

FEDERALISM IN THE EU, OR, HOW TO SEPARATE THE WHEAT FROM THE CHAFF

After the Social-Fascist electoral victory in Germany, the new Chancellor, Scholz, who 4 years ago had said that one of his primal objectives will be to establish an European Federation^[1] and advance EU into the next state, reaffirmed this plan of the document regarding the coalition deal with the Greens^[2]. Plans like this were defacto within the very scope of the EU since the very beginning, and they were already tried previously with the discussions regarding a common constitution e.t.c.

But today is not like in previous years; because back then EU was at its strong, imperialism was at its world wide peak. Global communism had fallen, global anti imperialist movements were splintered, anti-imperialism (let alone socialism) completely died within Europe, and within the non-imperialist Europe, the national question which previous generations failed to address came to bite back our generation, putting us one more burden, one more way for the imperialists to use against us by picking today Albania as their ally, tomorrow Serbia, the next day Romania, e.t.c to act as the year's comprador, further splintering our people's struggle against imperialism. Back then EU could still operate and extract profits from the world without being pushed into a federation. It was not necessary from them to have a centralized government all over the nations, it was easy for them to bribe some compradorist forces, and even have in board whole nations in their imperialist campaign (PASOK in Greece was basically a deal with the Greek nation and the imperialists, parasitism in exchange for not joining the anti-imperialist bloc). Right now, everyone sees that *no nation* can be brought into the imperialist pyramid; *no*

nation can become parasitic anymore, quite the *contrary*, *the already parasitic ones start to lose even this quality bit by bit*. It is apparent from the inclusion of Bulgaria and Romania for more than a decade in the EU, that the imperialists cannot buy entire nations anymore and bring them under the seal of parasitism. Even small nations like the Albanians, they are unable to buy them up. At best, they can offer them *immigration*, which too starts to be diminishing, this time from reaction *within* the imperialist nations, within the labour aristocratic or recently proletarianized masses of the imperialist world, who see that immigration brings space and time closer with the imperialized world, thus bringing them closer to proletarianization.

Therefore, the issue of closer centralization in Europe was not a matter of life and death back then; but now, now that imperialism is going down, now that the profits from imperialist plunder become fewer and fewer, now that the clear trend of the labour aristocracy of Europe is proletarianization (as many bourgeoisie professors put it, globalism is the process of bringing space and time together in the many places of the world), the issue of bringing most nations of Europe under a single state is a matter of life and death for the cosmopolitan bourgeoisie. Because then, there would be far more difficult for the proletariat of the smaller nations to break free from capitalism since there would be hundred more obstacles in front of them to break free from before they can even think of launching a communist revolution. They would not have to deal with just their own bourgeoisie (at least directly, the cosmopolitan bourgeoisie always aid the local bourgeoisie in their struggle against the proletariat), but with the *unified bourgeoisie of the entire Europe*. The question of national liberation would also distract the proletariat, since this development would either presuppose a wide revolution in the entirety of Europe, which is something rendered impossible by the very class

composition of this supposed federation, with the Germanic race being on top, with the working class of the Germanic nations being mostly a labour aristocracy due to the previous economic setups, with the Romance nations being in the middle, and the Slavic nations and the smaller nations in Europe being in the bottom, a revolution would either need to mingle itself with a separationist struggle, or a separationist struggle presupposing it.

The separationist struggles were mostly fought in Europe decades ago. Aside from some few territories, almost all nations in Europe (save the nations of Italy and Spain) have a state of their own. This federation would bring us decades back regarding this front, a front which the european masses managed to clear first from all, a front which we see the masses of Asia, America, and Africa entering now, now that the era of colonialism is a past, but its direct formulation of borders is not.

Taking all that in account, only the cosmopolitan bourgeoisie have something to win from this Federalism in the EU. Even the national bourgeoisie stand to lose something, since it would bring them one step closer to their subjugation under the big imperialist monopolies, putting their own struggle (competition) in chains. The proletariat has *everything* to lose, at least in the long term.

This is one side of the issue; why the bourgeoisie win, and why the proletariat lose.

But there is another side of the issue, a more "Political" one. One concerning the question of *ideological struggle* between us and the enemy in the political realm. Truly, if one sees the times were the proletariat sized power successfully, from the Paris Commune till Korea, it was always when the leaders of the proletariat would rise the banner of nationalism higher than the bourgeoisie could.

The nationalistic and patriotic masses amongst the proletariat, who also form the majority of it, the most class conscious and radical part contrary to the bribed and declassed elements of it who proffes either national nihilism, either national chauvinism, or both, this part, the backbone of every true national liberation struggle, needs to be won in the side of their true leaders, to understand that their beloved nation has two classes with two contradictory interests, and one thing which renders them in the control of the bourgeoisie is this very lip service of theirs regarding "nationalism". The bourgeoisie in power, is able to present itself as the "true protector of the nation", and many proletarians buy this, or at least it renders them "neutral". Vestiges of bourgeoisie nationalism is strong among the proletarian masses, and bourgeoisie nationalism will only be replaced by completely true proletarian nationalism in Communism, but till then, we, the Communists, need to strongly contrast proletarian nationalism against bourgeoisie nationalism, to strongly contrast the nationalism of the future against the nationalism of the past, trying to win over the masses of the proletariat actively in our side, not only in discussions around the dinner table where they may say "the communists are the true protectors of the nation" during a political debate, but in a practical way, i.e, to convince the proletariat to *rise up in arms* and fight a revolution and a national liberation struggle at the same time against the neo-colonial forces we are facing.

