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Abstract: At the initial stage of our study we were guided by the fact that Germany and the international system mutually influence each other as micro - and macrosystems. Their mutual influence is manifested in the process of historical development of the international system and the German state in it, and the foreign policy of Germany is formed precisely in the context of their historical interactions. Therefore, in order to understand the principles of German foreign policy, it is necessary to investigate the interplay of Germany and the system of international relations in the context of their historical interdependence. To do this, it is necessary to analyze the mutual influence of the international system and Germany at each of the historical stages of the development of the international system and to synthesize the evolution of the system of international relations, as well as the development of the foreign policy of Germany in the context of the evolution of the international system.

In this article we will focus on the mutual influence of the international system and the German state on the formation of the European-centered system of international relations since 1648 till the beginning of the Second World War. This will enable us to trace the formation of the German state as a consequence of system-building processes in European international relations, the influence of state entities on the territory of modern Germany on the formation of European-centered system of international relations, and, in the long run, to distinguish the geopolitical role of the German territory in the system of international relations and the potential strategies of Germany's foreign policy.

Historiography of the issue. The study of German history and foreign policy is elucidated in many scientific works. Florian Buch conducted a study of society and foreign policy of the German Reich in 1867-1882. G. Schöllgen carried out a systematic study of German foreign policy from the beginnings until the year 2004. In the multi-volume edition "History of Germany", edited by B. Bonwech and Yu.V. Galaktionov, they consider the history of the German state since ancient times. Other systematic studies on the history of the German state are "Deutsche Geschichte in Quellen und Darstellung", "Tage deutscher Geschichte. Von der Reformation bis zur Wiedervereinigung" and "Kleine

1 Buch F. Große Politik im Neuen Reich: Gesellschaft und Aussenpolitik in Deutschland 1867–1882 [Great Politics in the New Reich: Society and Foreign Policy in Germany 1867-1882], Kassel, Kassel University Press, 2004, 735 p. [in German].
2 Schöllgen G. Die AuBenpolitik der Bundesrepublik Deutschland von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart [The foreign policy of the Federal Republic of Germany from the beginning to the present], München, C.H.Beck, 2004, 277 p. [in German].
3 Conze E. Tage deutscher Geschichte: von der Reformation bis zur Wiedervereinigung [Days of German history: from the Reformation to reunification], München, Dt. Verl.–Anst, 2004, 326 p. [in German].
The Westphalian peace gave impetus to the establishment of Prussia as the center of power, which gained further privileges within the free creation of coalitions. After gaining the Westphalian peace, the coalition with France and Bavaria, Prussia consolidated the role of the center of power with the assistance of Russia. The growth of the role of Prussia was also the decay of Poland and Sweden, whose place Prussia occupied in northeastern Europe. At the time of the collapse of the system, there was a sharp competition of France and Austria for the role of a leading continental center and control of the center of Europe, which could be linked to the delay of Prussia when joining the anti-Napoleonic coalition. It was advisable to launch the war, having already got rid of one of the competitors, and subsequently to destroy another, or at least to transform it into a weakened ally. However, Napoleon did not act according to the logic of the traditional balance of power, building a monopolistic francocent model. This circumstance forced traditional competing centers to unite against a common enemy. Once in a victorious coalition, Prussia consolidated its status on the international level.

In the context of the Westphalian system of international relations, the formation of the main priorities and problems in foreign policy of the united Germany took place, namely the conflict with Poland, Austria and France, the alliance with Russia and cooperation with Britain as a lever of influence on France. Already in this period, Prussia forms its policy on contradictions between other centers, ensuring the existence and development of the state. However, the influences of the Atlantic, continental and Eurasian trends still have a controversial influence on Germany's foreign policy.

Since its rise, Prussia has been a system-forming element. Firstly, the basis of the Westphalian system of international relations was fragmentation in Germany, and the strengthening of Prussia provided for the integration of the center. Secondly, the emergence of a new center of strength violated the tradition of interaction between England, France and the Habsburg monarchy, since there was an alternative to the alliance with another player who, at the same time, led his policy in accordance with natural interests. Strengthening of Prussia contributed to the gradual decline of Poland and the withdrawal of Austria from the competition for German land. The conflict between future Germany, France and Poland, as well as the alliance with Russia and Britain's desire to influence European politics through Germany for a long period of time, have become the key characteristics of the system of international relations, and their modifications have led to the transformation of the international system. The participation of Prussia in the anti-Napoleonic coalition and the German national liberation war became a significant contribution to the construction of a new order as well as an impetus for the unification and leading role of Germany in Europe.

