

DRAFT OF MINISTER LEO TINDEMANS' KEYNOTE SPEECH ON THE OCCASION
OF THE EIGHTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF EUROPEAN AND AMERICAN
JOURNALISTS :

"EC-US RELATIONS : CONFLICT AND COHESION"

"WHERE ARE WE AND WHERE ARE WE GOING?"

Knokke, April 5, 1984

IT IS A PRIVILEGE FOR ME TO HAVE BEEN INVITED BY THE COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES TO OPEN HERE, AT KNOCKE, THE EIGHTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF EUROPEAN AND AMERICAN JOURNALISTS.

I WOULD LIKE TO THANK THE ORGANIZERS OF THIS MEETING AND TO TELL THEM HOW MUCH I APPRECIATE THE HONOUR OF FINDING MYSELF AMONGST EXPERTS IN TRANSATLANTIC RELATIONS, IN WHOSE MIDST I RECOGNISE MANY FRIENDS.

SPEAKING TO THE SPECIALISTS THAT YOU ARE, IS A PERILOUS TASK BUT IT IS ALSO A STIMULATING ONE, BECAUSE THE SUBJECT WE ARE GOING TO STUDY TOGETHER IS OF INTENSE INTEREST.

INDEED WE ARE GOING THROUGH A DIFFICULT PERIOD AND ANY ERRONEOUS JUDGEMENT WOULD HAVE GRAVE CONSEQUENCES FOR US AND GENERATIONS COMING AFTER US.

IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF POLITICIANS TO DEFINE A PRECISE DIAGNOSIS AND TO DRAW CONCLUSIONS FROM IT. BUT IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF JOURNALISTS TO JOIN FORCES IN THIS RESEARCH AND TO ECHO THE RESULT TO PUBLIC OPINION. AND SO I AM ESPECIALLY HAPPY TO UNDERTAKE THIS WORK OF COMMUNAL REFLECTION AND I HAVE NO DOUBT THAT IT WILL BE FRUITFUL.

AS AN OPENER, I WOULD PUT IT TO YOU THAT EUROPE-AMERICA RELATIONS HAVE, IN MY OPINION, A QUITE SPECIFIC DIMENSION AND MEANING.

- TAKING THE PAST FIRST OF ALL : EUROPE WOULDN'T BE WHAT IT IS TODAY, REBUILT AND FREE, WITHOUT THE ACTS OF BRAVOURY AND COOPERATION OF THE AMERICAN SOLDIERS AND THE AMERICAN PEOPLE.

THIS SOLIDARITY WHICH WE WITNESSED IN THE PAST DOES NOT ONLY LAY CLAIM TO OUR GRATITUDE BUT STILL REMAINS TODAY THE BEST PLEDGE OF CREDIBILITY FOR OUR SECURITY.

THE FINEST PROMISES AND THE MOST PRECISE COMMITMENTS, ARE NEVER WORTH AS MUCH AS CONCRETE ACTIONS, OF WHICH WE HAVE ALL KEPT AN UNFORGETTABLE MEMORY.

- IT IS SINCE THEN, AT THE START OF THIS SOMETIMES DIFFICULT BUT ALWAYS DEEPLY FELT UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE EUROPEAN COUNTRIES AND THE U.S.A., THAT WE HAVE KNOWN IN THIS PART OF THE WORLD, AN EXCEPTIONAL PERIOD OF ECONOMIC GROWTH AND SOCIAL WELL-BEING.

- BUT IT IS PERHAPS MORE SO FOR THE YEARS TO COME, THAT THIS TRANSATLANTIC SOLIDARITY MUST BE MAINTAINED AND REINFORCED. IT IS INDEED AT THE VERY TIME WHEN PRESSURES INTENSIFY AND TENSIONS INCREASE THAT THE BONDS WHICH UNITE US MUST PROVE THEIR COHESIVENESS.

WHAT IS AT STAKE IS IN FACT, THE FUTURE OF OUR DEMOCRACIES AND THE DEFENCE OF VALUES WE CONSIDER ESSENTIAL, WHICH DEPEND ON THE MAINTENANCE OF THIS CLOSE UNDERSTANDING WITH OUR PARTNERS, OUR ALLIES AND OUR FRIENDS.

THE PRINCIPLES WHICH ARE THE BASIS OF OUR COMMON CIVILISATION, POINT TO THE RESPECT AND THE PRIMACY OF THE INDIVIDUAL, THE SUPPORT OF DEMOCRACY, THE PRIMACY OF RIGHT AND THE CONCEPT OF THE OPEN ECONOMY, WHICH IS THE VERY FOUNDATION OF PROGRESS. TO BE SURE, THESE CONCEPTS ARE NOT EXCLUSIVE TO WESTERN EUROPE NOR TO NORTH AMERICA. BUT WHO WOULD DARE TO CLAIM THAT THEY COULD BE MAINTAINED - IN SO FAR AS THEY HAVE REALLY TAKEN ROOT - IN ASIA, AFRICA AND LATIN AMERICA, IF ONE DAY THE SUPPORT, WHICH THE UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN EUROPE AND AMERICA CONSTITUTES, WAS TO DISAPPEAR?

THE WEST SEEMS TO ME TO BE HAUNTED BY A PARADOX. WE HAVE LIVED THROUGH FOUR DECADES OF PEACE, PROSPERITY, NO NUCLEAR WEAPON HAS BEEN USED IN THE MEANTIME, THE STANDARD OF LIVING HAS NEVER BEEN SO HIGH, OUR COLONIES HAVE ACHIEVED THEIR INDEPENDANCE AND YET, THE YOUNGER GENERATION FEELS UNEASY AND NO LONGER SHOWS THE SAME CONFIDENCE WITH REGARD TO AN ALLIANCE WHICH HAS MADE ALL THAT POSSIBLE. NOW THAT THE SHIP FACES A SWELLING SEA, DOUBT SETS IN ABOUT ITS SOLIDARITY AND THE ABILITY OF THOSE AT THE HELM.

