long history of supporting dialogue and cooperation. They also have been instrumental in the process of political transformation in countries such as Spain, Portugal, the

---

4 The most in-depth comprehensive study on the subject was published first by Robert O. Keohane and Joseph S. Nye, “Transnational Relations and World Politics” Special Volume of International Organisations, Vol XXV, No. 3, 1971. Therein one finds that transnational networks and actors can range from foundations to the Roman Catholic Church, from private enterprises to contemporary revolutionary organizations.
5 There is no adequate translation for “parteinahe.” The “political foundations” (translated as “Political (Party) Foundations affiliated with the major German Political Parties” (the CDU, CSU, FDP, The Greens, SPD and recently the PDS) will be used instead.
Czech Republic, and Chile, among others. But how do they shape transatlantic relations in an era of rapid change and lingering dissent between the EU and the United States?

The focus of this study will be on the role and impact of the German political party foundations in the United States. Does the new global environment require a fundamental review of their work and possibly a complete change of mode? Do they hold the key to transcending the limits of traditional policymaking? Could the political foundations serve as a model for other countries?

- Political party foundations operating in the United States are unique. However, little is known on either side of the Atlantic regarding how they are set up, how they operate, and how they implement their programs.
- Political party foundations are distinct in that they are non-state actors but serve national interests. They are, therefore, “state actors.” The foundations are partisan but have a non-partisan mission, traditional in that they deal with intergovernmental relations but also involve non-governmental actors.
- The work of political party foundations could serve as a model for other countries. There is an increasing interest outside of Germany to develop and strengthen alternative models of intergovernmental relations. This development could be supported by a comprehensive analysis of German political party foundations and their activities in the United States.
- Political party foundations themselves are being challenged. In Germany, the political/philanthropic landscape is changing and so are the tasks overseas. Over the past decade many new foundations and other operational NGOs have been established. Private individuals, grant giving institutions, and private companies increasingly seek results measured by operational influence and put special emphasis on international relations.

THE CENTRAL QUESTIONS

The Impact of the Foundations
- What is the role of political foundations as non-state actors with a foreign policy mission in Washington today? Do their approaches and agendas meet the demands of our time?
- To what extent and in which ways do political foundations exercise influence on the decision-making processes in the United States?
- Do they succeed in transcending diplomatic stalemates?
- How does the German public perceive their influence on the political discourse regarding Germany and transatlantic relations? What is their image and perception in U.S. public opinion?

Operational Questions
- How do political foundations go about setting their agenda?
- Does a crisis like the disagreement over Iraq force more inter-institutional cooperation and common agenda setting among the respective party foundations, or does political tension result in more individual action?

---

• What are the recommendations for future actions and early warning mechanisms?

**The Transferability of Foundations**
• How are political party foundations a product of German political culture, and how do they contribute to its uniqueness?
• What is the agenda of foundations and other German transnational networks active in the United States?
• Can German political foundations serve as a model for other European countries in fostering dialogue with the United States?

**METHODOLOGY**

In order to assess the role and impact of political party foundations (The Friedrich Ebert Foundation (FES), the Konrad Adendauer Foundation (KAS), The Heinrich Böll Foundation (HBF), the Friedrich Naumann Foundation (FNST), and the Hanns Seidel Foundation (HSS)) this study will provide: an overview of their respective histories in the United States; describe their mission, mandate, and status; and explain how they are financed and how they operate (a special focus on their role and agenda over the last three years from 2001-2003/4 will give a more in-depth analysis of their function during the recent crisis). Apart from interviews and an analysis of primary and secondary sources, the representatives of the respective U.S. offices were asked how they view their mission by providing them with a questionnaire. Based on the findings, the interviews, and the workshop, the study will provide a list of recommendations for future activities.

**Benchmarks**
The benchmarks to measure the role, impact, challenges, degree of inter-institutional cooperation, and accomplishments are the following:
• Do the foundations have access to politicians, key decision-makers from the media, academia, and business community?
• Degree of influence: Do the foundations succeed in bringing together U.S. representatives from the whole political spectrum (Democrats and Republicans, conservative and liberal think tank representatives) or primarily a selected target group?
• Adaptation to the changing political environment: Do they have a built-in flexibility to respond to political changes?
• Demand-driven: Is there a rising demand for their programs and services?
• Public Image in the United States: Are they known by their target audience and beyond?
• Evaluation: How do they measure their own success? How do they create their goals and determine if they have accomplished them?
If “democratization” characterized international politics at the end of the twentieth century, then “networks and network building” are the new key concept of the twenty-first century. State sovereignty has grown increasingly diffuse, due to the proliferation of modern information technologies such as the internet and economic progress due to globalization. This increased access to information, the influence of multilateral or non-governmental actors and networks are all reshaping the political culture in which interaction takes place. Indeed, political interaction is no longer restricted to the terrain controlled by the political actors themselves. While networks vary in terms of their structure, goals, and composition, they share the following: Their importance in global debates is growing, and decision-makers increasingly need these networks as forums in which to learn, pursue, and propagate aims and ideas. As such, networks take on a unique role where they function as global actors and thereby reshape political concepts. This necessitates the integration of these networks by decision-makers into policy analysis, because there are limits to states’ ability to influence specific political processes and decisions. As Anne-Marie Slaughter correctly stresses, “We live in a world of old rules and new threats...already before September 11, decision-makers recognized that the existing rules and institutions created to address the economic, political, and security problems of the last century were inadequate for solving a new generation of threats to the world order.”

The discussion of transnational networks began in the 1960s, when studies based on earlier findings employed the concepts of international relations and transnational societies. However, the question of how international politics—conducted traditionally via state-based institutions—must adjust to changing global circumstances, and which tools of interaction should be introduced, have become increasingly urgent in the last few decades as a means of confronting political discord and addressing new challenges. “Although transnational relations are not new, their importance has been increasing in the years since World War II. The simplifications (in international and transnational relations) of the state-centric approach divert the attention of scholars and statesmen away from many other current problems and distorts the analysis of others...” Transnational networks can grouped into four categories:
• Catalysts;
• Complements;
• Conduits; and
• Competitors.

