



Publisher: Scientific-Professional Society for Disaster Risk Management

International Journal of Disaster Risk Management



Declination of the Strategic Compass: Transatlantic Elites, German Leadership, and the Future of European Security

Vladimir Ilić¹, Miraš S. Milašinović²

1 Government of the Republic of Serbia, Nemanjina Street No. 11, 11000 Belgrade, Serbia; govla@eunet.rs

2 Scientific-Professional Society for Disaster Risk Management, Belgrade, Serbia; miras.milasinovic.20240134@fmk.edu.rs.

Received: 1 January 2025; Revised: 14 March 2025; Accepted: 10 May 2025; Published: 30 June 2025.

ABSTRACT

The appointment of Friedrich Merz as Germany's new Chancellor, following an unusual repeat vote, marked a significant shift in German and broader European political dynamics. This paper examines the enduring influence of transatlantic networks, notably the Atlantic Bridge (Atlantik-Brücke), on Germany's strategic orientation within the evolving European security architecture. Through comparative and analytical-deductive methods, the study explores how elite transnational structures, shaped by economic and ideological power centres, influence the implementation and limitations of the European Union's Strategic Compass for Security and Defence. The paper argues that this strategic framework, conceived as a response to contemporary crises such as the war in Ukraine, may be increasingly subject to "declinations" driven by competing geopolitical interests and internal legitimacy challenges within EU member states. By tracing the personal and institutional ties of key actors, including Chancellor Merz, the paper sheds light on the deeper geopolitical alignments that underpin NATO-EU cooperation and transatlantic risk governance. The findings highlight the urgent need for a more balanced and citizen-oriented security strategy if lasting peace and stability are to be achieved in Europe.

KEYWORDS

Security; emergency; Friedrich Merz; Atlantic Bridge; Strategic Compass; European Security; NATO; Transatlantic Elites; Risk Governance; Ukraine; Germany; EU Foreign Policy.

1. Introduction

Friedrich Merz is not a new name on the German political scene. Since his youth, he has been a dedicated member of the Youth Union, joining in 1972. It is a special and joint organisation of German youth from the ranks of the Christian Democratic Union and the Christian Social Union. It is considered the strongest youth political organisation in Germany. It was founded *before* the establishment of the new state – the Youth Union was established in 1947, and the Federal Republic of Germany (colloquially known as West Germany) was established in May 1949. This fact alone in-



Copyright: © 2024 by the authors.

Ilić, V., & Milašinović, M. (2025). Declination of the Strategic Compass: Transatlantic Elites, German Leadership, and the Future of European Security. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Management*, 7(1), 495–506.

dicates the importance that the then masters of the occupied western part of the recently destroyed Third Reich, primarily representatives of the American state, attached to preparing youth for the new era. The most famous members who came from the ranks of the Youth Union were Gunther Oettinger, who was Minister-President of Baden-Württemberg; Christian Wulff, former President of Germany; Wolfgang Schäuble, former Federal Minister of the Interior; Hans-Gert Pottering, former President of the European Parliament and, last but not least – Helmut Kohl, Federal Chancellor from 1982 to 1998.

Even a cursory glance at these very prominent names in (West) German politics during the reconstruction of German statehood after World War II and the decades that followed shows that they were a “nursery” of future cadres and a kind of pivot of continuity. Traditional Catholic parties, such as the German Center Party, had squandered their decades-long credibility, especially on the eve of the Nazis’ rise to power (during World War I and until 1932, it produced German chancellors four times). Since many Catholic priests in “Weimar Germany”, such as Alois Hudal, were significantly compromised by their collaboration with the Nazis and, especially, their support for the “war channels” after World War II, a new positioning on the “centre-right” was needed. On June 26, 1945, the Christian Democratic Union of Germany (CDU – *Christlich Demokratische Union Deutschlands*) was founded together with its “sister” Christian Social Union (CSU – *Christlich-Soziale Union*) in Bavaria, which was founded in October 1945. According to the Encyclopedia Britannica¹, the two key foundations of this new alliance were a social market economy (“a mixture of a free capitalist market with strong state regulation”) and the overarching principle of the “welfare state”; an anti-communist, pro-American foreign policy directed towards “European integration”.

The CDU-CSU coalition won a convincing victory in the 1949 general elections. According to Britannica, this triumph was achieved primarily by two men: Konrad Adenauer (*Konrad Adenauer*) and Ludwig Erhard (<https://www.britannica.com>). The former became Chancellor, and the latter, as Minister of Economics and a Nazi sympathiser, was first the creator of the “German economic miracle” and then became Chancellor himself in 1963. However, some more recent sources (<https://www.ineteconomics.org>) claim that the real creator of this renewal was Edward Tenenbaum – an American Jew. The latest German Chancellor also comes from this and such a political “milieu”, but he operates in circumstances that could be called “something old – something new”. For a significant part of his political engagement in adulthood, Friedrich Merz served as an alter ego to the then-Chancellor Angela Merkel. It is believed that it was precisely because of her rise that he left politics for a while and did very lucrative work for the American law firm “Mayer (and) Brown”. The aforementioned law firm was founded in the late 19th century. The early founders were Adolf Kraus and Levy Mayer. The former, originally from the Czech Republic, was known as one of the spiritual leaders of the Jewish community in his environment, an associate of the “Sons of the Covenant” (*B’nai B’rith*). The latter was known for defending large corporations of his time from antitrust lawsuits. So, he was in the function of significant capital. Much later, Merz would also “surf” on that wave.