THESE FEARS FIND THEIR CAUSE, NOT IN A CRITICAL AND REASONED ANALYSIS, BUT IN NOSTALGIA FOR THE CAREFREE YEARS, AND PERHAPS TOO IN A FEELING OF IMPOTENCE AND DESERTION. ONE STARTS TO DOUBT THE VALUES WHICH ARE THE ATTRIBUTES OF OUR CIVILIZATION AND THE PRINCIPLES WHICH FORM ITS FRAMEWORK. THE RESULT OF THIS IS A FEELING OF SURRENDER AND AN ESCAPE FROM REALITIES, WHICH, EMPTIED OUT, HAVE LOST THEIR ATTRACTION.

IT IS A FACT THAT IN CERTAIN COUNTRIES, ECOLOGY AND PACIFISM, WHICH ARE BECOMING SYNONYMS FOR HAPPINESS AND PEACE, HAVE BECOME POLITICAL FORCES, WHICH CANNOT BE IGNORED. IN ADDITION, THE TENDANCIES REVEAL THEMSELVES IN DIFFERENT WAYS ON BOTH SIDES OF THE ATLANTIC.

IN EUROPE, IT IS CERTAIN THAT THERE HAS BEEN A MARKED CHANGE IN PUBLIC OPINION, IN POLITICAL IDEAS, A MORE SCEPTICAL ATTITUDE WITH REGARD TO AN ASSOCIATION WITH THE UNITED STATES, AND MORE FAVOURABLE TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF A MORE DISTANT STAND FROM AN ALLIANCE WITH THE SUPER POWERS.

IN THE UNITED STATES ON THE OTHER HAND, ALTHOUGH THE SUPPORT OF INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION HAS WEAKENED DURING THE LAST DECADE, THE PRIORITY GIVEN TO EUROPE AND THE WILL TO DEFEND IT, ARE STILL ALIVE. BUT THE MAJOR OBSTACLE TO THE ATLANTIC ALLIANCE AND TO THE UPKEEP OF CONFIDENCE IN EUROPE, IS, I BELIEVE, INSTITUTIONAL AND NOT IDEOLOGICAL.

THE MAIN PROBLEM OF AMERICAN COMMITMENT IS, PERHAPS, THE WEAKNESS OF ITS INSTITUTIONS. THE DILUTION OF POLITICAL POWER IN THE WAKE OF VIETNAM AND WATERGATE HAS RESULTED IN THE WEAKENING OF EXECUTIVE POWER AND A DIFFERENT BALANCE BETWEEN EXECUTIVE POWER AND CONGRESS. THE INSTITUTIONS HAVE HAD TO FACE A CRISIS IN CREDIBILITY AND MANAGEMENT, WHEN DECENTRALISING TENDANCIES ARE INCREASING THE PROBLEM EVEN MORE.

20 YEARS AGO, THE PRESIDENT AND THE SECRETARY OF THE FOREIGN OFFICE, IN AGREEMENT WITH CONGRESS, WERE ABLE TO COMMIT FOREIGN POLICY AND GAIN RESPECT FOR THIS COMMITMENT. THERE IS AN ATOMIZATION OF POWER AND AS A RESULT, A DECLINE IN AUTHORITY. ONE CANNOT NEGLECT EITHER, THE EVER-INCREASING ROLE OF THE ELECTRONIC MEDIA IN THE PROCESS OF FOREIGN POLICY. THE RESULT IS A TENDANCY TOWARDS UNCERTAINTY AND INCONSISTENCY OF AMERICAN POLICY IN THE WAY IT IS FORMULATED AND APPLIED, AND IT IS PROBABLY THE BIGGEST OBSTACLE TO HARMONIOUS RELATIONS BETWEEN THE TWO CONTINENTS.

IN EUROPE THE SITUATION IS PRESENTED IN A DIFFERENT WAY. THE GENERATION GAP IS CERTAINLY MORE MARKED HERE. IT IS MORE OBVIOUS THAT THE YOUNG PEOPLE WHO RECEIVED THEIR EDUCATION SINCE THE MIDDLE OF THE 60'S ARE CONSIDERED TO BE MUCH MORE RESERVED IN THEIR ATTITUDE TO AMERICAN SOCIETY AND ITS ELITE.

THE YOUNGER GENERATION IS LESS AND LESS PREPARED TO MAKE THE NECESSARY EFFORTS FOR DEFENCE AND HAS DECLARED ITS OPPOSITION TO NUCLEAR WEAPONS.

ON THE OTHER HAND, EUROPE IS INCAPABLE OF EXPRESSING ONE UNITED OPINION. THE SHILLY-SHALLYING, THE HALF-HEARTED ACTIONS, THE DIFFERENCES OF OPINION, INDUBITABLY DO NOT FACILITATE UNDERSTANDING OF THE EUROPEAN STANDPOINT FROM THE OTHER SIDE OF THE ATLANTIC.

