

'The enemy is Europe'

A first-hand report by Susan Welsh on London's efforts against the Franco-German alliance, as voiced by Chatham House.

"The longer-term reality in Europe is that of Franco-German cooperation," the Englishman said grimly. "The British have by and large opted out, or have not known what framework of relations to have with their allies." William Wallace, director of studies at Britain's most prestigious think tank, the Royal Institute of International Affairs—known familiarly as Chatham House—was addressing an audience of European experts at Columbia University on March 2. "An intelligent British strategy would be to quietly sow doubts in Germany about their relationship with France. But this would take a very long time now. We've lost so much time.

"The problem facing Europe is not how to deal with the Soviet Union, despite what Mrs. Thatcher says. She doesn't understand foreign policy at all! . . . The real question is how to deal with the United States and Japan."

If the Soviet Union is not the problem, why has Wallace's Chatham House just issued with great international fanfare a new 50-page study titled *Western Security: What has changed? What should be done?* whose principal concern is "enhanced Soviet military threats both in Europe and in Third World regions"? The study was funded by the German Marshall Fund and prepared by the institute's director and the directors of the New York Council on Foreign Relations, the Forschungsinstitut der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Auswärtige Politik in Bonn and the Institut Français des Relations Internationales in Paris.

The top four institutes of what has been called the Atlanticist establishment are trying to reassert their control over the "new nationalism" of continental Europe. In the past three years especially, this upsurge has challenged the supranational institutions through which British elites and their counterparts abroad have controlled the policies of other nations. The particular preoccupation of these elites is to prevent the Franco-German alliance from drawing the "nationalistic" Reagan administration into its orbit.

The problem in Europe, Wallace declared, is how to "square the circle" of combining national sovereignty with the "federalist" relation of interdependence which was originally the foundation of the European Commu-

nity. "People at my institute are stressing very much the need to review the theoretical framework for understanding the problem of national sovereignty, in view of what is called the 'new nationalism.' . . . This is the issue that fascinates me the most—especially regarding France. . . . In Germany, too, there is a new confidence, an emerging sense of nationhood."

The European Monetary System, created in 1978 by France and the Federal Republic of Germany, is the embodiment of this new situation in Europe. Great Britain has to this day refused to join, out of aversion to the EMS's Phase One fixed currency rates and Phase Two global development financing plans. Wallace believes this was a deadful mistake, since it deprives Britain of a most important channel for influence. "The EMS is stalled right now, but it is likely to move ahead into its second phase, if not this year then next. . . . The British did not know the name of the game at all. We should have gone in. We also failed to build on the potential that existed for a British-Italian coalition."

Wallace admits that "the Franco-German relationship goes very deep now," deeper than the mere personal friendship between Chancellor Schmidt and President Giscard. "You even find French and German civil servants working in one another's ministries." If Giscard or Schmidt were to disappear from the scene, would things change fundamentally? Wallace is not sure, but he remains hopeful. "Giscard may be around for another seven years. But Schmidt may *not*. It's beginning to look like he's getting tired. . . . It is not impossible that Mitterrand will win the French election. The French are bored with Giscard. The 'arrogance of power' is beginning to get a bit out of hand. . . . It is possible that the picture will begin to change in both France and Germany."

The Royal Institute is initiating a special priority research project on the France-German relationship, Wallace announced.

Crisis management

The *Western Security* document of Chatham House et al. proposes that interlocking networks of "directorates" be created to deal with crises in various parts of the

world, and to focus world politics eternally around the theme of crisis management with Moscow. European armed forces will be deployed to the Middle East and other areas outside NATO's perimeter, but—in an ostensible concession to German wishes—not under the auspices of NATO. “Dialogue” with the Soviet Union will be maintained within tightly controlled limits, as “the arms control process” is maintained to try to head off any Soviet edge in advanced military technology. Restrictions on high-technology exports to the Soviet Union will be “maintained and even tightened.” Seven-nation summit meetings of the industrial capitalist nations will discuss political and security concerns as well as economic ones, and the groundwork will be laid for these summit meetings by an elite supranational corps of technocrats responsible to no national constituency (“perhaps some type of a permanent, though small, secretariat”).