Mutual influence of the foreign policy of Prussia and the Westphalian system of international relations. Let us consider the influence of the system of international relations in the process of the establishment of Prussia as the center of power in Europe and the influence of the policy of Prussia on the system of international relations.

The Westphalian peace gave impetus to the establishment of Prussia as the center of power, which gained further privileges within the free creation of coalitions. After gaining the Westphalian peace, the coalition with France and Bavaria, Prussia consolidated the role of the center of power with the assistance of Russia. The growth of the role of Prussia was also the decay of Poland and Sweden, whose place Prussia occupied in northeastern Europe. At the time of the collapse of the system, there was a sharp competition of France and Austria for the role of a leading continental center and control of the center of Europe, which could be linked to the delay of Prussia when joining the anti-Napoleonic coalition. It was advisable to launch the war, having already got rid of one of the competitors, and subsequently to destroy another, or at least to transform it into a weakened ally. However, Napoleon did not act according to the logic of the traditional balance of power, building a monopolistic francocent model. This circumstance forced traditional competing centers to unite against a common enemy. Once in a victorious coalition, Prussia consolidated its status on the international level.

In the context of the Westphalian system of international relations, the formation of the main priorities and problems in foreign policy of the united Germany took place, namely the conflict with Poland, Austria and France, the alliance with Russia and cooperation with Britain as a lever of influence on France. Already in this period, Prussia forms its policy on contradictions between other centers, ensuring the existence and development of the state. However, the influences of the Atlantic, continental and Eurasian trends still have a controversial influence on Germany's foreign policy.

Since its rise, Prussia has been a system-forming element. Firstly, the basis of the Westphalian system of international relations was fragmentation in Germany, and the strengthening of Prussia provided for the integration of the center. Secondly, the emergence of a new center of strength violated the tradition of interaction between England, France and the Habsburg monarchy, since there was an alternative to the alliance with another player who, at the same time, led his policy in accordance with natural interests. Strengthening of Prussia contributed to the gradual decline of Poland and the withdrawal of Austria from the competition for German land. The conflict between future Germany, France and Poland, as well as the alliance with Russia and Britain's desire to influence European politics through Germany for a long period of time, have become the key characteristics of the system of international relations, and their modifications have led to the transformation of the international system. The participation of Prussia in the anti-Napoleonic coalition and the German national liberation war became a significant contribution to the construction of a new order as well as an impetus for the unification and leading role of Germany in Europe.

Mutual influence of the foreign policy of the German empire and the Vienna system of international relations. The development of the system of international relations exercised influence on the foreign policy of Prussia. During the evolution of the Westphalian system of international relations, the collapse of the centers of power took place, which eventually led to the formation of a pentarchy - a world order based on the interaction between Britain, Russia, Prussia, Austria and France - in the Vienna system. As a result of the decrease in the number of centers of power, there was a reduction in the options of coalitions, an increase in the interplay of the great powers, and, ultimately, the failure of unipolar French model of world order and the formation of the union of leading players, which also included Prussia.

Although weakening of the position of the main enemy - France - and the participation in the system-forming increased influence of Prussia on European politics, the formation of the German state was still complicated by the neighborhood with Austria and France, and by the threat of the besiegement. That was why the success of Prussia in unification of the German state was brought by balancing of conflict of interests between the leading powers, since none of them was interested in the formation of a new center of power, but each sought to create a counterbalance to rivals by others. In spite of this, the unification of Germany was realized only as a result of the two-stage displacement of Austria and France. However, later, in the case of the attemp
counterbalance to rivals by others\textsuperscript{10}. In spite of this, the unification of Germany was realized only as a result of the two-stage displacement of Austria and France. However, later, in the case of the attempt of a two-stage Blizkrieg against France and Russia, that strategy complicated the situation in Germany, confirming O. Bismarck’s position for the benefits of peaceful balancing of Germany\textsuperscript{11}.

To a certain extent, the unification of Germany was also promoted by Napoleon’s policy of overthrowing the dynasties, because although it was aimed at creating a sphere of influence dependent on France on the territory of Germany, it still reduced the number of independent actors whose interests should be taken into account in the negotiation and state-building processes\textsuperscript{12}.