*
* *

ALL THE CAUSES OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN US HAVE BEEN DESCRIBED IN DETAIL. THE POINT THAT ALL THESE DESCRIPTIONS HAVE IN COMMON, SEEMS TO ME TO BE THAT THE INTERESTS OF EUROPEANS AND AMERICANS ARE NOT ALWAYS FELT AS ABSOLUTELY IDENTICAL, WHETHER IT BE IN THE MILITARY FIELD, WHERE SOVIET NUCLEAR PARITY LEADS TO THE IDEA OF "DECOUPLING"; IN THE POLITICAL FIELD, THERE IS A DIFFERENT CONCEPT OF DETENTE ON THE TWO SIDES OF THE ATLANTIC. ON THE ECONOMIC FRONT TOO, THE POWER OF THE COMMUNITY MAKES IT A RIVAL TO THE UNITED STATES AND, IN THE IDEOLOGICAL ARENA, THE POST-VIETNAM PERIOD ILLUSTRATES A DIFFERENT SENSITIVITY TO THE PROBLEMS OF THE THIRLD WORLD.

I, FOR MY PART, SEE FOUR CATEGORIES OF FACTORS WHICH INFLUENCE THE CLIMATE AND UNDERSTANDING ACROSS THE ATLANTIC.

A) THERE ARE, FIRST OF ALL, THE FACTORS OF A PSYCHOLOGICAL NATURE, ~~IN THE LEADER~~ OF THE UNITED STATES FIRSTLY, THEN OF EUROPE, BUT ALSO THOSE STEMMING FROM THE SPECIFIC NATURE OF THEIR RECIPROCAL RELATIONS.

IT IS PERHAPS PRIMARILY WITH REGARD TO THE ROLE AND CONCEPT EACH PERSON ATTRIBUTES TO A SUPER-POWER, WHERE THE MISUNDERSTANDING IS DEEPEST. THE U.S.A. ARE NOT IN FACT A CLASSICAL SUPER-POWER, THAT IS TO SAY WHOSE HEGEMONIC OR DOMINATING TENDANCIES WOULD BE THE NATURAL CONSTANTS OF FOREIGN POLICY. IF THE UNITED STATES HAVE BEEN INDUCED TO TAKE ON INTERNATIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES, MORE OFTEN THAN NOT IT HAS BEEN WITHOUT BEING PREPARED FOR THIS NOR HAVING WISHED IT. AMERICAN POLICY THEREAFTER SHOWS THE PARTICULAR

CHARACTERISTIC OF BEING CONCEIVED AND FELT FROM WITHIN IN A WAY WHICH SUGGESTS BEHAVIOUR ESSENTIALLY STEMMING FROM MORAL OR EMOTIONAL CONSIDERATIONS, WHEREAS IT IS PERCEIVED FROM THE OUTSIDE AS A REAL POLICY OF DOMINATING POWER. FROM THIS FLOWS A LACK OF UNDERSTANDING KEENLY FELT BY BOTH SIDES.

THUS IT IS THAT AMERICAN PUBLIC OPINION IS MOST OFTEN SURPRISED AND WOUNDED WHEN THIRD PARTIES AND IN PARTICULAR ALLIES DISPLAY HESITATION, NAY EVEN CRITICISM WITH REGARD TO THEIR POLICY. THIS SENSITIVITY ON THE PART OF THE U.S.A. IS ALL THE STRONGER WITH REGARD TO THEIR POLICY. THIS SENSITIVITY ON THE PART OF THE U.S.A. IS ALL THE STRONGER WITH REGARD TO EUROPE IN THAT IT REPRESENTS THE OLD COLONIAL POWER WITH ALL THE COMPLEX ELEMENTS WHICH EMANATE FROM SUCH SITUATIONS. AS HENRY JAMES WROTE : "IT IS A COMPLEX FATE, BEING AN AMERICAN".

ON THE EUROPEAN SIDE, CERTAIN DECISIONS ARE FELT TO BE A HURTFUL ABDICATION ON THE PART OF AN ALLY FORM WHOM ONE EXPECTS SECURITY AND SAFETY.

IT GOES WITHOUT SAYING THAT THE PSYCHOLOGICAL FACTOR WORKS ALSO IN THE OPPOSITE DIRECTION. THE EUROPEAN PSYCHOLOGY IS JUST AS COMPLICATED AND IN ADDITION IT IS FORCIBLY DIFFERENTIATED ACCORDING TO THE VARIOUS COUNTRIES CONCERNED. IN GLOBAL TERMS HOWEVER, THE MOST DISTURBING FACTOR IN THE AREA OF EURO-AMERICAN RELATIONS, POINTS WITHOUT DOUBT TO THIS FUNDAMENTAL CONTRADICTION WHICH EXISTS IN THE HEADS OF

EUROPEAN COUNTRIES WHO, WHEN IT COMES TO PASSING JUDGEMENT ABOUT AMERICAN POLICY, DO NOT HESITATE TO MANIFEST THEIR SUPERIORITY, WHEREAS BY THEIR ACTIONS, THEY PROVIDE CONSTANT PROOF OF THEIR OWN INABILITY TO ACT. NOTHING IS, IN FACT, MORE IRRITATING THAN TO RECEIVE ADVICE FROM THOSE WHO ARE NOT CAPABLE OF PUTTING IT TO GOOD USE THEMSELVES.