Transnational networks can influence government decisions by exerting pressure on domestic or foreign policy. In so doing, they increase the transparency of decision-making processes and strengthen relations with policymakers. Transnational networks can also compete with decision-makers and their decision-making processes.13

The events of September 11, 2001 illustrated that transnational networks have assumed a new dimension. Terrorist organizations (a form of transnational networks) have grown essentially unhindered and can conduct trade in weapons, drugs, and human beings with little interference by state institutions. The rise of transnational terrorist networks indicates the need for a fifth category: threats. While transnational networks can increase transparency in societies and function as early warning systems for specific problems, some of these networks can result in a decrease in traditional state institutions’ reach of power.

The German political foundations are transnational networks defined in the first three categories; at times, they reflect category four as well. “Their contacts, coalitions, [and] interactions across state boundaries are not controlled by the central foreign policy organs of the respective government and their long-term goals revolve around ‘attitude changes.’ Face-to-face interactions may alter the opinions and perceptions of elites and non-elites within national societies.”14 The German political foundations were set up with the original goal of fostering dialogue between U.S. and German decision-makers in order to render the political discourse about Germany and its role in world affairs more pluralistic.

THE ROLE OF THE GERMAN POLITICAL PARTY FOUNDATIONS IN THE UNITED STATES

German political foundations have a long and controversial history both within Germany and abroad. Originally conceived as instruments of democratic education for postwar reeducation programs,15 German political foundations developed in many different directions. They became education or research institutes, party archives, meeting and event centers, or developmental aid organizations, with some attaining a global presence.16

---

15 The Friedrich Ebert Foundation (FES) is the oldest political foundation and had been established already in the 1920s. Banned by the Nazis in the 1930s, it was reestablished in 1947. The Heinrich Böll Foundation in its existing form was established in the 1980s.
Strongly anchored in West German party politics, German political foundations began to expand their focus in the 1960s to counterbalance the political aims of the German Democratic Republic’s activities in developing countries.\textsuperscript{17}

Relations between the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany changed throughout the 1960s and 1970s as a consequence of geopolitical shifts and through the framework of Ostpolitik. Tensions between the transatlantic partners and the genuine interest in strengthening ties with the United States led to the decision to open foundation offices in the United States.

**MISSION**

Having long deflected the scrutiny of outsiders, German political foundations have only recently gained attention as agents and instruments of German foreign policy.\textsuperscript{18} In recent years, there have been a number of publications and studies examining the activities of party-based foundations in countries undergoing political and economic transitions and their attempts to strengthen democratic structures in emerging markets.\textsuperscript{19} However, few have explored the specific challenges and complex history of party-based foundations, their mandates in industrial countries, and their role in the United States specifically. There is also a knowledge deficit on both sides of the Atlantic regarding the role these foundations play in U.S. policymaking.\textsuperscript{20}

Switzerland may serve as an example. Following substantial negative press in the late 1990s about the role that Swiss banks played during National Socialism and its conduct regarding the assets of Holocaust victims, the Swiss government sought to repair its international image through the revision of its public relations campaigns.\textsuperscript{21} This initiative included the establishment of a "Swiss American Institute," using German political foundations as a model. Defining the project revealed a lack of clarity regarding the nature of the German political foundations’ work in the United States. Furthermore, it became clear that the Swiss had conceived these foundations to serve primarily as lobbying organizations.\textsuperscript{22} In the United States, lobbying is a crucial means of influencing the decision-making processes, altering opinion, and affecting legislation. The German political foundations, however, do not aim to alter government decisions and the U.S. domestic policy process. They aim instead to initiate open-ended discussion and debate over controversial issues through civic and political education. Functioning primarily as an early warning system for their German clientele, the political foundations report regularly on developments in the United States in order to reduce potential

\textsuperscript{18} ibid p.675. See also Martin Thunert, "Think Tanks in Deutschland – Berater der Politik" *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte*, B 51/2003.
\textsuperscript{21} “Schatten des Zweiten Weltkriegs - Falsche Berater, halbbatze Konzepte: Fragezeichen zur schweizerischen PR in den USA,” *Neue Züricher Zeitung*, 11.03.1998
\textsuperscript{22} In addition to offices such as Swiss Re, since 2001 Switzerland has maintained the Swiss Foundation of World Affairs at John Hopkins University’s School of International Studies (SAIS) in Washington. Although an NGO, the Institute is not to be compared to a German political foundation. It is an academic forum for political dialogue financed by companies and in part by the Swiss government; see http://www.swissfoundation.org.
tensions and identify modes of cooperation. The representatives of the German foundations in Washington were asked precisely how they view their role in this respect, and they emphasized that the primary goal was to generate a dialogue. Changing the perceptions of U.S. policymakers was only a secondary goal. In this way, their work is fundamentally different from the work of lobbyists.

Misconceptions of how the foundations operate in the United States have arisen as a consequence of the complexity and differences in terms of size, budget, and composition of programs among the foundations.

A close look at the thirty year-old discussion in academics and the press on the activities of German non-governmental organizations in foreign and development policies shows that the bulk of the discussion focuses on political foundations and that this discussion is highly emotional. Foundations are praised and admonished, sometimes excessively so. Astoundingly enough, they are often praised and admonished for precisely the same thing.

The lack of relative clarity regarding the foundations’ mandate, status, and funding has further contributed to their image problem.

WHAT MAKES GERMAN POLITICAL FOUNDATIONS AND THEIR OFFICES IN THE UNITED STATES UNIQUE?

The foundations belong to the group of “transnational actors that evoke interest because although they operate independently of the federal government, they are tied to their respective parties and therefore enjoy excellent contacts to elites and opposition groups in many parts of the world. [...] German political foundations have, in many ways, anticipated the organizational modus operandi in the age of Globalization.” The special position occupied by German political foundations is rooted in the following:

Status
The status of German political foundations has yet to be clearly defined. There are numerous criteria characterizing a foundation as non-governmental (NGO) and non-profit organization. Most are registered associations (*eingetragene Vereine*) (Konrad-Adenauer Stiftung e.V., Friedrich-Ebert Stiftung e.V., Friedrich-Naumann Stiftung e.V., Heinrich-Böll Stiftung e.V., Hanns-Seidel Stiftung e.V.). Because the foundations are neither financed directly via party funds nor permitted to donate money to their respective party, they enjoy a degree of independence.