Beginning in a heterogeneous environment of colonial empires with a national state at the core, the German state also sought to appear as a nation state and colonial empire. In the process of formation of the state and spheres of influence, Germany entered the conflict with other centers of power, which, together with the exacerbation of other conflicts between the centers of power, resulted in the First World War\textsuperscript{13}.

In turn, Germany’s influence on the Vienna system of international relations took place. In particular, the existence of a single normative system during the formal period of functioning of the Vienna system of international relations can be called into question at least because, after the unification of the German state in Europe, both the decay of forces and the nature of state interests have changed. The integration of the center of Europe and the threat to all other centers of power as a result of Germany’s ability to strike in all directions significantly changed the structure of international relations, and the emergence of the group of states with revolutionary system of interests called into question the functioning of the existing norms of intergovernmental cooperation\textsuperscript{14}.

With coming to political power of O. Bismarck and the internal problems of Austria because of nationalists’ mood of the constituent monarchy, the initiative in the system went to Prussia. In the wave of the bourgeois revolutions and the Crimean War, there was also France’s return to great policy. However, drawing on the formation of monopoly of force in Europe, it quickly lost international support and lost to Prussia.

The successful military campaigns of Prussia against two main opponents of the formation of the German state - Austria and France - led to the change in the balance of power in favor of Germany, giving it the opportunity to further expand of the sphere of influence. These campaigns pushed Austria to the Balkans, pushing it against Russia, and caused not only French revanchism in military-strategic interests, but also an ideological struggle between Germany and the West, which at that time represented the modernized industrial bourgeois France and the United Kingdom.

Another consequence of the victory of Prussia over Austria and France was the unification of Italy, because it had the same geopolitical problem as Germany - the location of the crossing of the spheres of influence of France and Austria. That is why Italy became a natural ally of Germany, but, taking advantage of the sphere of influence, during the war, it changed the coalition, which in the end did not bring it the desired result\textsuperscript{15}.

Aware of the weakness of Germany in the case of the besiegement (the Kaunic coalition and the British blockade), O. Bismarck focused on the formation of unions of states, in which the number of German allies should have exceeded the number of participants in any anti-German coalition\textsuperscript{16}.

Insisting on Germany’s role as a peaceful mediator between European centers of power, he indirectly formed the basis of the united Europe, which today is largely built around the united German state.

However, the retirement of O. Bismarck led to ill-considered foreign policy. Germany intervened in colonial disputes between Great Britain and France and the confrontation between Russia and Great Britain. Only Austria left as the alliance center of power to Germany but it could not cope with internal contradictions. Italy, despite its foreign policy ambitions, was not a very influential center. It did not have enough resources and only formed a foreign policy strategy, and therefore could not be a powerful counterweight to France, Great Britain and Russia. William II made in the foreign policy of Germany what O. Bismarck warned: he went on to worsen relations with Russia, which provided a positive balance of power for Germany and intervened in the colonial interests of Britain, bringing it closer to France - a natural opponent not only of Germany but also of Britain by that time. In addition, he intervened in the British-Russian confrontation in Central Asia. Having entered practically simultaneously into a conflict in three triangles: Britain - France - Germany, Great Britain - Russia - Germany and Austria - Russia - Germany, the German state was in a situation close to the blockade. Considering that between France and Austria there was also a centuries-long enmity, Germany was intersecting the interests of the warring parties. With the release of Russia from the confrontation, the situation in Germany has improved significantly, but the entry into the war of the new player - the United States - led to its defeat.

\textsuperscript{10}Ivasyuk H.O. “Rol’ Otto fon Bismarka u formuvanni kontseptsiyi zovnishnoi polityky Nimechhyny” [Therole of Otto von Bismarck in the formation of the concept of Germanys foreign policy], Aktualni problem zovnishnoi polityky Ukrainy [Topical problems of Ukrainian foreign policy], 2011, P. 82–84 [in Ukrainian].

\textsuperscript{11}Ivasyuk H. O. “Istorychnyi vytoky nimesko-frantsuzskyh vidnosyn” [Historical origins of German-French relations], Aktualni problemy zovnishnoi polityky Ukrainy [Topical problems of Ukrainian foreign policy], 2013, P. 63–66 [in Ukrainian].