- B) A SECOND ELEMENT WHICH IS ALTOGETHER FUNDAMENTAL FOR RELATIONS ACROSS THE ATLANTIC, HAS BEARING ON THE DEGREE OF DEPENDANCY IN WHICH EUROPE FINDS ITSELF WITH REGARD TO THE UNITED STATES IN THE QUESTION OF SECURITY. WHATEVER THE RECIPROCAL EFFORTS MAY BE, THE NOTION OF "EQUAL PARTNER" HAS, OF NECESSITY, ITS LIMITS, BEING PERCEIVED ON THE ONE SIDE AS "INGRATITUDE" AND ON THE OTHER AS "INFRINGEMENT ON AUTONOMY OF ACTION BY THE COUNTRIES OF EUROPE".
- C) A THIRD SOURCE OF LACK OF UNDERSTANDING CONCERNS THE FACT THAT THE U.S.A. ASSUME, AT THE PRESENT TIME, RESPONSIBILITIES ON THE WORLD LEVEL, WHICH IS NOT THE CASE FOR EUROPE, WHICH ON THE CONTRARY, DOES NOT MAKE THE AMERICANS' TASK ANY EASIER, IN SOME OF ITS STATEMENTS.

IN EAST-WEST RELATIONS, THE UNITED STATES HAVE THE MAJOR POWER'S PREOCCUPATION WITH SETTING UP AND MAINTAINING A BALANCE OF POWER, IF POSSIBLE TO THEIR ADVANTAGE, WHEREAS EUROPEAN COUNTRIES ARE LESS CONCERNED WITH A WORLD BALANCE, AND ATTACH GREATER IMPORTANCE SUBSEQUENTLY TO THE ASPECTS OF "DETENTE" AND "COOPERATION", LEAVING THE ULTIMATE RESPONSIBILITY OF SECURITY TO THE U.S.A.

- D) AND FINALLY, A SERIES OF PRECISE POINTS OF FRICTION IN THE ECONOMIC FILE : MONETARY QUESTIONS (INTEREST RATES AND THE PRICE OF THE DOLLAR), THE COMMON AGRICULTURAL POLICY, STEEL AND TEXTILES, THE CREDIT POLICY, THE TRANSFER OF TECHNOLOGIES ETC... THESE PROBLEMS HAVE SOMETIMES BEEN RESOLVED PUNCTUALLY BUT REAPPEAR MOST OF THE TIME IN ANOTHER FORM. MOREOVER IT IS DIFFICULT TO IMAGINE IT POSSIBLE TO HAVE NO POINTS OF FRICTION WHEN DEALING WITH ENTITIES THE SIZE OF THE U.S.A. AND THE E.E.C.

*
* *

BUT GIVEN THE STAKE AND THE GROWING RISK OF DETERIORATION, WE MUST AT ALL COSTS RE-ESTABLISH THE CONDITIONS FOR A LASTING AGREEMENT AND IMPROVE UNDERSTANDING AND DIALOGUE BETWEEN THE TWO CONTINENTS. IT MUST HOWEVER BE BORNE IN MIND THAT SOME OF THE DIFFICULTIES MET ARE INHERENT IN EURO-AMERICAN RELATIONS. THIS CONSIDERATION IS ALSO AN ADDITIONAL REASON FOR UNDERTAKING THE NECESSARY EFFORTS AND CLARIFYING THE MISUNDERSTANDINGS OR PROMOTE SOLUTIONS TO PRESENT PROBLEMS.

WE FIND OURSELVES FACED WITH AN URGENT TASK, BUT A LONG-WINDED ONE. LACK OF UNDERSTANDING WILL NOT BE DISPELLED IN ONE GO. THE FRICTION POINTS WILL NOT BE ELIMINATED ONCE AND FOR ALL. THERE WILL ALWAYS BE CONFLICTING POINTS OF INTEREST WHICH OBVIOUSLY REQUIRE EFFORT IN RECONCILING, BUT WHICH MUST BE SEEN PARTICULARLY IN THE CONTEXT OF A SOLIDARITY TO BE SAFEGUARDED AND NOT OF UNREMITTING RIVALRY.

THE COMPLEX NATURE OF OUR SOCIETIES AND OUR INSTITUTIONS, WILL NOT BE SIMPLIFIED EITHER, IN THE FORESEEABLE FUTURE. BUT THE MOST DELICATED ISSUE AND THE MOST SENSITIVE APPEARS TO ME, TO BE THE QUESTION OF SECURITY. INDEED IT IS IN THIS AREA THAT SOLIDARITY OVER THE ATLANTIC IS MOST NECESSARY AND IT IS ON THIS POINT THAT I AM AFRAID THAT POSITIONS TEND TO DIVERGE MORE AND MORE FROM EACH OTHER.

REMEDIES MUST BE APPLIED TO SUIT THE DIAGNOSIS WHICH ONE HAS REACHED. IF THE ILLNESSES ARE MANY, DOUBTLESS DIFFERENT TREATMENTS ARE NECESSARY. AND I, FOR MY PART, WOULD LIKE TO PUT FORWARD HERE, FIVE PRECISE SUGGESTIONS WHICH ARE PROBABLY NOT NEW BUT WHICH I WOULD LIKE TO HAVE YOUR THOUGHTS ON TOGETHER.

IN ORDER TO RECREATE A CLIMATE OF UNDERSTANDING AND TO AVOID PROBLEMS ON INDIVIDUAL ISSUES CLOUDING THIS, I WOULD LIKE TO REPEAT THE IDEA I PUT FORWARD IN 1975 WHEN I WAS ON AN OFFICIAL VISIT TO THE U.S.A. AND WHICH WAS SUPPORTED ON MANY SIDES : THE SETTING UP OF A GLOBAL DIALOGUE AND POLICY BETWEEN THE 10 AND THE U.S.A. THIS WOULD NOT MEAN DISCUSSING PRECISE FILES BUT ONLY SITUATING THEM IN THE CONTEXT AS A WHOLE OF EURO-AMERICAN SOLIDARITY, SO AS THEN TO PROMOTE THE SOLUTION IN THE APPROPRIATE INTERNATIONAL ARENAS AND ACCORDING TO THE PREVAILING RULES. (I.M.F., O.E.C.D., G.A.T.T., ETC...).

