

trans-party "big business" grouping catalyzed by the U.S. Labor Party into challenging the Carter Administration's initial "zero-growth" direction amounts to a citation of programmatic organizing's impact on previously divided and semi-conscious "interest groups" in the national interest.

Structure-Building or Citybuilding

The convergence of Western Europe's own national interests with those of the U.S. as the key to world peace and prosperity was self-evident to leaders and populations around the world during and after World War II. It was equally plain that this common interest involved peaceful development of Soviet industry and resources in order to multiply the rate of world economic and energy growth. In other words, the U.S., working with the USSR, should and could take charge through a United Nations-International Monetary Fund framework of putting its industrial-political leverage to the best international use. Otherwise, the USSR and Europe could grow only slowly and autarkically, barring a third world war, and the post-colonial regions would suffer Malthusian horrors of population contraction. What in fact happened was a back-and-forth between the two extremes, depending on who defined U.S. national interest.

In the late 1940s, the Marshall Plan provided basic raw

materials and infrastructural goods to avert outright starvation and impel "European recovery." But this was a belated little Cold War *pis-aller* compared to the initial American conception of the Bretton Woods-founded World Bank as a true "Bank for Reconstruction and Development," issuing long-term credit for technological proliferation on a huge scale. By the late 1940s, the U.S. was not providing such capital to Europe, which would have spun off triangular trade with Eastern Europe and the other underdeveloped sectors.

Moreover, the "fiscal conservative" operators who took over the International Monetary Fund were insisting that everyone adopt the model that had supposedly produced a West German economic miracle—the only way to finance capital investment is within your own borders, by starving your work force; the only way to promote exports is bitter currency devaluations, import penalties for the population, and diversion of national resources from balanced, advanced industrial growth!

European opposition prevented Europe from being wholly conquered by this "Third World" formula. And the Eisenhower Administration finally moved to supersede the Cold War with its Atoms for Peace initiatives and to pump serious investment into Europe. While London-hired populists were allowed to screech "dollar imperialism" and "multinational bargain-

French, German, Soviet Relations: Two Views

In an April 6, 1978 interview, a senior Kennedy Administration foreign policy official discussed the importance of French-German relations:

Q: What do you think of reports this week that Schmidt and Giscard are going to "educate" President Carter?

A: It's certainly not something to be paranoid about. At this point, they have positive policies, we don't. They have a right to lecture us. During the Kennedy years we still had authority, moral sway, over the shape of Europe....

Q: What do you have in mind? What about the de Gaulle-Adenauer special relation, wasn't that against U.S. authority?

A: Well, when de Gaulle first made overtures to Adenauer for a special Franco-German summit, Adenauer came to us and asked us what we thought. My view was, "By all means, accept." At the time we were tied up in so much, we would have been happy to see a responsible French-German policy team. I encouraged the idea, Adenauer went ahead.

What really cooled the thing down was de Gaulle's refusal to give those concessions that Adenauer needed to make the thing stick domestically in West Germany....De Gaulle still had a fear of Germany overshadowing France, thought Germany had to be controlled. I once asked de Gaulle, "I don't really understand your concept of 'Europe,' can you explain it?" De Gaulle said

"France is the heartland of Europe, the core, France is Europe. We've seen what Germany has done to Europe in three wars, Germany is not Europe, Germany wanted to destroy Europe.... Italy, Benelux are not Europe.... Britain is nothing." In essence I think de Gaulle was right — France should have been the center of Europe — and had he not been so strident toward the Germans, it would have been.

Financial Times of London, "Bonn Favors Deployment," Moscow Correspondent David Salter, April 5, 1978.

For the Russians, Mr. Brezhnev's Bonn visit will be an opportunity to give fresh impetus to East-West détente but only if the question of the neutron bomb has been effectively laid to rest.

Soviet-German relations have been good since the 1970 Moscow Treaty.... There are three pending Soviet-German agreements on scientific and technical co-operation, legal assistance and cultural co-operation.... Mr. Brezhnev's visit could end with the signing of these agreements, or with a joint statement of principles on détente.... The visit could also be the occasion for announcing new large-scale joint projects.

A great deal will depend however on whether the West Germans have agreed to the deployment of neutron weapons on their soil.