According to data available on the global network, Joachim-Friedrich Martin Josef Merz, as his full name is, was on the boards of directors of many powerful corporations: a) Robert Bosch” (*Robert Bosch*); b) BlackRock in Germany; c) Ernst and Young; d) Axa; e) German Stock Exchange” (*Deutsche Borse*) etc. This certainly contributed to significantly improving his material status and joining the ranks of millionaires and the “jet set” (owning a private plane). Now comes a much more difficult task - revitalising the German economy, the “sick man of Europe”, as the British “Times” called Germany, on the 12th. January 2025 (<https://www.thetimes.com>), certainly alluding to the former “sick man on the Bosphorus”, that is, Turkey, as it was called in the 19th century throughout Europe based on a “joke” by the Russian Tsar Nicholas I.

“He supports economically liberal policies while taking a more conservative stance on social issues. Under his leadership in the last legislative period, the CDU has more explicitly emphasised its right-wing stance. The party’s new basic platform, approved in 2024, marks a clear departure from Angela Merkel’s policies in many areas: it now, for example, advocates the return of compulsory military service and the retention of nuclear energy. The new program also marks the reintroduction of the concept of German culture as a *Leitkultur*, or core culture, in Germany. This is an issue that

Merz initiated a debate on in 2000 when he was the leader of the CDU/CSU parliamentary group in the Bundestag," claims Deutschland (<https://www.deutschland.de>). Apart from their disagreements on certain positions with Merkel, the central issue between Merz and "Mutti" was who would be the leader. What indeed connected them was their membership in one of the first international "clubs" established in the Federal Republic of Germany after World War II. That organisation still exists today and is called the "Atlantic Bridge" (*Atlantic Brücke*).

2. Atlantic bridge

The Atlantic Bridge organisation is a child of the Cold War. It was founded in Hamburg in 1952. As its name suggests, it is (geo)politically oriented towards expanding German-American cooperation in all fields while also supporting Atlanticist structures, the most visible part of which was – and remains – the recently founded NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organisation), or the North Atlantic Alliance, in 1949. This support was significant in preparing German public opinion for the country's entry into the new military bloc. The Federal Republic of Germany would join this "wave" later, in 1955.

The founder of the Atlantic Bridge was Eric M. Warburg (1900-1990). He was a prominent member of the Jewish-German-American Warburg family. The headquarters of the family bank MM Warburg) which he managed for almost a decade in Hamburg, where the Atlantic Bridge was founded seven years after the end of World War II. Incidentally, the bank was founded by the Warburg brothers, Moses and Marcus, back in 1798. It began as a money exchange office. The most influential figure in the Warburg family was Max Moritz Warburg. His mother was from another powerful banking family, the *Oppenheims*. Brother Paul Warburg was a member of the Board of Directors of the US Federal Reserve, and Brother Felix was the son-in-law of Jacob Schiff (1847-1920), a prominent figure in the equally powerful banking firm of Kuhn, Loeb & Co. Jacob's father had worked as a broker for the rising Rothschild banking family. He went down in history not only as a great banker and railroad magnate, along with his partners, but also as the leader of a massive loan to Japan for the war against Russia (1904-1905). For his efforts, he received the Order of the Rising Sun from the Emperor of Japan.

All of the names above, in fact, constituted a kind of Western *proto-nomenclature* (Ilić, 2002, p. 20) from which, later, through generational extensions and connections with partners from Europe and the USA, the Federal Reserve Bank of the USA and the most important international monetary institutions, the Bank for International Settlements, the World Bank and the IMF, would emerge. It is clear that the "Atlantic Bridge", as an organisation with strong foundations, had every chance of succeeding in a defeated and embittered Germany; however, it was now already overwhelmed by entrepreneurship and enrichment, marked by the so-called "economic miracle".

Friedrich Merz was at the head of the Atlantic Bridge for a full ten years. In his farewell speech, when he took over his duties in July 2019, he thanked the members and the Board of Directors for the good working cooperation: "It has been a great pleasure and an honour for me to be the President of the Atlantic Bridge for 10 years. One thing has become clear many times: the transatlantic relationship is more than trade policy or a security alliance.