SUCH A DIALOGUE COULD TAKE PLACE IN THE FORM OF A HALF-YEARLY MEETING OF FOREIGN MINISTERS FROM THE 10, WHO, WITH THEIR AMERICAN COUNTERPART WOULD REGULARLY ASSESS THE OUTSTANDING PROBLEMS WITH THE PREVAILING INTERNATIONAL AND WORLD CONTEXT AS A BACKCLOTH. THESE MEETINGS SHOULD BE PREPARED BY THE POLITICAL COOPERATION OR THE COMMUNITY, ACCORDING TO THE CASE (POSSIBLY IN A JOINT SESSION).

IN SECOND PLACE CONFIDENCE IN OUR SOLIDARITY MUST BE RE-ESTABLISHED AS REGARDS SECURITY AND DEFENCE. THE ATLANTIC ALLIANCE IS COMING UP AGAINST A GROWING DISENCHANTMENT IN PUBLIC OPINION IN THE VERY LEAST, AS WE HAVE SEEN IN CERTAIN EUROPEAN COUNTRIES. IN ADDITION, I AM AFRAID THAT THE GAP BETWEEN US IS TENDING TO WIDEN. IT IS IN FACT AT THE VERY TIME WHEN IDEAS ABOUT PACIFICISM, NEUTRALISM, FINLANDISATION AND DENUCLEARISATION ARE MULTIPLYING IN EUROPE, WITHOUT HOWEVER A VERY CLEAR DISTINCTION BEING MADE MOST OF THE TIME BETWEEN EACH OF THESE NOTIONS, THAT THE U.S.A. EXPECT EUROPE TO MAKE A KEEN EFFORT IN THE MATTER OF DEFENCE OF ITS OWN TERRITORY, SO AS TO ENABLE THE U.S.A TO TAKE ON THE GROWING RESPONSIBILITIES WHICH ARE THEIRS ON THE WORLD LEVEL.

I PERSONALLY BELIEVE THAT THE SOLUTION MUST NOW BE TAKEN UP AGAIN AND APPLIED, A SOLUTION WHICH IS BY NO MEANS NEW, WHICH IS TO SET UP A "EUROPEAN PILLAR" IN THE HEART OF NATO. THE DEFENCE OF EUROPE IS NOT ONLY THE BUSINESS OF EUROPEANS. BUT A CLEARER CONFIRMATION OF THE EUROPEAN IDENTITY WITH REGARD TO SECURITY AND DEFENCE WOULD RESPOND TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF EUROPEAN INTEGRATION AND WOULD MAKE IT POSSIBLE - WITHOUT GUARANTEE HOWEVER - TO MAKE AN EXTRA EUROPEAN EFFORT IN THE AREA OF DEFENCE. CERTAINLY SUCH A DEVELOPMENT WOULD ASSUME ACCEPTANCE BY THE UNITED STATES AS A "FULL PARTNER".

IT ALSO IMPLIES ON THE PART OF THE EUROPEAN COUNTRIES, THE WILL TO GIVE A EUROPEAN DIMENSION TO THEIR SECURITY. IT ALSO IMPLIES THAT THE EFFORTS TO BE UNDERTAKEN ON ONE SIDE AND THE OTHER SHOULD BE WITH COMMON AGREEMENT AND ACCORDING TO A COMMON STRATEGY.

THE OBJECTIVE OF A "EUROPEAN PILLAR" WITH THE AIM OF REINFORCING THE "PARTNERSHIP" WITHIN THE ALLIANCE, THUS MAKING IT ONCE AGAIN MORE IN LINE WITH PUBLIC OPINION AND BETTER ABLE TO SAFEGUARD OUR COMMON SECURITY IN EUROPE.

SUCH A PATH THEREFORE CANNOT BE ENTERED INTO LIGHTLY. I PERSONALLY SEE THREE PRECISE CONDITIONS WHICH MUST BE MET.

- THE EUROPEAN PILLAR MUST HAVE CREDIBILITY AND A POLITICAL STRUCTURE, WITHOUT WHICH WE SHALL NEVER BE ABLE TO MOBILISE THE DEGREE OF SOLIDARITY NECESSARILY REQUIRED IN A COMMON ACTION IN THE MATTER OF DEFENCE. PUBLIC OPINION CANNOT BE MOTIVATED WITHOUT AN IDEAL OR A COMMON PATRIMONY TO DEFEND, AND A POLITICAL CONCEPT AS ITS EXPRESSION. WHAT IS MORE, THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR ACTIONS TO BE IMPLEMENTED, MUST BE SITUATED ON A POLITICAL LEVEL WITH TRUE DEMOCRATIC CONTROL. THESE CONDITIONS ARE OBVIOUSLY BEST MET WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF EUROPEAN INTEGRATION OF THE 10, ALWAYS BEARING IN MIND HOWEVER THAT IT WILL BE FITTING TO REINFORCE, WHEN THE TIME COMES, THE POLITICAL INSTITUTIONAL FACET.