The proposed system of “directorates” of “principal-nations groups” is an updated version of the Trilateral Commission, tailored to the now even more urgent task of thwarting the Franco-German alliance. Like the Council on Foreign Relations' *Project 1980s* studies, the new document's basic premise is the “controlled disintegration” of the world economy as a defense of “the liberal order” against the “dirigism” of continental Europe, Japan, and the U.S.S.R.

In *Western Security* we read that “the period ahead will also be one of prolonged economic crisis worldwide. It will be characterized in the West by very low growth rates combined with high inflation and high unemployment rates. These economic difficulties can be expected to sharpen North-South tensions, increase competition among Western nations themselves, and produce potentially dangerous social tensions within Western democracies. . . . Scarce resources have to be reallocated and new responsibilities shouldered. . . .”

The authors of the Western Security report

Royal Institute of International Affairs (Chatham House). **Director: David Watt.** The RIIA is the “mother” institute to the other four think tanks which participated in the *Western Security* study. It was founded in 1919 as part of a project begun in the 1880s by British colonialist Cecil Rhodes. Rhodes declared that the “true aim and purpose” of such a policy-formulating establishment should be “the extension of British rule throughout the world . . . [and] the ultimate recovery of the United States as an integral part of the British Empire.”

David Watt participates on a regular basis in highly

confidential meetings, under the auspices of the “Anglo-Russian Round Table,” with Nikolai Inozemtsev of Moscow's IMEMO think tank and Georgii Arbatov of the Soviet Union's U.S.A.-Canada Institute. These are the Soviet institutions which, together with the KGB, are most opposed to the European Monetary System and most in favor of the world-federalist policy orientation which Chatham House shares.

Council on Foreign Relations. Director: Winston Lord. The CFR was established in 1921 and was modeled directly on the RIIA; it is America's number-one “patriotic” think tank. The CFR's *Project 1980s* study, undertaken during 1975-76 by individuals who later became the top policymakers of the Carter administration, was “the largest single effort in our 55-year history.” Its premise was that the main strategic conflict in the world is not between East and West, but between “liberalism” and the dual threat represented by the economic policies of Alexander Hamilton and Friedrich List on the capitalist side and Karl Marx on the socialist side.

CFR Director Winston Lord was a former National Security Council official under Henry Kissinger and a participant in the *Project 1980s* enterprise. The executive core of the CFR includes John J. McCloy, Robert Roosa, Gabriel Hauge, and others who also comprise the core of the German Marshall Fund, which financed the *Western Security* study.

Forschungsinstitut der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Auswärtige Politik. Director: Karl Kaiser. This institute was set up in the 1950s, modeled on the RIIA and CFR under the auspices of John J. McCloy, the postwar American High Commissioner for Germany. Karl Kaiser is a member of the Trilateral Commission and the London International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS), and is a central figure in conduiting RIIA-originated policies into the Federal Republic of Germany. It was Kaiser who last year shocked attendees at a meeting of the Aspen Institute by proposing that West German troops be deployed to Turkey and other areas. The *Western Security* pamphlet cites Turkey as “strategically key” to the Mideast, and demands the deployment of West European military forces to areas throughout the Third World.

Institut Français des Relations Internationales. Director: Thierry de Montbrial. Montbrial is a member of the Club of Rome. IFRI is a principal instrument for imposing the Club of Rome's zero-growth perspective in France. It works closely with the *Interfuturs* group, an Aquarian set of futurologists led by H. G. Wells-trained Bertrand de Jouvenal, also a member of the Club of Rome. Together with the other three institutes cited above, IFRI is involved in “research projects” aimed at subverting the economic policies of French President Giscard. Both IFRI and *Interfuturs* receive generous financial support from the German Marshall Fund.