As organizations receiving financial support from the state, the foundations are subject to a certain degree of governmental control and influence.

---

23 Foundation representatives responded clearly to pointed questions on this issue (see appendix). Interviews with the Friedrich Ebert Foundation on November 5, 2004, the Friedrich Naumann Foundation on November 8, and the Heinrich Böll Foundation on November 9, 2004.


25 Philips, p.678
Boards
Representatives of each party are found on the executive boards and committees of each foundation. These representatives participate actively in foundation operations. They also work together with the foundations to either develop strategies for specific issues and/or initiate their examination.26 Nevertheless, the foundations enjoy a certain degree of autonomy through their ability to explore issues on which the party has yet to take a clear position or over which the party is divided. Contemporary examples include Turkey’s application for entry into the European Union and the future of transatlantic relations. For example, in April 2004, together with the German Marshall Fund of the United States, the Heinrich Böll Foundation and the Konrad Adenauer Foundation organized a conference in Washington, D.C. on Turkey’s accession to the European Union. Other German political foundations such as the Friedrich Ebert Foundation also took part in the conference, thereby acting to support the conference and further developing the discussion. Much acclaimed for its non-partisan, or rather multi-partisan character, the conference was particularly interesting because the foundations had already faced difficulties with their activities in Turkey in 2002.27 The foundations active in Turkey were accused of undermining the authority of the Turkish national state and strengthening anti-Turkish groups.

The court case against the German foundations turned out to be without substance. Although the Turkish government did not have problems with the work of the foundations, it chose to not get involved in the legal proceedings against the foundations, an indication of an emerging legal culture of “separation of powers” in Turkey. The case was dismissed—as observers had expected—for lack of evidence. In Turkey the Friedrich Naumann Foundation for example, cooperates not only with human rights NGOs but also with the official Human Rights Presidency.28

Because they are able to bring controversial figures and experts together for discussion, the foundations can establish a critical dialogue that reaches beyond the limits of their respective parties. The foundations in the United States can therefore generate a discussion or strategy not possible within the party that reaches beyond the confines of the party itself and meets scholarly demands. However, there are clear differences between the foundations in terms of how they define their respective roles. These differences relate to the individuality of individual office directors, their position within their respective foundations, and how they view their responsibilities. German political foundations are at the nexus of government and civil society. In June 2003 for example, the representative of the Friedrich Ebert Foundation in Washington, D.C., Dr. Dieter Dettke, gave a statement on the future of transatlantic relations before the U.S. House of Representatives Subcommittee on Europe.29

The foundations are tied to their respective parties in terms of content and to some extent in terms of organization. Their mission, however, is to fulfill a non-partisan, socio-political good.

27 http://www.turkishdailynews.com/old_editions/10_26_02/for.htm#f12.
29 Federal News Service, June 20, 2003, “Prepared Testimony of Dieter Dettke, Executive Director, Washington Office of the Friedrich Ebert Foundation before the House Committee on International Relations Subcommittee on Europe.”
“Yet it would be wrong to assume that they merely provide auxiliary support for the Federal Government’s foreign policy, as this would ignore, for example, their close association with competing political parties, which is not to imply that political foundations can be instrumentalized arbitrarily for narrow party purposes.”

Means/Endowment

The German Federal Constitutional Court’s decision to establish federal support of political foundations was made on July 14, 1986. The judgment stipulated that political foundations must act in accordance with the German Basic Law both legally and effectively as independent institutions that protect and promote intellectual freedom. They must therefore, in practice, maintain the required distance from their respective parties. German political foundations are financed primarily through federal and state-level funding sources. A majority of public donations are allocated for specific projects and (increasingly) for institutional support. In an era of decreasing public funding, private and corporate funding become increasingly important. The foundations also receive additional funds through bequests from private individuals or sympathizers.

Originally German party-based foundations in industrialized nations such as the United States were funded by the German Federal Foreign Office, while foundations in the developing world were financed by the Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ). This strict division was lifted in 2003. Since then, the foundations active in Washington also receive funding from the BMZ for specific issues relating to development policy relating to the United States as well as for issues related to the Bretton Woods institutions. While the federal government is the largest source of foundation funds, additional support comes from the federal states, the European Union, and other cooperating partners. The latter provide approximately 10 percent of the total income for the political foundations.

Annual federal funding for German political foundations is determined each year by the German Parliament’s budget committee. The overall allowance as well as the project-specific grants are passed along with the annual budget. The allocation of the total funds is proportional to the party representation in Parliament. In 2004, the Friedrich Ebert Foundation received 33.75 percent, the Konrad Adenauer Foundation 32 percent, the Friedrich Naumann Foundation, Heinrich Böll and Hanns Seidel Foundations 11.42 percent each.

The total annual budget for foundation operations is €300 million, with approximately €60 million allocated for their work abroad. These numbers vary. The Friedrich Naumann Foundation, for example, states in its annual report 2003 that the budget for their domestic and international work was altogether €39.9 million. Nearly 60 percent of this sum is allocated for operations in developing countries and 40 percent for operations in industrialized countries. The administrative budgets for offices abroad make up approximately 20 percent of the budget for foreign aid. Modestly equipped in comparison, offices in the United States have a budget

---

31 Bartsch, p.217.
34 Duschinsky, ibid.
between €500,000 and €1,000,000. This budget covers operating costs for the offices and their personnel, events, and travel costs. (As the owner of the building in which its offices are housed, the Konrad Adenauer Foundation incurs no rent costs.)

Structure
German political foundations are also structurally unique insofar as their office directors in Washington enjoy relative independence, despite their organization’s close party ties. Key to their operations is their exhaustive national and international network of foundations that enable them to identify contacts and issues in other regions. No comparable institution—private or state-run—exists with a similar network or extensive global structure of representation at its disposal.