- SECONDLY, THE ACTION UNDERTAKEN ON THE EUROPEAN FRONT, SHOULD AT LEAST REPRESENT A REINFORCEMENT OR IN ANY CASE THE MAINTENANCE OF THE PRESENT DEGREE OF SECURITY, THIS BEING AS MUCH FOR EUROPE AS FOR AMERICA. IT WOULD BE CRAZY INDEED TO WANT TO ENTER UPON A PATH WHICH WOULD LEAD TO THE WEAKENING OF THE FREE WORLD. THIS CONDITION, IN MY EYES, MEANS THAT THE EUROPEAN PILLAR CANNOT DAMAGE THE COHESION AND CREDIBILITY OF THE ALLIANCE.
- AND FINALLY A SUFFICIENTLY REALISTIC APPROACH MUST BE ADOPTED SO THAT THE SUGGESTIONS PUT FORWARD HAVE SOME CHANCE OF BEING ACHIEVED. IT CANNOT INDEED BE FORGOTTEN THAT THE FAILURE OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY ON DEFENCE STILL REMAINS FRESH IN THE MIND. ANY PROJECT WHICH IS TOO AMBITIOUS, RISKS SINCE THEN BEING SEEN AS UTOPIA AND BEING THEREFORE THROWN OUT BEFORE AN EXAMINATION OF ITS OWN MERITS IS MADE.

A PROGRESSIVE APPROACH STRICTLY CONNECTED TO THE ALLIANCE BUT BASED ON POLITICAL COOPERATION BETWEEN THE 10 IS CERTAINLY THE BEST COURSE. HOWEVER WE KNOW THAT CERTAIN MEMBER STATES ARE NOT IN ANY CASE PRESENTLY DISPOSED TO COMMITTING THEMSELVES IN THIS DIRECTION.

AND SO IT HAS BEEN THOUGHT - AND THE FRENCH PRESIDENCY HAS PUT OUT A MEMORANDUM ABOUT THIS - TO HAVE RECOURSE IN THE FIRST INSTANCE TO THE W.E.U., WHICH BRINGS TOGETHER THOSE FROM AMONGST THE 10 EUROPEAN COUNTRIES WHO ADVOCATED A CLEARER CONFIRMATION OF THE EUROPEAN IDENTITY WITH REGARD TO DEFENCE. BUT FROM THE BEGINNING, "DECOUPLING" MUST BE AVOIDED, AS MUCH IN RELATION TO THE 10 AS TO N.A.T.O. AN ACTION LINKED ON THREE LEVELS, W.E.U., THE 10 AND N.A.T.O. WOULD DOUBTLESS BE THE BEST ANSWER AT THIS STAGE.

THE INTEREST OF THIS APPROACH LINKED TO THE W.E.U., THE 10 AND WITHIN N.A.T.O. LIES IN CLEARLY STATING FROM THE VERY BEGINNING, THAT THE W.E.U. EXERCISE CANNOT BE A SUBSTITUTE FOR A DEVELOPMENT TO BE CARRIED OUT BY THE 10, NOR CAN IT BE CONCEIVED OR UNDERTAKEN OUTSIDE OF N.A.T.O.

THE NECESSITY AND THE URGENCY FOR THE STRENGTHENING OF A EUROPEAN PILLAR COMES FROM THE FACT THAT THE U.S.S.R., AFTER REASSURING ITSELF ABOUT STRATEGIC PARITY WITH THE UNITED STATES, HAS ACQUIRED REGIONAL SUPERIORITY, AS MUCH WITH REGARD TO EUROPE AS TO OTHER REGIONS OF THE WORLD. THIS REGIONAL SUPERIORITY - OF WHICH THE MASSIVE DEPLOYMENT OF SS-20'S IS ONLY ONE FACT - THREATENS US DIRECTLY, US EUROPEANS, TO THE EXTENT THAT "THE BALANCE OF TERROR" EXISTING BETWEEN THE TWO SUPER POWERS COULD DISSUADE AMERICAN INTERVENTION AND THUS MAKE A LIMITED CONFLICT ON OUR CONTINENT, POSSIBLE.

IT IS THEREFORE ESSENTIAL FOR US, NOT ONLY TO STRENGTHEN THE COUPLING WHICH LINKS US TO OUR AMERICAN ALLIES, BUT ALSO TO DEMONSTRATE TO THE U.S.S.R. THAT A LIMITED ATTACK AGAINST EUROPE WOULD COME UP AGAINST A DETERMINED AND EFFICIENT REPLY. IN OTHER WORDS, IT IS A QUESTION OF ESTABLISHING CREDIBLE REGIONAL DISSUASION LINKED TO THE WORLD DISSUASION ENSURED BY AMERICAN STRATEGIC WEAPONS.

THIS IS WHY THE MEMBER COUNTRIES OF THE W.E.U. ARE SEEKING TO REVITALISE THEIR ORGANISATION, AS THE FIRST POSSIBLE STEP TOWARDS A WIDER AND BETTER INTEGRATED EUROPEAN DEFENCE. THEY ARE HOWEVER CONSCIOUS OF THE RISKS RESULTING FROM THIS UNDERTAKING AND ARE INVOLVED IN CONSULTATIONS TAKING PLACE NOW, IN ORDER TO AVOID THESE DANGERS. WHAT ARE THEY?

FIRSTLY : THE DANGER OF OUR BRINGING ABOUT, EITHER BY TOO HASTY AN INITIATIVE OR A BADLY CALCULATED ONE, THE DECOUPLING FROM THE UNITED STATES, WHICH IS THE EXACT THING WE ARE TRYING TO AVOID.

NEXT : OF CREATING IN SOME WAY, A "EUROPE WITH TWO-SPEED SECURITY" BETWEEN THE EUROPEAN MEMBER COUNTRIES OF THE W.E.U. AND THOSE WHO ARE NOT MEMBERS. FINALLY, THE DANGER OF WEAKENING N.A.T.O. AND ESTABLISHING, FOR SOME OF ITS MEMBERS, A POLICY OF SECURITY AND DEFENCE WHICH WOULD RUN THE RISK OF NOT BEING IDENTICAL WITH THAT OF THE ALLIANCE.