"The Atlantic Bridge organisation was featured in the September 29th issue of Spiegel magazine. January 1958. described as 'The Association of Former Occupation Officials of Post-War Germany'. It is, therefore, not surprising that between 1957 and 1970, the Atlantic Bridge published an information magazine, *Meet Germany*, aimed at American soldiers stationed in Germany. After all, it is a *propaganda organisation of former occupying powers*. Why are people like the editor-in-chief of *Bild*, Kai Diekmann, its members? The *Atlantic Bridge* is just one such association out of around 600,000. That the Atlantic Bridge is an organisation that stands out among rabbit protection and breeding associations, as well as rowing and gardening associations, is clear at first glance from the list of those who are closely affiliated with the organisation or are its members. The board of directors of this prestigious association includes Walter Leisler Kiep, the former Federal Treasurer of the Christian Democratic Union (CDU). He was also a member of the Supervisory Board of Volkswagen and the

chairman of the Atlantic Bridge from 1984 to 2000. The current chairman of the Atlantic Bridge is the CDU politician Friedrich Merz, who is also a member of the Trilateral Commission, founded by David Rockefeller. The deputy president is the vice president of the Bundestag, Edelgard Bulmahn (SPD), who is also affiliated with the Rockefeller Trilateral Commission, a private interest financing community (Ulfkotte, 2014, p. 137).

Why is Kai Deckmann singled out? He is a journalist with a strange biography, who already in his younger days wrote for the Catholic school newspaper "Passepartou" and as a young man was invited to "Axel Springer", one of the largest media houses of the time. With a dizzying rise, he became a prominent journalist for "Bild", the most widely circulated tabloid in Europe at the time, and remains so to this day. He helps write and publish the biography of Helmut Kohl, the former Chancellor of Germany. Before he departs from this "valley of tears", he meets the great unifier, who, on the anniversary of the fall of the Berlin Wall, goes to the grave of Frederick II the Great (*Friedrich der Grosse*), Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire, who was also a role model for Adolf Hitler. That Kohl was no stranger to this "flirting with the Nazis" was clear early in his reign when, with Ronald Reagan, he went to the SS cemetery near Bitburg in May 1985 as a sign of "reconciliation with history".

It was not the first time that the spirit of Frederick the Great was invoked: on the famous "Day in Potsdam", on March 21, 1933, the old Marshal von Hindenburg and the new Chancellor Adolf Hitler met in front of his grave in the Garrisonkirche. It was important to present the "Führer" as the successor of the ideas of both the great Frederick and the great unifier Bismarck (*Otto von Bismarck*). At that time, a propaganda postcard was famous, showing the profiles of the king, the steel chancellor, and the Führer to emphasise the continuity and the essence of "European civilisation" (Bled, 2011, 310). The modern architecture of European security cannot be fully understood without recalling the meetings between US President Ronald Reagan, Pope John Paul II, and then-German Chancellor Helmut Kohl in June 1987. The visits were held on the occasion of Berlin's 750th anniversary, at a time when the "Berlin Wall" still existed and Germany was divided into the so-called East and West. On that occasion, Reagan solemnly declared:

"Berlin has overcome desolation and isolation time and again with will, energy, and courage. Even now, its spirit towers over the wall that presently divides the city. Today, Berlin remains close to the spiritual centre of the Western world. Americans have a special affinity for Berlin that extends beyond formal political or economic ties because we feel a kinship with its spirit of strength and creativity and because we see our hopes and ideals reflected in the deep attachment of its people to freedom and its blessings. Thousands of Americans—scholars, servicemen and women and their families, business people, diplomatic personnel, and so on—live in Berlin and make vital contributions to the life of the city. We have helped Berlin grow, and we have shared its spirit." (Reagan Library, proclamation 5665).

The most striking "triple pact" of the 20th century was neither the aggressive "Central Powers" of World War I nor the "Axis Powers" of World War II, but rather the understanding among Reagan, Wojtyła, and Kohl. Can we understand today's war in Ukraine without these facts? In an ideological sense, the "march to the East" and the expansion of NATO beyond the borders of the area for whose "preservation" it was supposedly founded, as well as the future unification of Germany, were very "compatible" with the three leaders who would go down in history as the "victors over communism", with the same ideology that Karl Marx, a descendant of a rabbi from Holland, wrote in Brussels and London.

However, even after the unification of first Germany and then (Western) Europe, it was not easy to define the term "European". It is not easy today, and Friedrich Merz, along with all other leaders of the "duplicated" EU since Maastricht, are facing this challenge. One of the authors who played a significant role in the "understanding of the Balkans" for then-US President William Clinton, Robert David Kaplan, attempted to answer this question by analysing the works of the Irish writer James Joyce. "To be European means to be cosmopolitan, therefore free from the shackles of religion, ethnicity and other forms of group identity" (Kaplan, 2023, p. 143).

