

regarding nation, must look to its own interests, its own defense. De Gaulle purports to offer Germany a place in a European coalition free from Anglo-Saxon domination, but as a junior partner which would follow French leadership. This, he suggests, is better than relying on the United States, which may seek better relations with Moscow at Germany's expense.

Given the immediate choice, however, it seems clear to German leaders—as it does to almost all but the Gaullists—that Germany's interests can be better protected through strengthening its ties with the U.S. The question of German reunification is not to be more readily resolved by cutting Germany free of American support and interest. This lends weight to the argument of those who say that there are sound reasons why the German Federal Republic would choose to cooperate in the MLF. And it would be natural and relatively easy to add to Germany and the U.S. other countries such as Britain, Italy and, with a large question mark, France.

The arguments that run counter to this are, however, potent and persuasive. Put simply in terms of questions: "Would Germany attempt to use its measure of control in the MLF to further its own, presently inhibited, desire for independent nuclear power?" "Would the United States be giving over to a possible veto its own power to make the crucial decision to use nuclear weapons?" Or, conversely, "Could the United States be drawn unwillingly into nuclear conflict by decisions of the other participating nations?"

In whatever form these questions are posed, what they actually do is to direct attention once again to the problems any nation-state faces when it considers an alliance, coalition, or federation which appears to demand that it yield up a measure of its sovereignty. This is the hard crux on which have shattered many pleasant theories of international cooperation. The MLF is not going to be an exception to these general and durable problems.

If it proves eventually to be a viable concept it will be simply because the political reconstruction of Europe will make it not only desirable but possible. But even if, eventually, the present concept of the MLF is discarded, an intensive examination of its possibilities and its problems will be valuable, for such an examination will reveal how closely intertwined in any such concept are the technical, military, economic, and political problems of the nations of the Western world.

## THE PROGRAM OF CRIA

This issue of *worldview* is devoted primarily to various problems of the modern nation-state. In his discussion of the implications for the religious citizen, Gordon Zahn refers to the Council on Religion and International Affairs (CRIA)—which publishes *worldview*—and to the seminars which it conducts. For the benefit of *worldview* readers who are unfamiliar with the CRIA program it seems well to offer some background for Mr. Zahn's reference.

CRIA was founded fifty years ago as an independent, non-sectarian organization. Drawn together by Andrew Carnegie, distinguished Protestant, Catholic and Jewish leaders asserted as a group that the faiths which they represented could—and should—make a substantial contribution to the international affairs in which our country was to be increasingly engaged.

The purpose of the Council has remained constant over the years. It has always attempted to implement the conviction of its charter trustees that the insights of religion must inform any sound attempt to cope with the harsh and complex problems of international life. The Council believes that we will make no progress towards the goals of peace, justice and order in the international sphere unless the moral imperatives to which we give public allegiance are related to the realities of power.

The program of the Council is designed to stimulate among those who share these presuppositions discussions of present urgent problems at a sustained high level. As one part of this program it brings together in various forums men of differing and often opposing views—the liberal and the conservative; the "idealist" and the "realist"; Catholic, Protestant and Jew. The Council brings these people together in seminars across the country in groups of thirty to forty to discuss, under a general rubric of "ethics and foreign policy," particular topics ranging from the morality of nuclear warfare to the ethics of intervention. It is to these seminars, which attempt to place foreign policy within a moral context and also relate it to the democratic processes of our country, that Mr. Zahn refers.

*worldview* will be pleased to send additional information about these seminars, and other aspects of the CRIA program, to any readers who are interested. A card requesting such information addressed to the editor of *worldview* will be sufficient.