Generally, the offices are staffed by a director, an administrative assistant, and one or two local employees, with some variation among the foundations. The Friedrich Ebert Foundation maintains offices in Washington D.C. and New York. The New York office focuses on international development policy and cultivates contacts with New York-based multilateral institutions such as the United Nations. Funding for this office stems from the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development.

Different employment models also characterize the foundations. Whereas the Friedrich Ebert Foundation’s Washington office is characterized by continuity and personnel anchored within the organization’s network, other foundations undergo frequent changes of leadership every three to four years due to shifting priorities and concepts within the foundations and parties.

Mandate
Closely tied to their domestic agenda, the mission of the foundations abroad is to promote democracy, the rule of law, and civic education. The foundations active in the United States focus on transatlantic relations and on foreign and security policy. Although parallels exist, the foundation offices abroad differ in structure and pursue issues specific to their organization.

In addition to the concentration on foreign and security policy, the Konrad Adenauer Foundation’s office in Washington focuses, for example, on economic issues and globalization. The Friedrich Ebert Foundation focuses on changes in civil society through communication, the reform of the social welfare state, and the role of state within society. It also conducts programs on gender policy and pursues an active dialogue with U.S. labor unions. The Friedrich Naumann Foundation fosters the exchange of ideas on globalization, education, conflict prevention, rule of law, human rights, constitutional reform, and civil society, while the Hanns Seidel Foundation emphasizes weapons control and security policy, and the Heinrich Böll

---

Foundation is devoted to facilitating debates on human rights, minority issues, gender questions, renewable energy, and the role of democracy in society.  

The foundations support exchange programs for future leaders and parliamentarians, organize studies, educational trips, and grant fellowships for academic research.

**International Comparisons**

Few institutions in other western democracies are comparable to German political foundations. Founded in 1983, the National Endowment for Democracy (NED) is, in programmatic and organizational terms, similar to German political foundations, which had advised the founders of the NED. However, due to differences in political culture and in the degree of importance given to parties in the United States, there are clear differences between the two. Interest in establishing similar instruments of foreign policy in other countries has grown in recent years. However, this goal has yet to be realized in many of these countries.

Examples of political foundations in Europe are:

- Dr. Karl Renner Institute, Austria
- Foundation Jean-Jaures (French Socialist Party)
- Alfred Mozer Foundation, The Netherlands (Dutch Labor Party)
- Centerns Internationella Foundation, Sweden (Center Party)

In 1976, France established the French-American Foundation to cultivate and promote bilateral French-American relations. Their programs focus on political, economic, cultural, and social science exchanges between France and the United States. As a non-partisan organization, the French-American Foundation is financed primarily through the private sector.

The rise of transatlantic tensions in 2002 has intensified this desire to establish additional instruments of foreign policy. The Brookings Institution’s Center on the United States and Europe, founded in 2004, houses a special program on French-American relations. After passing a new law on political foundations, France is currently exploring various forms of French representation in the United States. There is also growing interest among the Congressional Study Groups in Washington to intensify work with France.

**Operations**

Because political parties in the United States play a different role than in Germany, they are not natural partners for German political foundations. The foundations have, nonetheless,

---

42 http://www.ned.org
43 Interview with Dr. Dieter Dettke November 5, 2004.
45 In addition there is the U.S. Crest, Center for Research on Strategy and Technology, http://www.uscrest.org.
46 http://www.frenchamerican.org
succeeded in raising the interest of U.S. decision-makers on issues relevant to European affairs that reach beyond political debates by engaging media, business, and academic leaders. German political foundations benefit most from their cooperation with American institutions and think-tanks, which give them direct access to decision-makers in the United States.

Serving, on the one hand, as a platform for dialogue by facilitating contact and exchange, German political foundations also function as an early warning system and in-house think tank. Contributing not only opinions and names to current issues,\(^\text{48}\) they prepare ad-hoc analyses of important topics and provide a continuous review of work conducted at Washington think-tanks.\(^\text{49}\)

The German political foundations are also active in policy consulting. The Friedrich Ebert Foundation’s New York office was involved in negotiations with South Africa’s apartheid regime. It held a number of symposia on the issue of apartheid and acted as an advisor to the United Nations on this issue. Certainly not all such efforts at counsel are held publicly. Many, particularly those that are politically sensitive, are held behind closed doors.

German political foundations therefore also identify key issues, build networks, and establish German contacts for Americans and vice-versa.\(^\text{50}\) The foundations thus function as an interface for experts on both sides of the Atlantic. In addition to their core activities, they provide fellowships for graduate students, promote parliamentary exchanges, and act as a secondary “spokesman” for German policy. They support cooperation and partnerships with other institutions of public debate and opinion.

History
The history of German political foundations is intricately linked with that of a divided Germany and the special role that the Federal Republic of Germany played in transatlantic relations during the Cold War.\(^\text{51}\) Transatlantic relations were the pillars of security, economic, and cultural relations after 1945. Yet the special geo-strategic and political position of Germany demanded alternative models—particularly in the 1960s—that lay beyond the American agenda. Certainly, there existed a genuine need for close ties with the United States to safeguard West Germany’s survival. Simultaneously however, the Federal Republic of Germany had a vested interest in developing a dialogue with eastern Europe and the German Democratic Republic. Willy Brandt’s intensification of Ostpolitik in the early 1970s facilitated a gradual emancipation and change in the political role of a divided Germany in the Cold War. These developments and differing domestic as well as foreign policy expectations led to tensions in the transatlantic alliance.\(^\text{52}\)

Characterized as they were by personal animosities, relations between individual transatlantic leaders suffered as well throughout the late 1960s and 1970s.\(^\text{53}\)

The Konrad Adenauer Foundation opened up the first German political foundation office in Washington in 1977 to cultivate governmental relations with the United States and establish new contacts. The Friedrich Ebert Foundation initiated a new discourse by opening its New York


\(^{49}\) http://www.kas.de/proj/home/pub/1/2/index.html.

\(^{50}\) http://www.Böll.org/500.asp.

\(^{51}\) Duschinsky, ibid.


and Washington offices in 1978, which was followed by the Friedrich Naumann Foundation opening its U.S. office, first in New York under the chairmanship of Sir Lord Dahrendorf in 1982, then moving it to Washington in the 1980s.