European or not, in farewell to his long-time "comrade" in the fight for a "more liberal and European" Germany, the respected journalist Kai Deckmann published a warm column, a *de facto* obitu-

ary, on the *Kress* website on June 30, 2017, entitled “My Friend Helmut Kohl.” The article states that the German Chancellor told him during their last meeting: “People are sinners, and you, my dear Kai, although you are a staunch Catholic, are no saint.” <https://en.ejo.ch>). In any case, Helmut Kohl, while still in his prime, offered to be the best man at the wedding of Kay Deckmann and his wife. It was a kind of recognition of Deckmann for his contribution to the development of “Bild”, in fact, to the Americanization and tabloidisation of the German media space. But also an example of good cooperation between the “guys from (and around) the Atlantic Bridge”.

On the global business network LinkedIn, the current role of the organisation “Atlantic Bridge” is stated as follows: “Atlantic Bridge aims to deepen cooperation between Germany, Europe and America. Transatlantic cooperation remains a crucial factor in maintaining global order and stability, particularly in times of challenge. Now that *nationalist tendencies are gaining popularity worldwide*, Atlantic Bridge is more committed than ever to its mission. *It advocates for multilateralism, open societies, and free trade*. As a non-profit, non-partisan association, Atlantic Bridge strengthens the exchange between politics and business, as well as between young leaders and representatives of civil society. It provides a platform for diverse perspectives and fosters lively debate. The approximately 800 members of Atlantic Bridge are decision-makers from business, politics, science and the media on both sides of the Atlantic.

These three highlighted sentences from the above paragraph would make every devotee of the “multiculti religion” happy. Still, they would also elicit an ironic smile in at least three-quarters of the world, which comprises the vast majority of the global population. Because in these countries, “nationalist tendencies” are read as a response to threats to sovereignty; open societies are reminiscent of the role of George Soros and today’s younger successors of the figure and work of Karl Popper; free trade is read as a monopoly of global world corporations; “membership by invitation” is reminiscent of – sectarianism and communist-type parties.

At that time, the entire “European “ (read: pro-globalist) press and electronic media had a similar tone, and the determinants can be summarised in a few basic points discussed in the EJO (*European Journalism Observatory*) from January 20, 2017:

- Trump questions the post-war order
- Trump is destroying the European Union
- Frivolously dismissing the ideas of European integration and the second largest market in the world as unimportant is ignoring history and rejecting the future.
- Once destroyed, Western alliances will not be easily rebuilt.
- Trump’s presidency will mark *a new beginning for US-German relations, and not in a good way*.
- There will be a growing nationalism in Europe
- Europe will be left to *make deals with Russia in a weakened position on Russian terms*.

Many of the same concerns plague European leaders today, including the newly elected, yet not a newcomer, Friedrich Merz. “European nightmare”, Trump was elected for the second time, to the alleged or absolute horror of the established European and world order. During his first term, there was no war like the one that began later in Ukraine, when Joseph Biden was already at the helm of the USA, *with expressed personal interests in Ukraine*, similar to those that the late Madeleine Albright, real name Korbel, former US Secretary of State, and General Wesley Clark, real name Kane, or Goldman, had in Kosovo. “In his hawkish policy toward Russia, Biden has found a willing partner in Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelensky. It is hardly a coincidence that Zelensky’s massive turnaround in relations with Russia began just as Biden took office,” Al Jazeera states, January 18, 2025).

3. Declination of the strategic compass

The “Strategic Compass for Security and Defense” document was drafted by the European External Action Service and adopted by the European Council on 25 May 2022. The document is a type of “(inter)national security strategy” similar to those used on the other side of the Atlantic, in the USA.

The Introduction already states the “main reasons” for adopting the “Strategic Compass”: “Russia’s war of aggression constitutes a tectonic shift in European history. The European Union is more united than ever in the face of Russia’s unprovoked and unjustified military aggression against Ukraine, which grossly violates international law and the principles of the UN Charter and undermines European and global security and stability. Readers in the Balkans were certainly amused when they read the lines here, remembering the “adherence” of the EU, the USA and NATO to the UN Charter during the 1990s, when all the principles of the United Nations and the OSCE were violated. The Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia was destroyed, the only state in Europe that resembled the future European Union in structure, only with far more related peoples than those who make up that union today. Not to mention the “respect” of UN Security Council Resolution 1244 of June 10, 1999.