A *condition* for the revolution is therefore, the *merging* of the national liberation struggle with the proletarian revolution, and this condition becomes even more striking in imperialized and neo-colonized nations.

On one hand, due to the mechanics of neo-colonialism, the control of the imperialists over us is more hidden, more implicit, and therefore there is more room for the

compradorist bourgeoisie to maneuver and to make it seem as if their class interest is the interest of the nation. On the other hand, thanks to the very mechanics of imperialism and capitalism, neo-colonialism will tend more and more in the *centralization of political power* in the hands of the cosmopolitan bourgeoisie officially too, i.e in a more colonialist-proper political system (albeit greatly in new forms). EU, NATO, e.t.c, all are neo-colonial institutions. An European Federation under the rule of the bourgeoisie, would be the *most precise, advanced, and strong neo-colonial institution*, and hence, the most *explicit* neo-colonial institution of them all, the most colonialist-proper form of government since the demise of the old colonialism.

Therefore, what does this tells us about separating the wheat from the chaff? It tells us the following: the "nationalists" will need to *pick a side*; either with anti-EU anti-imperialist forces, or with EU, pro-imperialist forces.

They need to pick either the dimes the imperialist bourgeoisie may give to their nation for being explicitly without independence, or independence without the dimes falling from the pockets of the imperialist bourgeoisie. This is the first struggle we communists need to fight with them.

The recent plans on Federalism of the EU, *push for the polarization* of all forces in a X nation, for the elimination for the "middle" elements, into *two, big camps*, ones being in favor of the EU, and ones being against it. A *core* component of the nationwide political debate will be ever more, the question of independence of the nation, i.e nationalism. Hence, all nationalist-minded people, especially the "intellectual" ones, not only of the bourgeoisie, but of the working class too, will need to be polarized in two sides, the first one being the side which will embrace the loss of their own nation's independence and whatever comes with it, in exchange for a perceived

economic "return" for the "nation", and obvious bribing of them (and the national oriented bourgeoisie) by the imperialist bourgeoisie to keep the nation into compradorship, and the second one, the ones who will oppose their nation's loss of independence, and whatever comes with it, i.e the loss of imperialist benefits their nation may currently enjoy at one level or another.

This polarization will still happen within the realm of capitalism, i.e, the question of communism and proletarian revolution wont be the one polarizing the entirety of society, but the question of comprador or national capitalism will be. After the first stage, i.e the polarization of the nation between forces who put it in compradorship and forces who put it in independence, things will be more clear, and the *ultimate polarization* in the whole nation will take place: this polarization consists of the political understanding that the nation is being divided in the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, this time not only understood precisely by the communist elements in the working class, but being understood by the mass of it, by becoming the core subject of national debate. And during this debate, the "anti-imperialist nationalists" among the intellectuals, soldiers, and in general the people who arent engaded in production, (save a minority of them, since to the majority of the proletariat, at this point, it will be as clear as day) will need by then to have to pick a side, either with the forces of capital, who in the long run, *will again pick the end point of capitalist development, the imperialist side*, and thus, the *death of the nation*, or the forces of labour, who being the core of the nation, its producer, its feeder, its parent and child at the same time, can be the only ones to safeguard the nation's development and health.

Thus, the EU federalization project, now put explicitly by the main mouth piece of the EU in the table, the SDP coalition governing Germany, is a step forwards at the

polarization of the nation into two big groups, which itself pushes for the polarization of the nation in another two groups which will put in question capitalism as a system itself, not a separate stage of it.

But the bourgeoisie forces, anti-imperialist or not, will present their own case for the question. It is the duty of the communists to put the case in the right position, exposing the contradictions as they indeed are, and therefore try to instigate this polarization further and in a more quick and efficient way.

Agitation therefore of this new development should be in the front page as much as possible from our forces, else we will be caught off guard when the proletariat will need to pick a side without knowing the actual implications of its action.

The more communists hold sway of the proletariat, the more the two stages of polarization will be *merged to one*, and therefore, the more quick and in an efficient way our victory will be, the more quick and efficient the victory of the proletariat will be. To separate therefore the wheat from the chaff amongs the nationalist minded masses, should be the order of the day for anyone truly serious on bringing about revolution, especially now tha the capitalists bring the issue on the table by their own admission.

F. U. Kuqe

12-1-2022

REFERENCES:

- [1] POLITICO, Janosch Delcker, " SPD's Martin Schulz wants United States of Europe by 2025 ", Dec. 7 2017. To

quote Scholz: "I want a new constitutional treaty to establish the United States of Europe. A Europe that is no threat to its member states, but a beneficial addition."

[2] Chartbook #54 (updated): Germany's New Government - "Dare more Progress", we quote: "We will use the Conference for the Future of Europe for reforms. We support necessary changes to the Treaties. The Conference should open the way to a constitutional assembly leading to the development of a federal European state (föderalen europäischen Bundesstaat) that will be organized on the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality with a charta of basic rights as its foundation. We want to strength the European parliament ... We will give priority to the community method, but, where necessary, go forward with individual member states. We support a unitary European franchise with partially transnational lists and a binding Spitzenkandidat-system."

Note for the reader: **If a MAC line is expressed, then it will be clarified. If not, the reader should consider the work expressing the views of the writer.**