

## Report from Paris by Jacques Cheminade

### Nervous about decoupling

*French spokesmen for a "New Yalta" deal are ants about what the Russians plan for their future, but. . . .*

**L**et's stop cheating. Our days are numbered; our future is being played away before our eyes. If the Federal Republic of Germany pursues its current evolution all the way, Europe will go from the Atlantic to the Urals, in other words it will not exist, and it will be in the 21st century what the Balkans were in the 19th." This solemn warning about "Europe 1992" is all the more striking because it came from an unexpected quarter: This is a quote from *The Great Illusion*, a book published the first week in January by Alain Minc.

"The debacle of the political commissar [in the U.S.S.R.] does not establish the joyous advent of the manager, the information expert, and the jurist, because it may also be the prelude to the return of the high priest, the Sufi, the Dostoevskian *Starets* and the plunge along the pathways of the 'faiths in Christ' into the Third Rome, heir to Byzantine caesaro-papism." This analysis of the greater risk which is arising today in the East is all the more amazing, as it comes from Régis Debray (*New Perspectives Quarterly*, of Los Angeles, repeated by France's *Libération* daily).

Minc, chairman of the Society of Readers of *Le Monde*, who defended up and down some weeks ago a policy of opening up to the East, is the right-hand man in France of Italian financier Carlo De Benedetti, author of the proposal to bail out Gorbachov with a "Marshall Plan for the East."

As to ex-presidential aide Régis Debray, his "revolutionary" past as the companion to South American terror-

ists is well known.

Thus, in the bosom of the Paris hack writers' elite, the reality principle is manifesting itself: Minc and Debray now realize—as usual, "sniffing the winds of the time five minutes before the others," as Mrs. Alia correctly noted in *Le Nouvel Observateur*—that Soviet pressures are a threat in the face of "American weakening and German vacillation."

We are all the more in accord with this diagnosis, since we formulated it ourselves more than five years ago.

However, Mr. Debray's only proposed solution is a nationalism without substance or depth, a nostalgic return to the spirit of 1981—or for that matter, 1848 or 1793. That doesn't weigh much in the face of the Soviet system, especially since, like his New Right admirers, Debray rejects the United States not only as it currently is, but as it ought to be.

As to Mr. Minc, his analysis goes further: "Decoupling from the United States is a reality, the repositioning of Germany in the center of Europe is a fact. . . . The system [of European security] of yesteryear presumed a balance of forces between the great European powers; today's postulates the crushing superiority of one of the players [the U.S.S.R. vis-à-vis France]. This is no security system; it's a latent tool of domination. Thus on the economic level there is set up, at Germany's instigation, that 'common house' between East and West which Gorbachov wishes for."

This remarkable analysis was echoed by Minister of European Af-

fairs Edith Cresson: "To properly center our European project, from now on we must balance Germany. This necessary counterweight can be carried by France, a politically and economically strong France, a France tied to the Mediterranean, a France as a factor of independence, equilibrium, and stability for all of Europe to come."

Where does this analysis lead? With Minc, to praise of the European Commission in Brussels, the very body which is preparing for the destruction of Europe's nation-states. He recognizes all its defects—"giant bureaucracy," "uncontrollable tower of Babel," "technocratic vision," and yet, he still perches on this "broken down horse." Yet, says he, "subjected to a college of qualified commissioners, awakened by the extraordinary shaker-up of bureaucracies which Jacques Delors can be, it has regained trust and effectiveness. . . . It is the only possible administration for managing new skills, but it is also . . . the only embryo we can envision for a European government."

Bureaucratic supranationalism thus appears to Minc as the only possible framework: after his brilliant analysis, what a fall!

What is going on in the circles Minc speaks for? The danger and the way the wind is blowing are well perceived—"the end of the postwar period"—but they don't want to give up the master who holds the soup bowl. The bowl in this case, is the financial profit from which the De Benedettis, the Ferruzzis, the Cargills, and their ilk operate; and these cartel operatives need a hunting-ground that is bigger, and administrated "from above": They can't dispense with the helping hand of a multinational bureaucracy.

So they hope that the enemy pawing the ground in the East does not notice that they are riding on a broken down old nag!