In any case, in such a context of the “declination of the strategic compass”, the revitalisation of which is expected precisely in 2025. , Friedrich Merz and all the “NATO allies” will be forced to act. 16) We have already seen that the “Atlantic Bridge” was and remains an important “reservoir of personnel” when it comes to both West Germany and today’s Germany. In a similar manner to how the American Council on Foreign Relations operated for decades, this American organisation had a much broader and more autonomous space for action than the association that emerged in the middle of the Cold War in defeated Germany. In the context of achieving peace in Europe (understood more broadly than the EU), it would be undoubtedly helpful if leaders like Merz had also kept in mind what Russian leader Putin said in an interview with Oliver Stone in response to the American director’s question-statement: “The US can maintain a united, pro-American Europe and NATO only with the help of an external enemy like Russia”: “I can say with certainty – yes, that is true. I know it; I feel it. Without that internal discipline, the Euro-Atlantic idea is destabilising. We are not living in the Cold War era. A few years ago, certain leaders told me that our American friends asked me to intimidate them. However, they said they were not afraid. They understood that the world had undergone a significant change. Moreover, as for that external threat – it is difficult to introduce such strict discipline. It is in someone’s interest, but I think such logic is wrong. Since such thinking is rooted in the past, we must also look to the future. You must understand that the world is different now, with new threats and strategic challenges. We cannot freeze and remain as if we were living in the Cold War era .”, Vladimir Putin replied (Stoun, 2017, pp. 78-79).

However, one of the first joint steps taken by European leaders after the German elections was the departure of French President Emmanuel Macron, British Prime Minister Keir Starmer, and Friedrich Merz to Kyiv via train from Poland. Historical memories of when Poland was an important factor in Ukraine, as well as the severe suffering of Poles at the hands of the Nazi regime in occupied Ukraine and their satellites during World War II, were not in the foreground on this occasion. Instead of a joint celebration of Victory Day over Nazism and Fascism, the European leaders paid their “homage” to that important date. They appeared before the European and world public with a proposal for a “30-day truce”.

The leading European media, and a good part of the world’s media, would not be “modern” if they did not, in the foreground of the visit, especially via social networks (which are anything but social), stage a spectacle in the form of accusations that the three European leaders enjoyed using opiates on the long journey from Poland to Ukraine. This would perhaps even be comical if such an approach did not reveal something else: the complete crisis of legitimacy among (political) figures in Europe. If, in a situation where a fratricidal war is raging in one part of the Old Continent, and Putin himself said about ten years ago that “the Ukrainian and Russian peoples are not just close relatives, we are almost one people” (Stone, 2017, p. 187), and the mainstream media foreground bizarre details about the “meeting of three leaders” on a (blue) train, it is evident that kitsch civilisation and “cowboy journalism” have taken deep roots on the European continent as well.

What are some other striking features of the “Strategic Compass”, an important document for understanding more the “defence climate” than the real intentions of European policymakers, as well as other steps taken so far? Let us list just a few: assessment of the strategic environment and threats facing the EU. The document is based on four pillars: action, investment, partnership, and security; rapid response capabilities in response to a crisis beyond its borders; preventing conflicts before they occur or reducing the scale or impact of violence (based on Article 21 of the Treaty on European

Union); EU-NATO cooperation is an integral pillar of work in the field of security and defence; EU-UN Strategic Partnership in (Peacekeeping Operations and Crisis Management 17).

There is no doubt that there is a danger that in the conflict in Ukraine, both sides will exploit a possible ceasefire for additional military activities and rearmament. Such experience already exists from the wars in the former Yugoslavia. The assistance to the “democratic military forces in Croatia”, headed by the pro-Ustasha, therefore pro-Nazi, leader Gojko Šušak (1945-1998), who was tolerated for decades in North America, to be “used when the time comes”, is well known. The funeral of this former Minister of Defense of the “new Croatia” was also “presented” by the former US Secretary of Defense – William J. Perry. By his act, he confirmed that the ties between the Nazis and their followers, which began long before the outbreak of World War II, continued with the rescue of Nazi criminals and officials immediately after its end and their incorporation into new “European communities”, have survived to this day (Ilić, 2020).

Chancellor Friedrich Merz is well aware of what a “strategic compass” entails. Still, he also sees that it can have specific “declinations” and that the original text will most likely be revised, as will practice, if lasting peace in Europe is to be achieved. The main problem that EU leaders will face, especially the “chosen ones”, like the trio from the “train to Kyiv”, will be moral credibility. It has been damaged for a long time, and this also applies to most leaders of non-European states. *The crisis of legitimacy, as well as that of personality, which we have already discussed, has been eroding the European building since its inception.* And not only her.

“The political evolution of Europe is essentially a matter for Europeans to decide. However, the Atlantic partners have a significant stake in it. Will emerging Europe remain an active participant in the construction of a new international order, or will it be consumed by addressing its internal problems and issues? Contemporary geopolitical and strategic realities preclude the pure balance-of-power strategy employed by traditional European powers. However, the organisation of rules and norms of the emerging pan-European elite will not be able to demonstrate sufficient ability to find ways and paths for a global strategy if it does not follow the movements in geopolitical realities. The US has every reason, based on history and geopolitics, to encourage the European Union and prevent it from drifting into a geopolitical vacuum. If the US were to separate itself from Europe in politics, economics, and defence, *it would become a geopolitical island far from the shores of Eurasia. Europe itself would turn into a pendant vast areas of Asia and the Middle East .,*” warned the staunch Atlanticist Henry Kissinger (1923-2023), born in Germany and whose real name was Heinz Kissinger, in his “Reflections on the Character of States and the Direction of History” (Kisindzer, 2015, p. 107) Kissinger had invested his entire political life in separating and hindering the cooperation of the two “communist powers”, the USSR and China. Towards the end of his long life, he lived to see the establishment of the BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China, South Africa) group.