AND SO, BELGIUM, PERSUADED ON THE ONE HAND BY THE NEED TO RAPIDLY REINFORCE EUROPEAN DEFENCE AND MINDFUL ON THE OTHER HAND, OF THE LIMITATIONS INHERENT IN THE OPERATION, HAS PUT FORWARD THE FOLLOWING PROPOSALS :

IT WOULD BE APPROPRIATE TO RESHAPE THE W.E.U. INTO THE SUITABLE FRAMEWORK FOR A COMMON EFFORT OF REFLECTION AND COORDINATION OF POLICIES OF THE 7 IN MATTERS OF SECURITY AND DEFENCE. THIS COMMON THINKING COULD THEN BE PROPOSED TO N.A.T.O. WITH INCREASED POLITICAL WEIGHT.

SO THAT EACH MEMBER MIGHT MAKE A BALANCED CONTRIBUTION TO THE COMMON EFFORTS IN DEFENCE, IT WOULD BE NECESSARY TO ADAPT EXISTING MEASURES AS REGARDS PRODUCTION AND CONTROL OF ARMAMENTS.

IN ADDITION, WITHIN THE W.E.U., THE 7 SHOULD TRY ON THE ONE HAND TO PROMOTE A STRICT COORDINATION OF THEIR POLICIES WITH REGARD TO CONCEPTION, PRODUCTION AND ACQUISITION OF ARMAMENTS, AND ON THE OTHER HAND TO SET UP A FORUM ON COOPERATION AND ANALYSIS OF DISARMAMENT QUESTIONS.

IT WILL PROBABLY BE NECESSARY, FOR THE SUCCESS OF THE ENVISAGED REFORM, TO ADAPT THE DIFFERENT ORGANS OF THE W.E.U., AMONG OTHERS THE ASSEMBLY AND THE COUNCIL, TO THE NEW TASKS OF DISCUSSION AND INITIATIVE-TAKING WHICH WILL BE GIVEN OVER TO THEM.

TO THIS EFFECT, WE HAVE SUBMITTED TO OUR PARTNERS IN THE W.E.U., A FEW CONCRETE SUGGESTIONS CONCERNING THE MODIFICATIONS WE ENVISAGE. OUR PROPOSALS ARE, AT THE MOMENT, THE OBJECT OF THOROUGH CONSULTATIONS, BOTH WITH OUR ATLANTIC ALLIES AND WITH OUR PARTNERS FROM THE 10 AND FROM THE 7.

WE HAVE RECALLED, ON EACH OCCASION, OUR DEEP ATTACHMENT TO THE REINFORCEMENT OF THE EUROPEAN UNION AND THE MAINTENANCE OF ATLANTIC SOLIDARITY, THE ONLY EFFECTIVE AND CREDIBLE GUARANTEE OF SECURITY IN EUROPE. THE STRENGTHENING OF THE W.E.U. AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF ITS ACTIVITIES SEEM TO US TO BE SUCH THAT THEY WILL BE ABLE TO CONTRIBUTE TO THESE TWO OBJECTIVES WHICH ARE FUNDAMENTAL TO OUR DIPLOMACY.

I AM ALREADY ABLE TO TELL YOU THAT FIRST REACTIONS TO OUR PROPOSALS HAVE BEEN LARGELY FAVOURABLE.

IN OTHER RESPECTS, OTHER ACTIONS COULD BE ENCOURAGED WITH THE AIM OF AFFIRMING THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION IN OTHER DOMAINS. THUS, CONSIDERATION COULD BE GIVEN IN PARTICULAR, TO THE POSSIBILITIES OF CERTAIN INITIATIVES - PRUDENT ONES - WITHIN THE EEC FROM THE ANGLE OF AN INDUSTRIAL POLICY OR ONE OF COMMON RESEARCH, STARTING NOT WITH ARMAMENT MATERIAL BUT WITH CIVIL EQUIPMENT CAPABLE OF PLAYING A ROLE IN THE AREA OF SECURITY. IT IS INDEED CERTAIN THAT FOR EXAMPLE THE FINALIZATION OF

PROTOTYPES, ON THE EUROPEAN SCALE, OF VEHICLES, TELECOMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT, AIRCRAFTS, OR OTHERS COULD BE PROMOTED PERFECTLY WELL WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE COMMUNITY. IN THE CLIMATE OF THE PRESENT ECONOMIC CRISIS, POTENTIAL ECONOMIC REPERCUSSIONS MAY HAVE AN INFLUENCE ON GOVERNMENT DECISIONS AND RECEPTION BY PUBLIC OPINION, AND PRODUCTION ON A BIGGER SCALE WOULD ENABLE US TO CONCILIATE THE WORRY ABOUT LOWERING THE COST AND MAINTAINING OR PROMOTING EUROPEAN PRODUCTION AND TECHNOLOGY. ALSO, WITHIN N.A.T.O., THE CONCEPT OF THE "TWO-WAY STREET" COULD BE IMPLEMENTED AS SOON AS A CERTAIN THRESHOLD OF COMPETITIVENESS HAS BEEN REACHED.

OTHER IDEAS PUT INTO A CONCRETE FORM - PROBABLY MORE PUNCTUAL BUT STILL WITH A PRECISE SIGNIFICANCE IN THE COURSE OF EUROPEAN AFFIRMATION OF IDENTITY IN RELATION TO DEFENCE - COULD FOR INSTANCE BE REALISED IN THE FORM OF COMMON EXERCISES.