The motivation to open foundation offices in the United States was based upon a simple premise: to overcome political differences between governing administrations by engaging new key American actors and decision-makers cultivating their identification and involvement with German and European issues.

During their initial phase of active engagement in the 1970s and 1980s, German political foundations conducted “damage control” by seeking to reduce transatlantic tensions. In so doing, they became active political agents. German political foundations were able to move in channels independent of the German embassy and engage American actors in a dialogue on issues of their choice. With the ability to influence—both directly and indirectly—opinion-making processes in the United States, they were simultaneously privy to a great deal of information of interest to German decision-makers.

Despite the soured relations between Bonn and Washington—particularly over issues such as the controversial NATO two-track decision, which involved stationing new missiles in the West if the Soviet Union did not dismantle its new missiles—it was the German political foundations that maintained American contacts and a continuing, albeit informal, dialogue. In addition to their targeted exchange with American contacts, the primary focus of German political foundation activities during this period was to cultivate partnerships between representatives of the German government and their support staff with the U.S. Congress.

This effort was part of a larger attempt to encourage rapprochement between the respective policies and geopolitical interests and to promote American engagement with Germany. Forums and programs such as the Congressional Staffer Briefing Tour, the German Parliamentarians’ visit to the United States, or American Congressional Representatives’ tours of Germany are the results of such attempts. By emphasizing contemporary foreign and security policy issues, the foundations remained closely aligned with the agenda of their respective party during this period.

During the 1980s, establishing the best means of dealing with the Soviet Union and developments in central and eastern Europe became the focal point for German political foundations. Cooperative projects with American institutions and think tanks increased throughout the 1980s, creating inroads that reached further into American social, economic and political circles. This was evidenced by the realization of cooperative projects with German political foundations on central and eastern Europe after 1989.

54 Interview with Dr. Dieter Dettke, November 5, 2004, Washington, D.C.
56 Information brochures of the Konrad Adenauer Foundation’s Washington office.
57 The list of American cooperation partners includes nearly all-leading think tanks such as Brookings, CSIS, Council on Foreign Relations, and the American Institute for Contemporary German Studies. Cooperation with more conservative think-tanks such as the CATO Institute and Heritage Foundation have also begun. Detailed information is included in each foundation’s annual report.
The second phase of active engagement began with the U.S. recognition of the Federal Republic of Germany as a “partner in leadership” after 1989, which rendered German political foundations the “conveners” of their respective political target audience in Germany and the United States. Displaying flexibility, German political foundations generated a forum for mediating new contacts and initiating ideas in the United States. Interest in a reunified Germany within a unified Europe introduced a phase of relaxed tensions and the valuation of the “European model of democratic success.” During the early 1990s, German political foundations experienced a honeymoon of sorts as they, along with other institutes such as the Centers for German and European Studies at Berkeley, Harvard, and Georgetown University, facilitated scholarly research on Germany and Europe in the United States.  

The process of reunification brought Germany to the forefront of European interests and activities, thereby strengthening Germany’s role in Europe. German political foundation offices in the United States disseminated a differentiated image of a reunified Germany and its role in Europe. However, there was still fear that a unified Germany might lead to a rise in nationalist tendencies, anti-Semitism, and violence against foreigners.

Events in unified Germany and particularly in the new federal states at the time seemed to vindicate these concerns and provided the media with simplified images of post-reunification Germany. The repeated attacks on asylum seekers and other foreigners in Germany increased concerns about how willing and able Germany was in confronting these problems. An article by a former Washington Post correspondent for Germany cited failed policies as the cause of increased violence against foreigners. “The wave of violence remains unabated, pushing the number of reported attacks in 1991 to over 600. Bonn has declared regret over the incidents and reminded the nation that, Germany is a foreigner-friendly country.”

German-Jewish relations also suffered as a consequence of the attacks on foreigners in Germany. Working with the Jewish community in America is an important aspect of the foundations’ operations in the United States. Born of a historical responsibility, their activities aim to facilitate a German-Jewish dialogue by engaging with Jewish institutions in the United States. Bringing experts together in Washington to discuss events in Germany became a particularly important foundation activity during this period, as it helped reduce fears and produce a more balanced, realistic view of a reunified Germany in the United States. Reports published by the American Jewish Committee on the rise of anti-Semitism in Germany after 1991 prompted German political foundations in the United States to intensify their work on this issue. Building trust became therefore the foundations’ primary goal. German political foundations organized a series of symposia on German-Jewish relations, which took place in the United States (hosted by the Friedrich Ebert Foundation), in Germany (hosted by the
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58 For information about the Centers for Excellence funded by the German government in 1990, see http://www.georgetown.edu/sfs/cges/about.html.
63 The Friedrich Ebert Foundation initiated also a series of books in which renowned authors focused on German Jewish relations and multiculturalism. International Political Currents, A Friedrich Ebert Foundation Series, Vol. 3, Multiculturalism in Transit: A German-American Exchange, edited by Klaus J. Milich and Jeffrey M. Peck.
64 AJC Reports see http://www.ajc.org.
Konrad Adenauer Foundation), and Israel (hosted by the Friedrich Naumann Foundation). These events helped the foundations to continue their work with Jewish organizations in the United States, regardless of changes to the foundation offices' leadership. 65

German political foundations continued to pursue their specific core issues as well. The Friedrich Ebert Foundation increased its activities on the reform of the social welfare state, environmental policy, changes in civil society via telecommunications and the internet, demographic change, and healthcare policy. The Konrad Adenauer Foundation pursued issues of security policy, trade and bio-ethics and intensified its university exchange program through fellowships and other forms of support. The Hanns Seidel Foundation focused on security policy, including the problem of weapons of mass destruction, and the consequences of demographic change for social, economic, and political conditions in the United States and Europe.

A new phase in German–U.S. relations emerged as the process of reunification normalized and the United States' geopolitical security interests shifted away from Germany and Europe to other regions. This change in transatlantic relations also brought about a shift within the German political foundations in the United States in terms of their orientation and role. While these changes began in the early 1990s, they became politically important in the aftermath of the terrorist attacks in the United States on September 11, 2001.

