

Oil crisis
weakened
European
currencies

that the EEC countries have since been able to help bring about new discussions on the North-South economic relation, they have a historic achievement to their credit. But, at the same time, this very process has revealed deep divisions among themselves.

These divisions will be considered shortly; but, in the meantime, they are also reflected in the second effect of the transformations of 1974. This lies in a reversal of power. The European countries, depending so heavily upon energy imports from the Middle East, were much more closely affected by the rise in oil prices than the United States, which, while by no means self-sufficient in energy, was far less reliant on Middle Eastern sources. Even today many Americans are unaware of how far they were beneficiaries of the oil crisis of 1973-4. It greatly weakened the European currencies; it greatly strengthened the American dollar. In turn, this change was linked to a third: a high degree of inflation in the domestic economies of most European countries and an endemic economic crisis in some of them.

Internal frustrations

These frustrations in external matters might in themselves seem sufficient to account for the disappointment of those high hopes that had been conceived in Europe at the beginning of 1973. But they were accompanied by a series of internal frustrations too. Indeed, it would appear in retrospect that the negotiations on the enlargement of the Community had really served, by their success, to cover the failure of The Nine (or The Six) to agree on other matters. For it must be remembered that the original intention of the signatories to the Treaty of Rome had been to create a political community. All hopes of progress in that direction were stopped dead when General de Gaulle vetoed the first British application for membership in 1963. Ever since, the inveterate question had remained unanswered: what was to be the vehicle for "Europe"? And all that The Six had come up with was the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP).

Yet they had agreed on an ambitious program for economic and monetary union by 1980. Even if this had been realistic in the first place (a doubtful proposition), there was no chance at all of its realization once the inflation of 1974 began to be felt, and to be felt so unevenly.

Before the program was forgotten, the German Chancellor, Willy Brandt, announced a new vehicle. This was the Common Energy Policy. Indeed, Brandt went

further. He argued that, without policy, Europe would be finished. Fortunately, a common energy policy was not so difficult to achieve even in countries that are already united. The United Kingdom still lacks one. And, in the case of questions of energy merely accentuating the divisions among the members. For example, Germany was attempting in 1975 to deal with its domestic energy problems by borrowing heavily from the North Sea with the promise of North Sea collateral.

While this reflected Britain's economic weakness, it also indicated a certain expectation of political strength — or the *hutzpah* of Mr. Wilson's Government. This was evident in the British attempt to insist on a separate seat at the conference of energy-producing and -consuming nations at which it had already been agreed that The Nine should have a single common representative. For France, on the other hand, energy questions provided a splendid opportunity to establish the capital of the Euro-Arab dialogue thereby fulfilling the twin French dreams of assuming a leading role in Europe and snubbing the United States. General de Gaulle called for a common energy policy, therefore, an indication less of European unity than of that country's special position in the field of competing international organizations. In other words, Europe had, and still has, no vehicle beyond the CAP.

This would not have mattered much if the member states had been able to consolidate their position, continuing to reach *ad hoc* agreements on a variety of issues, and share the profits of the economic growth in such schemes as the Regional Development Fund. It was here that the differences in economic performance made such agreements impossible. In 1975, for instance, the GNP actually fell, and this fall was accompanied by a large increase in the balance-of-payments deficit. In 1976, it appears that the GNP has grown slightly but this growth is accompanied by a larger balance-of-payments deficit.

Germany, on the other hand, continues to accumulate vast surplus reserves of foreign currency. The downward pressure on the pound (and the *lira*) goes hand in hand with pressures for the revaluation of the *Mark*. Differences in domestic economic performance were, in fact, accentuated by the system of floating exchange-rates that came into being as the old international monetary system had broken down. In turn, this has meant that tensions on these matters have increased.