4. “Blackrock” as a “Stability factor”

The capitalist power elite exists throughout the world. The globalisation of trade and capital is bringing the world’s elites into increasingly interconnected relationships – to the point where social scientists have begun to theorise the development of a transnational capitalist class (TCC) over the past few decades, “Peter Phillips reminds us in his excellent book “Giants – The Global Power Elite”(Filips, 2021, p. 23).

It was during the great global financial crisis of 2008, which, like the 1929 crisis, brought ruin to some and enormous profits to others, that one name began to emerge, first from the background and then more and more clearly on the world’s economic and political scene – BlackRock. It originated from the slightly older company Blackstone, founded in 1985 by Peter Peterson and Stephen Schwarzman, former colleagues from the old banking house Lehman Brothers. The two incorporated their names into their firm: Schwarz (meaning “black”) and Petros (meaning “stone”). That same year, Peterson became president of the American Council on (Foreign Relations), a position he held until his retirement in 2007.

Laurence Fink, co-founder, chairman and CEO of BlackRock, was “raised in a middle-class Jewish family in Van Nuys, California” (Phillips, 71). He made his name at First Boston, where he had to leave after initial success because he misjudged the market for interest rates, which caused the bank significant damage. Perhaps it was this “stubbornness” that drove Fink to create what would become the world’s largest money management company. Risk management was at the forefront, and so Aladdin (Asset Liability and Debt and Derivative Investment Network) was born, an electronic system in which thousands of analysts, using thousands of computers, monitor and examine all aspects of financial markets globally. One of Aladdin’s users was Deutsche Bank.

In such circumstances, it is no surprise that a politician of such reputation and “background” as Friedrich Merz would become one of the leaders of “Blackrock” in Germany.

The analysis of BlackRock’s German branch operations was conducted by Werner Rigemer (Private Banker International). He published his findings at the beginning of 2025 under the title “BlackRock Germany”; in the subtitle, he calls the company “the hidden world power” (Die heimliche Weltmacht). According to Rigemer, the citizens of Germany should be aware of how the world’s largest investment firm works for the benefit of the global elite and how it invests vast amounts of money in the largest corporations and banks, such as “Bayer”, “Deutsche Bank”, “Adidas”, etc. What he particularly emphasises is that almost all public companies in Germany, as well as in many countries around the world, are heavily influenced by “BlackRock”. What is even more worrying is that the organised concealment of the “mailboxes” of large clients could lead to a system of tax evasion, similar to the so-called “tax havens (ports)”, which would have unforeseeable consequences for the social market economy established after World War II. Of course, there is always a fear of inflation in Germany since 1923, when a banknote with a nominal value of 100 billion marks was issued. (Rugemer, 2025). In addition to its influence in prominent private and public companies, it seems that BlackRock will pay special attention to solar energy in Germany. Decarbonisation is a priority for many governments in Europe, and there is no doubt that the new German Chancellor will give it due attention.

However, given the financial power and potential behind the American giant, it is clear that energy and security will be intertwined, as always. Dirk Schmitz has been at the helm of German BlackRock, overseeing Austria and Eastern Europe, since 2018. Before taking office, he was responsible for global markets at Deutsche Bank. 20) A greater role for BlackRock in the German, and not only German, economy should contribute to the American strategic goal – reducing dependence on Russian energy resources both in Germany and in the entire EU. “On the one hand, the EU could benefit significantly from diversifying its sources of supply and thereby increasing competitiveness in the natural gas sector. This could have a direct consequence not only of a drop in gas prices but also of stimulating producers to increase deliveries and production capacities. However, despite all the EU’s efforts to implement its policy of global diversification of energy supplies, it can be safely stated that Russia will remain the most important supplier to the European continent and that such a trend will exist as a constant in the medium term, in parallel with the diversification processes that will be implemented by both the EU and Russia. On the other hand, however, in addition to the positive ones, the launch of the ‘diversification at all costs’ strategy could also have negative consequences for Russian-European energy relations in terms of complicating the Energy Dialogue and weakening the Russian-European energy partnership.” (Milosavljević, 2014, p. 484).

Unlike the leftists from the magazine “Hintergrund”, representatives of the German Council on Foreign Relations, a sister organisation of the “club” of the same name from the USA, have a completely different “worldview” and a completely different view of the development of Europe: “It is clear that, in the current situation, Europe - especially Germany - must significantly increase its defence efforts and this must be done together with the USA, but also in cooperation with other Western countries.”