A PARADIGM SHIFT

The presidential election of 2000 and differing transatlantic domestic and foreign policy priorities changed the tone of Washington-Berlin relations. 66 Attention focused at first on the personal relationship between Chancellor Gerhard Schröder and President George W. Bush, 67 which was often compared to Helmut Schmidt’s relationship with Jimmy Carter and the less popular Ronald Reagan in the 1970s 68 and early 1980s. 69

Eventually, the discussion on where the sources of transatlantic tensions lay placed less emphasis on the personality differences between the respective U.S. and German leaders and more emphasis on fundamental changes in the transatlantic relationship after the end of the Cold War. 70 Simply put, the United States' security and geopolitical interests had shifted away from Europe after 1989, removing it from the center of American security concerns. Consequently, underlying divergent views on sovereignty, security and economic policies, and global issues came to the forefront. 71 Signs of such change were certainly visible during the
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68 Heinz Bude und Bernd Greiner, Westbindungen, Amerika in der Bundesrepublik, Hamburg 1999.
Clinton administration, but Clinton’s political strategies and rhetoric gave the Europeans a sense that they were still considered equal partners.72

The shock of September 11, 2001 fundamentally changed the substance of transatlantic relations. The terrorist attacks prompted the United States to implement a new security strategy as a “nation at war.” Divergent views of how best to confront the problem of international terrorism placed great strains on transatlantic relations. These differences shaped the discussion on the future of NATO as a platform for transatlantic relations as well as the debate over how to shape the future world order.73 A State Department official at the 2004 German Studies Association conference passionately characterized the situation in the following: “If a country goes to war and its allies try to stop it from going to war—that is a serious crisis!” The U.S. decision to invade Iraq without the support of its most important allies and the related issue of how the European Union should respond intensified the crisis in transatlantic relations and threatened to divide Europe itself.74 Robert Kagan’s oft-cited theses in “Of Paradise and Power” that “Americans are from Mars and Europeans are from Venus”75 clearly exposed the need to acknowledge—on both sides of the Atlantic—the new partnership that had emerged.76

HOW EUROPEAN WILL AMERICA REMAIN?

At the start of 2001, the Friedrich Ebert Foundation in Washington had already posed the question in its annual report, “How European Will America Remain?” With its finger on the pulse of the era, the Foundation also predicted the following:

The key question for transatlantic relations is whether a new global partnership can emerge between the United States and Europe that moves beyond the end of the Cold War into the context of globalization and is aimed at a common global strategy of integration that incorporates both Russia and China in the global economy. This means minimal agreement on a series of questions must be attained. …The long list of issues reflecting political, military, economic, and cultural differences between Europe and the United States does not necessarily point to a lack of common basis for action, such as the discussion on trade issues, the question of the European defense of NATO, missile defense, the behavior of multilateral institutions, Balkan politics, etc.77

The report points not only to areas of potential cooperation but sees as well clear signs of a new unilateralism in the United States. The report also points to concerns in the United States over Iraq—which became the decisive factor in testing transatlantic relations—voiced already by Senator Jesse Helms, then Chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, who made Iraq a top priority in the new administration’s agenda. The report states that the new administration of George W. Bush based its policy of preserving national interests on the following: a robust armed forces; strong allies; increased foreign trade; and resolute diplomacy. The Friedrich Ebert Foundation’s annual report also emphasized new kinds of threats emerging as a result of increased globalization, pointing directly to the danger of criminal activities by non-state actors

such as Osama bin Laden. The CIA Global Trends Report 2015, which was published before the 2001 change of administration, served as the source of this information. Predictions for the year 2001 stated “that the United States would increasingly establish security militarily and be self-reliant if necessary. This could mean that partnerships and cooperative efforts will wane in importance to America.” This thesis indicated the United States would move away from its former role as a “European power” toward fulfilling other global political objectives. Seeking consensus, coming to agreement, and pursuing a common approach between the United States and Europe became increasingly difficult after 2001.  

**BUSINESS AS USUAL?**

German political foundations were thus faced not only with the challenge of continuing their traditional work in foreign and security policy, but also with the need to strengthen their profile as political actors within German foreign policy. The foundations’ objectives abroad can be interpreted in a number of ways. One description thereof states that “…the foundations pursue the goal of promoting those parties, organizations and individuals with a political orientation parallel to that of the foundation.” Assuming this interpretation is accurate, continuing German political foundation activities after 2002/2003 would have been next to impossible, since foundations would have had to operate in a vacuum. Foundation representatives were called upon to help communicate differentiated positions by bringing together U.S. and German decision-makers. The foundations targeted specifically those U.S. decision-makers negatively predisposed toward Germany, seeking to influence and inform by engaging them in dialogue. Germany’s determined opposition to intervention in Iraq was met with a variety of reactions in the United States. The most common, however, was one of incomprehension. Repeatedly confronted with questions about the German position on the war in Iraq, the foundations worked to create a dialogue with U.S. policymakers.

**MEASURES**

Representatives of the Heinrich Böll Foundation see their purpose in this period of transatlantic tension as contributing energy and ideas through a expansion of their activities—or at least prevent dialogue from failing. In addition to a new focus on issues such as terrorism and “nation-building,” the Heinrich Böll Foundation continues to emphasize classic “Green” issues such as renewable energy sources. They also continue to develop a network in the United States of organizations supportive of the Kyoto Protocol, despite the Bush administration’s clear rejection thereof.
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Another important aspect of the Heinrich Böll Foundation’s work in Washington since 2002 has been to cultivate relationships with previously untapped institutes, decision-makers or other networks. Therefore, the foundations have made a concerted effort to work more closely with think tanks such as the American Enterprise Institute or the New America Foundation.

A third important aspect of this new phase in transatlantic relations has been to incorporate within the networks of the German political foundations a new generation of decision-makers. This generation has little or no direct experience with the postwar era and is therefore much more pragmatic in its approach toward transatlantic relations. With a younger core of representatives, the Heinrich Böll Foundation enjoys a particular advantage over other foundations in identifying with its clientele. Young Green party representatives have already reached positions of power, even in terms of foreign policy—a phenomenon that continues to be quite rare in other parties because of their size, history, and makeup.