\textsuperscript{12}“Russko-germanskiy souz po Bismarku” [Russian-GermanAllianceAccordingtoBismarck], [Electronic resource], Vsemirnaya istoriya v litsah [Worldhistory in persons], URL: http://viv.lu/bismark/souz.php [in Russian].

\textsuperscript{13}Baev V. G. “Politicheskie i pravovye vzglyady kantslera Germanii Bismarka” [Political and Legal Views of Chancellor of Germany Bismarck], Gosudarstvo i parvo [State and law], 2008, No. 6, P. 88–94 [in Russian].

\textsuperscript{14}Ivasyuk H. O. “Osnovni etapy stanovlennya zovnishnoi polityky Nimechhyny” [The main stages of the formation of German foreign policy], Nauka i osvita: krok u maibutnie. “Kaindl chytannia” [Science and education: step into future. “Kaindl readings”], 2011, S. 183–187 [in Ukrainian].

\textsuperscript{15}Koppel O.A., Kopiika V.V. “Videnska sistema mizhnarodnykh vidnosyn” [Viennese system of international relations], [Electronic resource], Systemy mizhnarodnykh vidnosyn[International relations systems], URL: http://edu.cirs.kiev.ua/smainmenu-16/s-smainmenu-76/104-sss.html [in Ukrainian].

\textsuperscript{16}“Russko-germanskiy souz po Bismarku” [Russian-GermanAllianceAccordingtoBismarck], [Electronic resource], Vsemirnaya istoriya v litsah [Worldhistory in persons], URL: http://viv.lu/bismark/souz.php [in Russian].
**Mutual influence of Germany’s foreign policy of and the Versailles-washington system of international relations.**

As a result of the influence of the international system, the separation of the German territories and the destruction of the colonial empire took place. In the early stages of the existence of the Versailles-Washington system in Germany, too, significant reparations and military restrictions were imposed. These measures were aimed at depriving Germany of system-building roles. The incorporation of Germany into a new international system was facilitated by the change in the political system of the state, but without changing political values and ideology, as well as under the discriminatory role of Germany in the system, this change did not succeed.

At the same time, the restoration of the German power, as in the previous stages of the establishment of the German state, was also largely determined by the influence of the international system. For a balance of forces between Britain and France there was not the third part, which was one or another state formation in the center of Europe since the foundation of systemic structure in Europe. Britain has restored to its traditional step by supporting the continental rival of France, which remained Germany in the realities of the twentieth century. The rapprochement with Russia was perhaps the only one possible foreign policy strategy that Germany left behind the rules of a new international order 17.

If France, the countries in place of Austria-Hungary and the United Kingdom were in the same coalition, then Russia and Germany automatically balanced the system, forming an oppositional force. The aggravation of relations between Britain and France, as well as the disintegration of the fifth center - Austria-Hungary, allowed Germany to change the balance of power in its favor, leaving France and some countries of Central and Eastern Europe in the actual minority and the opposition role in the new order that began to form Germany. Also, US economic support has played a role in restoring German power 18.

Although the Versailles-Washington system left Germany little opportunity to choose a foreign policy strategy, it is still worth considering the influence of Germany's foreign policy on further evolution of the international system.

Taking into consideration the above mentioned information, the choice of the foreign policy strategy of Germany was largely determined by the opportunities for maneuver left by the international system. Such opportunities included an alliance with Russia, and concurrence of interests with Great Britain, as well as economic cooperation with the United States.

Hitler, in an attempt not only to return Germany to a leading role in international system, but to realize a monoplistic grand strategy, applied active system transforming activities. Strengthening coordination with Russia, Italy and Japan, he simultaneously established a temporary cooperation with Poland, to which Poland was fueled by French-Russian rapprochement. In the geo-spatial dimension, Hitler repeated Bismarck's strategy, which strengthened the alliance of the Three Emperors - Germany, Russia and Austria-Hungary with the alliance of Germany, Italy and Austria-Hungary, taking into account the fact that in the place of Austria-Hungary there were independent states. That was why, having temporarily established friendly relations with Poland and annexing Austria, Hitler had the opportunity to unite easily step-by-step the Austro-Hungarian geopolitical space. On the background of suppression of the United States and the British-French differences, the Versailles-Washington order collapsed before the Second World War.