Dr. Stefan Meister, discussing the consequences of the war in Ukraine for the reconfiguration of the security system in Europe, explicitly states: “Russia’s large-scale attack on Ukraine has led to a profound change in German policy towards Russia. Decades of efforts towards rapprochement have given way to retreat. The polarization of political forces in Germany, particularly in terms of security strategy (Hasan & Sultana, 2024; Sudar et al., 2024; Aleksandrina et al., 2019), is becoming

increasingly pronounced despite the seemingly straightforward “EU Strategic Compass”. Traditional pro-American forces, embodied mainly in the victorious CDU/CSU coalition and the aforementioned Council on Foreign Relations, have encountered serious competition in the form of the “Alternative for Germany” (Alternative für Deutschland), which is considered far-right. However, its “worldview” is far more complex. However, many left-wing circles and intellectuals across the political spectrum are also very dissatisfied that “Atlanticism” is pushing Germany too far into the “Procrustean bed of American democracy”. In their “Manifesto for Germany” (2017), they call for the return of national power and advocate for a Europe of nation-states, directly opposing the globalist vision of the world and the “Eurocrats” from Brussels. They explicitly advocate protecting German borders from false asylum seekers and following the principle of protecting victims, not perpetrators. In protecting borders and victims, they also have the “understanding” of the new German Chancellor, Friedrich Merz.

Since many of the points of the “Manifesto”, such as scepticism towards the euro and the EU, are very appealing to a large number of German voters, the new German government will undoubtedly have to take this into account, especially when it comes to foreign and security policy (<http://www.afd.de>). A fundamental sentence from the “Manifesto”, when it comes to security, refers to the role of NATO: “NATO membership is in Germany’s interests when it comes to foreign and security policy as long as its role, as an alliance, is defensive.” (<https://news.err.ee>). The “New World Order” (or “New World Order”), a now somewhat forgotten expression, was promoted by U.S. President George H.W. Bush in a speech to the U.S. Congress on September 11, 1990. It was the prelude to the US “intervention” in Kuwait and then in Iraq, which marked not only the military dominance of the sole superpower but also the beginning of the media dominance of CNN. By a strange coincidence, the “terrorist attack” on the US occurred *on the same date*, but in 2001. It was the prelude to the “war on terror” and the invasion of Afghanistan to overthrow the Taliban, the same Islamic fighters that the US had recruited to fight the USSR.

In a time of intoxication with the “triumph in the Cold War”, the US defined the foundations of its foreign policy and future military engagement in two documents called the “Wolfowitz Report” and the “Jeremiah Report”, after the Undersecretary of Defense and the Admiral who led a large group of experts. They then determined that the primary goal of US foreign policy was to maintain hegemony. To achieve this, it was necessary to maintain the status of the sole superpower through a military power sufficient to deter any nation or group of nations from threatening US supremacy. At that time, a strategy was also defined towards the European allies: “*We should act in the direction of preventing the emergence of a European security system that could destabilise NATO*” (Bodson, 1996, pp. 18-19).

These very characteristics are constant even today when it comes to the American administration, not the Americans as a people, of course. Moreover, that is why the “Alternative for Germany” has become a political problem, and not because of its alleged or real extremism towards refugees or Islam. After all, one of the party leaders does not hide in public appearances her sympathy for Margaret Thatcher, but also for homosexuals (<https://www.eruactiv.com>).

Most of the founders of the Alternative for Germany came from the traditional, pro-European, and pro-American CDU/CSU coalition, which was dissatisfied with the way former Chancellor Angela Merkel handled the resolution of problems in the eurozone, particularly regarding Greece and the ensuing economic crisis in 2010. Henning Conle, a German-Swiss billionaire originally from Duisburg (<http://www.afd.de>), also influences the financial flows in the party.

Globalisation, as a process of technical and technological connection of humanity, and globalism, as an attempt by the humiliators (Ilić, 2020, pp. 395-397) to impose their rules on the entire world, led to open protests and even conflicts in Germany, as well as in most of the world. Professor Dr Smilja Avramov predicted such a development of events a quarter of a century ago: “Today, millions of people around the world are protesting against the ideology of globalism, and not against the process of globalisation, which is normal. By protesting, they are demanding that this process be conducted through states, not by states and that democratic principles and civilisational achievements be incorporated into the process of globalisation rather than leaving the world in the hands

of barbaric, savage capitalism. This is the essence of the matter. So, it is not about the left or the right but about the answer to the essential question: whether nation-states will disappear and hand over all power to multinational companies, of which there are approximately five hundred leading ones worldwide. That is the essence of the problem and conflict" (Vukašinović, 2003, pp. 14-15)

In support of this, Christy Raik, Director of the International Centre for Defence and Security (ICDS), who previously worked at the Directorate-General for External and Political-Military Relations of the European Commission (Department for Ukraine and Moldova), points out that the future of European security now largely depends on Germany. The newly appointed Chancellor, Friedrich Merz, bears significant responsibility in this regard. Speaking about it and comparing it to the previous German government, she believes that the German position is now much more decisive and reliable and that it will increase support for Ukraine: "I believe that Germany's intention to increase its defence capabilities significantly is serious. At the same time, it is not easy to move in that direction. There are different opinions within Germany.