The Friedrich Ebert Foundation in Berlin has initiated a non-partisan network of young transatlanticists, the “Global Atlanticists,” in cooperation with its Washington office, the goal is to bring young German and American representatives, journalists, and specialists together over a three-year period on both sides of the Atlantic. Such network-building events serve to ease the transition of generational change while cultivating important new contacts.84

Although a close affiliate of Germany’s Social Democratic administration, the Friedrich Ebert Foundation’s representatives in Washington remain welcome at the White House, the Pentagon, and the State Department. Other foundation representatives confirmed this access. An American initiative begun by the Congressional Study Group on Germany made an important contribution at the congressional level by helping to partially overcome political grievances and to maintain interest in further dialogue.85

Since 2001, German political foundations have had to work even harder at communicating a differentiated image of Germany and Europe in the United States. According to all of the foundations, “business as usual” was no longer possible from 2001-2003. The foundations focused on issues that encouraged dialogue between the United States and Europe. In addition to security and foreign policy issues, questions relating to the Middle East, Europe’s role as a global actor, "nation-building," and international trade and finance were emphasized. Along with the issue of terrorism and the problem of confronting so-called “rogue states,” the foundations supported debate over other important issues such as the future challenges of development policy, NAFTA, and the German-Jewish dialogue.

Since 2001, German political foundations have been developing innovative ideas for confronting new challenges to the international order and the means to bridge the recent diplomatic stalemate. The Konrad Adenauer foundation for example, has begun a new transatlantic initiative, the “Transatlantic Strategy Group,” which brings German decision-makers and members of the U.S. Congress together to develop concrete strategies to improve coordination and cooperation. Despite their divergent views and strategic goals in the wake of the Cold War,86 Americans and Germans found common ground on key issues such as the effects of globalization and demographic change on societies, the threat of transnational terrorism, and improving international cooperation in intelligence.87

84 Beginning in 2003, the project is funded by funds from the BMZ budget. [http://www.fes.org](http://www.fes.org).
87 Annual reports of the foundations, 2002 and 2003.
IMPACT

From 2001-2004, German political foundations enjoyed an advantage as transnational actors and non-governmental organizations. Unlike their French counterparts, they were not subjected to as much anger during the dispute and were able to cushion the freeze in relations between Berlin and Washington. Foundation representatives pointed to an increased demand for their work, which entailed explaining to both Germans and Americans the other’s respective position. Whereas this development improved their credibility, it also highlighted their inseparable ties to German foreign policy. Foundation programs occur within a specific framework and follow official German foreign policy closely. Although a mandate of independence exists, German political foundations subject decisions to a voting process within their administration.

As tax-supported institutions, the foundations are required to render their activities transparent and accountable. They therefore announce an upcoming event through the Federal Foreign Office generally six weeks ahead of time. The Federal Foreign Office can then request further information regarding the event. There are also coordination meetings in Washington held by both foundation and German embassy representatives.

The foundations—precisely because they have a different mission than that of the embassy—are able to push certain issues further and generate a different discourse. At times, they even do have a somewhat different foreign relations strategy than the German government. However, their ability to penetrate certain circles and impact decisions is limited. This inability also affects their visibility and degree of recognition: to some decision-makers and other networks the work of the foundations in the United States is very familiar, while others do not know about the foundations at all.

FUTURE CHALLENGES FOR THE FOUNDATIONS

Despite their accomplishments at home and abroad, German political foundations face a dilemma. Like many other institutions established in postwar Germany that continue to function under the outdated German Foundation Law, they continue to fulfill their duty as civic educators in Germany and are therefore limited in terms of budget, operations and strategy.

As recipients of federal funding—totaling over €300 million in 2003—German political foundations are dependent on public funding. Changes in Germany’s economy, however, are beginning to impact the foundations’ budgets and personnel. Yet there is, as of yet, neither a culture nor structure for fundraising within the foundations. Therefore, competition is essentially non-existent. Indeed, the opposite is true. In the event that foundations receive funding, beyond
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a certain sum for a specific project, their budgets are cut. As a result, there is no legal incentive for foundations to actively pursue outside funding, nor is there an incentive for them to grow into a framework that has greater practical relevance and that can respond more quickly to current demands.

In addition to financial and budgetary restraints, the foundations are subjected to programming limits. Although foundation leaders are free to shape their respective programs, no true market or external efficiency analysis is conducted. The criteria of evaluation certainly take economic aspects into consideration. However, adapting to changes in the political consulting market has, as of yet, failed to reflect these criteria.93

Time and capacity limits
German political foundations in the United States have limited the time and capacities to promote their activities and mission. However, as the Konrad Adenauer Foundation’s overview of U.S. think tanks illustrates, foundation work has much to gain from such endeavors. In part, the U.S. offices of the German foundations face the difficulty of relating the ideas from the United States back to Germany. Certain issues of little interest to decision-makers in Washington nonetheless continually appear on foundation agendas because German guests believe these issues are sure to provoke and captivate audiences in Washington. Among these are specific issues relevant to their respective constituency in Germany but without any relevance to a U.S. audience. Although rare, there are also reports of German political decision-makers who view the foundation offices in Washington less as an independent institution of international relations and more as a service provider for their travel to the United States.

Growing need
While public funding decreases, the demand for political consultation and civic education is growing. First, the increasing complexity of issues makes it all the more imperative for decision-makers to have access to concrete strategic measures and concise expert analyses of facts and issues. Second, in the field of civic education, the problem of voter and political apathy is a serious problem that can be confronted by targeted measures and improved channels of information dissemination. One vehicle of dissemination can be the political foundations.

New actors
In Germany and elsewhere, new actors—such as privately funded foundations—are forging their way onto the civic education and policy market. With other resources, methods, and capacities, these institutions are competing with German political foundations for the same clientele.

Even if the situation at the beginning of the twenty-first century bears resemblance to the period when the foundations first opened their offices in the United States, the geopolitical framework and the substance of the transatlantic partnership has changed. Thus, the political foundations, along with other actors in the field of German-American relations, must confront the question what kinds of mechanisms they can provide if a crisis situation occurs between Berlin and Washington, as in 2002/2003.