**Conclusion.** Investigating the dynamics of the development of the system of international relations, it is possible to describe it as a "play on the extinction". The beginning of the formation of the European-centered international system was a two-fold process of the fragmentation of monolithic prenational state formations (the Holy Roman Empire, the Kingdom of France) and the extensive seizure of undeveloped territories. As a result of this process, there was a multipolarity, in which the struggle between the centers led to the emergence of systemicity, the consequence of which was the formation of European balance of power. Systematic collisions between the centers formed a single process, which resulted in gradually falling centers. In addition, after the implementation of geographical discoveries no unresolved space virtually remained. As a result, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, there were five competing centers in Europe, whose spheres of interest collided and crossed one another. At the same time, Germany, as the new center of systemic stability, found itself in a strange position, and Italy, claiming this status, had no established spheres of influence. Taking into consideration that the logical development demanded the maximum building-up of force positions and the continuation of the "subversion game" from the old centers, the ambitions of the newly created states only catalyzed the growing systemic conflict, which resulted in another turning down of power centers up to the formation of bipolarity. Characteristically, the confrontation was not confined to European players, and Russia and the United States were continental and naval forces whose influence was not limited to the European continent, indicating the end of Eurocentrism and the globalization of the international system.

As to Germany's role in the international system, since the Wessel Peace until 1871, fragmentation of the territory of modern German state was considered one of the foundations of stability in Europe. Using the struggle between the European centers, whose logic did not include the established allies, Prussia managed to gain status in European politics. The desire of France to form a monoplistic franco-centric system led to the collapse of a number of centers of power and to the legitimization of the international system-making status of Prussia as a part of a victorious coalition. In order to strengthen its position, Prussia continued to weaken Austria and to perform the maximum possible destruction of the positions of France, thereby gaining the opportunity to unite the German lands into a single state.

The German state, thanks to its geopolitical location, played an important system-forming role. It could act in all directions, and be exposed from all sides. Otto Bismarck's project for united Germany was a system of allied relations around Germany, from which, however, France fell out. That project was intended to postpone a new systemic conflict that would call into question the existence of German state, or at least expand the choice of possible allies for Ger-

---

17 Bogaturov A.D. Cisternmaya istoriya mezhdunarodnyih otmosheniy v chetyreh tomah. 1918–2003. Sobyitiya i dokumenty [Systemic history of international relations in four volumes], Moskva, Moskovskiy rabochiy, 2000, Tom I: Sobyitiyaia1918–1945, 2000, 520 p.[in Russian].

18 Ivasyuk H.O. “Pidgruntia ta naslidky zovnishnoi polityky Nimechchyny v roky Veimarskoi republiky” [The basis and consequences of Germanys foreign policy during the Weimar Republic], Skhidna Yevropa v systemi koordynat (Pivnich, Pivden, Zakhid, Skhid [Eastern Europe in the system of coordinates (North, South, Weast, East]), 2012, P. 58–62 [in Ukrainian].
many in the event of armed confrontation. However, his successors chose an alternative version of foreign policy for Germany, namely a two-stage offensive, which in fact corresponded to the logic of international politics in the then Europe.

Although Germany made a separate peace with Russia, and corrected the consequences of unsuccessful planning, it failed to escape the defeat by attracting a new non-European center - the United States. Not taking into account the influence of the United States and Russia in the international system, as well as failing to reconcile the conflict of interests and trying to continue the confrontation in the diplomatic sphere, the European centers faced the German threat for the second time. Having secured Russia's neutrality in advance, Hitler achieved considerable success both in the western and in the eastern directions. However, eliminating the French threat and expanding the living space to the east, he did not take into account the danger of a collision of Germany with the continental power (Russia) and the sea power (at that time, it was already not only Britain, but also its allied USA) at the same time. As a result, Germany was surrounded and defeated.

In the context of our study, it is important to analyze the historical retrospective of the formation of the international system and foreign policy of Germany for the following reasons. First, the formation of the main, geopolitical interests determined by the conflicts in Europe, as well as the coalitions of states associated with geopolitical interests, began shortly after the Thirty Years’ War. In the process of conflict interaction of state entities in Europe there was the formation of the system of international relations, as well as the definition of the roles of geopolitical spaces of states in the system. That was why, by examining the formation of Germany's foreign policy in a profound historical retrospective, one can determine its role in the system of international relations and, accordingly, possible strategies of the future German state have been determined in accordance with the geopolitical role of the German territory in the international system.
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