There is no doubt that in this turbulent sea of opposing views and policies in Germany, the greatest declination of the EU's "Strategic Compass" will occur. Chancellor Friedrich Merz, after taking a seat in the comfort of the "Blackrock" armchair, will face the greatest challenge of his career and strive to prove that the "Atlantic Bridge" remains safe and worthy of those who chose it. Last but not least, American partners can rely on him. Whether Donald Trump is also among his reliable partners remains to be seen.

References

1. Reagan Library. (n.d.). *Proclamation 5665*. Retrieved from <https://www.reaganlibrary.gov>
2. AfD. (n.d.). *Manifesto for Germany*. Retrieved from <http://www.afd.de>
3. Bled, J.-P. (2011). *Bismarck*. Belgrade: NNK International.
4. Bodson, G. (1996). *The new world order and Yugoslavia*. Belgrade: ING-PRO.
5. Ilić, V. (2002). *The Family – The Media's New World Order*. Belgrade: Konras.
6. Ilić, V. (2020). *Prometheus – Media "Nazification" of the Serbian people*. Kragujevac: Konras Foundation.
7. Kaplan, R. D. (2023). *Adriatic Sea – Agreement of civilisations at the end of the new century*. Belgrade: Laguna.
8. Kissinger, H. (2015). *World order*. Belgrade: Club Plus.
9. Milosavljević, S. (2014). *Russia and "Peace": The security strategy of the Russian Federation: Geopolitical, energy and military aspects*. Belgrade: Academic Thought – Innovation Center of the Faculty of Security, University of Belgrade.
10. Phillips, P. (2021). *Giants – The global power elite*. Belgrade: Clio.
11. Stone, O. (2017). *Interviews with Vladimir Putin*. Belgrade: Russia.
12. Ulfkotte, U. (2014). *Gekaufte Journalisten – Wie Politiker, Geheimdienste und Hochfinanz Deutschlands Massenmedien lenken*. Rottenburg: Kopp Verlag.
13. Vukašinović, M. (2003). *Encounters – Selected conversations*. Nova Pazova: Bonart.
14. Hasan, M. K., & Niger Sultana. (2024). Dynamics of Internal Migration in the Southwest Region of Bangladesh. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Management*, 6(1), 13–26.
15. Sudar, S., Cvetković, V. M., & Ivanov, A. (2024). Harmonization of Soft Power and Institutional Skills: Montenegro's Path to Accession to the European Union in the Environmental Sector. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Management*, 6(1), 41–74.
16. Aleksandrina, M., Budiarti, D., Yu, Z., Pasha, F., & Shaw, R. (2019). Governmental Incentivization for SMEs' Engagement in Disaster Resilience in Southeast Asia. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Management*, 1(1), 32-50.

17. European Journalism Observatory. (2017, January 20). *European media ponder a Trump presidency*. Retrieved from <https://en.ejo.ch>
18. Kress.de. (2017, June 30). *My friend Helmut Kohl*. Retrieved from <https://kress.de/news/beitrag>
19. Atlantic-Brücke. (2017, October 24). *Atlantic-Brücke's beginnings*. Retrieved from <https://www.atlantik-bruecke.org>
20. Private Banker International. (2018, January 22). *BlackRock hires new business head for Germany, Austria and Eastern Europe*. Retrieved from <https://privatebankerinternational.com>
21. Inet Economics. (2018, June 20). *The American behind the Deutsche Mark*. Retrieved from <https://www.ineteconomics.org>
22. DGAP. (2022, February 24). *Ways into the future: Perspectives for foreign policy*. Retrieved from <https://dgap.org>
23. European Union External Action Service. (2022, March 22). *A Strategic Compass – EEAS – European Union*. Retrieved from <https://www.eeas.europa.eu>
24. The Times. (2025, January 12). *Friedrich Merz's economic cure for Germany, the sick man of Europe*. Retrieved from <https://www.thetimes.com>
25. Al Jazeera. (2025, January 18). *Biden's Ukraine disaster was decades in the making*. Retrieved from <https://www.aljazeera.com>
26. Britannica. (2025, April 17). *Konrad Adenauer, West German Chancellor and the father of German reunification*. Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com>
27. Deutschland.de. (2025, May 6). *Friedrich Merz: Conservative transatlanticist*. Retrieved from <https://www.deutschland.de>
28. News.err.ee. (2025, May 13). *ICDS head: The future of European security largely depends on Germany*. Retrieved from <https://news.err.ee>
29. Euractiv. (2025, May 14). *Germany's Merz vows to build Europe's strongest military*. Retrieved from <https://www.euractiv.com>