New methods and progressive concepts are required to meet the new demands. The increasing “de-governmentalization” of foreign policy via non-state actors such as private companies, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and inter-governmental organizations (IGOs) means that
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the role of transnational actors such as foundations is increasing and needs to be better coordinated with state-centric measures.\textsuperscript{94} Some of the representatives of the political foundations stated that they see themselves and their work as an important contribution to German foreign policy and that their programs are set up to support German foreign policy. It might be time to refocus the attention more on the U.S. market in order to increase the visibility of the foundations with U.S. decision-makers.

In light of their budgetary, personnel, and legal restrictions, they are nonetheless capable of developing relevant programs and maintaining interest in their activities among a broad political spectrum of actors in Washington. They have also been exemplary in promoting a differentiated image of Germany in the United States and providing a platform for dialogue on controversial issues. The framework has shifted, however, and political foundations are facing a historical change. The foundations must adapt to these changes if they are to continue their activities abroad, by acting as a model for other countries.

\textsuperscript{94} Pogorelska, ibid.
POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

Establish a roundtable on new challenges
- Non-partisan and institutional activities: Call for a roundtable discussion on philanthropy in the twenty-first century — what is the role and function of transnational actors in global issues and, what are the new challenges to security policy?
- Development Policy and the problem of “failed states”: Review of the activities in the field of development policy and the future role of transatlantic cooperation.

A critical inventory of activities
- Which programs are particularly effective, and which should be abandoned? Who are the potential cooperation partners?
- Change of focus: The foundations concentrate primarily on foreign and security policy. Thus, there is very little transfer of information and concepts on other subjects of interest such as health care reform, taxation, demographic change, etc.

Improved public relations
- The foundations lack a concise and effective communication strategy and are therefore less known by a broader public or by decision-makers that traditionally have not been their primary target audience. It would also help to disseminate the results and policy recommendations to a broader circle of people interested in their work.

Change in leadership
- New leaders must be identified as the old “transatlanticism” wanes. Who are these new leaders; and what issues can they be engaged in a dialogue? What is of importance to Americans? Where can Europeans increase their presence?

Regional assessment
- The traditional focus on the American east and west coasts and Washington, D.C. is no longer appropriate. More programs in the American mid-west and south must be conducted to improve German understanding of the United States.

Germany in Europe
- The lack of knowledge about Europe and the European Union point to a deficit in transatlantic relations. This should be confronted by increasing the presence of European issues on foundation agendas and bringing more European experts and decision-makers to participate in foundation activities.

Private sector partnerships
- Within the framework of “corporate social responsibility” private firms and institutions might be interested in becoming new partners for cooperation by intensifying a dialogue with the foundations. For the foundations, enhanced cooperation with the private sector might result in a new target audience and the identification of new political networks.
APPENDIX

Questionnaire for Interviewees

I. German Political Foundations

1. German political foundations have an impact on the foreign relation policies of both Germany and the United States.

Strongly Disagree Neutral Strongly Agree
1 2 3 4 5

2. Respective parties dictate initiatives of German political foundations.

Strongly Disagree Neutral Strongly Agree
1 2 3 4 5

3. The political landscape is changing for German political foundations within Germany and abroad.

Strongly Disagree Neutral Strongly Agree
1 2 3 4 5

4. Competition for foreign policy influence has developed in the last decade from non-governmental organizations and foundations.

Strongly Disagree Neutral Strongly Agree
1 2 3 4 5

5. German political foundations are still relevant considering the changing political landscape.

Strongly Disagree Neutral Strongly Agree
1 2 3 4 5

6. German political foundations are successful at dealing with changes in the field of foreign/security policy.

Strongly Disagree Neutral Strongly Agree
1 2 3 4 5

7. German political foundations are successful at dealing with changes in the fields of economics, finance, and trade policy.

Strongly Disagree Neutral Strongly Agree
1 2 3 4 5
8. German political foundations are successful at dealing with changes in the field of global politics.

   | Strongly Disagree | Neutral | Strongly Agree |
   | 1                | 2       | 3        |

II. German Political Foundations and U.S.-German relations

9. German political foundations are influential on U.S. decision-making.

   | Strongly Disagree | Neutral | Strongly Agree |
   | 1                | 2       | 3        |

10. German political foundations are successful at transcending diplomatic stalemate.

   | Strongly Disagree | Neutral | Strongly Agree |
   | 1                | 2       | 3        |

11. German public opinion perceives the political foundations ability to influence political discourse as positive.

   | Strongly Disagree | Neutral | Strongly Agree |
   | 1                | 2       | 3        |

12. U.S. public opinion perceives German political foundations as positive.

   | Strongly Disagree | Neutral | Strongly Agree |
   | 1                | 2       | 3        |

III. Operational Questions

13. German political foundations have control over agenda setting.

   | Strongly Disagree | Neutral | Strongly Agree |
   | 1                | 2       | 3        |

14. A political crisis (such as the Iraq war debate) fosters political cooperation among party foundations.

   | Strongly Disagree | Neutral | Strongly Agree |
   | 1                | 2       | 3        |

15. More individual activities result from political crises within German political foundations.

   | Strongly Disagree | Neutral | Strongly Agree |
   | 1                | 2       | 3        |
16. Political crises are avoidable.

Strongly Disagree Neutral Strongly Agree
1 2 3 4 5

17. German political foundations can play a role in the prevention of political crises.

Strongly Disagree Neutral Strongly Agree
1 2 3 4 5

IV. Transferability of German Political Foundations

18. German political foundations contribute to a unique German culture.

Strongly Disagree Neutral Strongly Agree
1 2 3 4 5

19. German political foundations result from a unique German culture.

Strongly Disagree Neutral Strongly Agree
1 2 3 4 5

20. German political foundations are distinct political actors.

Strongly Disagree Neutral Strongly Agree
1 2 3 4 5

21. German political foundations are merely political facilitators.

Strongly Disagree Neutral Strongly Agree
1 2 3 4 5

22. The model of German political foundations can be transferred to other countries.

Strongly Disagree Neutral Strongly Agree
1 2 3 4 5