THESE DIFFERENT SUGGESTIONS TAKEN SINGLY PROBABLY ONLY HAVE A LIMITED EFFECT, BUT TOGETHER, MAY HOWEVER CONSTITUTE A DECISIVE STEP IN THE HOPED-FOR DIRECTION, IN THE INTERESTS OF EUROPEAN CONSTRUCTION, OF SECURITY IN THIS PART OF THE WORLD, AND ATLANTIC SOLIDARITY.

MY THIRD SUGGESTION OF MUCH MORE MODEST CONSEQUENCE, IS AIMED AT FACING THE PROBLEM OF THE COMPLEXITY OF OUR DECISION-MAKING SYSTEM. IT STEMS FROM OBSERVING THAT THE CONGRESS PLAYS A DECISIVE ROLE IN NUMEROUS DECISIONS CONCERNING EUROPE AND OUR VOICE HARDLY MAKES ITSELF HEARD THERE. WOULD IT NOT BE POSSIBLE FROM NOW ON TO ENVISAGE REGULAR CONTACTS BETWEEN EUROPEAN POLITICIANS AND THEIR COUNTERPARTS IN THE AMERICAN CONGRESS. SUCH AN INITIATIVE COULD SPRING FROM THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT, PREFERABLY EVEN IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE NATIONAL PARLIAMENTS OF THE MEMBER STATES, SO AS TO FACILITATE AN EXCHANGE OF VIEWS ON A REALLY QUALIFIED LEVEL.

THIS BRINGS ME TO A FOURTH IDEA, WHICH LIES IN THE SAME LINE OF THOUGHT CONCERNING THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE EUROPEAN PRESENCE IN THE UNITED STATES. THE LIMITED POWERS WHICH ARE AT PRESENT THOSE OF THE COMMISSION, ARE SUCH, THAT CONTACTS ON THIS LEVEL CAN ONLY HAVE A LIMITED IMPACT. THE APPEARANCE, ABOUT EVERY SIX MONTHS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL, EACH TIME DIFFERENT AND MORE OFTEN THAN NOT UNKNOWN ON THE AMERICAN SCENE, IS HARDLY LIKELY TO DEFINE, IN THE EYES OF AMERICAN PUBLIC OPINION, A CLEAR IMAGE OF WHAT EUROPE DOES AND WANTS. THERE IS IN FACT AN "INTERLOCUTOR" PROBLEM FACED WITH THE AMERICAN PARTNER, WHICH COULD PERHAPS BE RESOLVED AT THE LEVEL OF THE COMMISSION, IN THE HOPE OF A MORE DEVELOPED EUROPEAN POLITICAL STRUCTURE. THIS ASPECT SHOULD NOT BE UNDER-ESTIMATED WHEN YOU ARE AWARE OF THE DIFFICULTY OF CAPTURING THE ATTENTION OF THE AMERICAN PUBLIC.

FINALLY ONE LAST SUGGESTION COULD BE IMPLEMENTED IN THE AREA OF EXCHANGING VIEWS AND DISCUSSION BETWEEN PERSONALITIES WITH RESPONSABILITIES IN THE POLITICAL WORLD, OR WHO ARE CAPABLE OF INFLUENCING THOUGHT TRENDS. NUMEROUS CLUBS, STUDY CENTRES AND SYMPOSIA EXIST BUT DO NOT ALWAYS HAVE THE NECESSARY LEVEL OR ATTENDANCE.

THE INTRODUCTION OF A "CLUB" OR A "EURO-AMERICAN COMMITTEE", OF HIGH LEVEL AND ENDOWED WITH SUFFICIENT MEANS TO FACILITATE UNDERSTANDING AND TO PLOT LINES OF ACTION COULD BE ENVISAGES IN SUCH A PERSPECTIVE. A FRAMEWORK OF THIS SORT COULD NOT BE USED TO LEAD NEGOCIATIONS OR EVEN PRELIMINARY NEGOCIATIONS. ITS OBJECTIVE SHOULD BE TO PREPARE THE WAY FOR MORE STRUCTURED NEGOCIATIONS, BY FACILITATING BETTER MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING AND A TWO-WAY EXCHANGE OF IDEAS.

MY SPEECH TODAY IS NOT INTENDED TO GO FURTHER THAN TO FUEL THE DEBATE, BUT IN THE KNOWLEDGE THAT IT ALSO INVOLVES INITIATING A TRAIN OF THOUGHT AND PAVING THE WAY FOR MORE CONCRETE REALISATIONS.

WE CAN NO LONGER IN FACT, ALLOW OURSELVES THE LUXURY OF WAITING AND HOPING THAT THE WAVE OF DEFEATISM SUBMERGING EUROPE AND THIS TENDANCY TO UNILATERALISM GAINING GROUND IN AMERICA, DISAPPEAR BY MAGIC.

THE FATE OF TRENDS WHICH SEEM TO ME ON THE CONTRARY TO BE GAINING GROUND AND CAUSING A WIDER RIFT BETWEEN US WHEN OUR SOLIDARITY IS MORE NECESSARY THAN EVER.

THUS I COME BACK TO MY POINT OF DEPARTURE. MEETINGS LIKE THIS ONE TODAY ARE UNIQUE OCCASIONS TO MAKE THE POINT AND TO DISCUSS TOGETHER "WHERE WE ARE AND WHERE WE ARE GOING". BUT AFTER THIS, WE SHALL EACH HAVE OUR HOMEWORK TO DO. THE EUROPEANS FOR THEIR PART HAVE - ONCE IS NOT A CUSTOM - ALREADY STARTED. I AM CONVINCED THAT, AS IN THE PAST, "EUROPE AND AMERICA WILL TAKE THE RIGHT STEPS, AND WILL DO IT TOGETHER".
