"UNITED EUROPE," - a Counter-revolutionary Offspring Of Capital

In political circles on our continent, more and more is being heard of the slogan of a «United Europe». The discussion has passed beyond the stage of theoretical debates to that of taking some concrete steps towards a supra-national European unification. «United Europe» is one of the most complex problems of the present day international politics.

«The United Europe which West European capital, «is knocking together», said Enver Hoxha at the 6th Congress of the PLA, «aims at becoming a new Imperialist superpower with pretentions to hegemony and domination just like those of the United States of America and the Soviet Union. The struggle against US imperialism would be ineffectual if struggle were not waged at the same time against the friends and allies of US imperialism, the imperialists Powers as a whole».

EVOlUTION OF THE EUROPEAN IDEA

Historically, following various divergent and convergent movements in the state and structures of the continent, Europe, the cradle of capitalism, the master of the European world and destinies, has witnessed the birth of various concepts of the European idea, embraced by the top circles of the bourgeoisie of various countries who aspired to complete hegemony over the continent. Things changed in the 20th century when the United States of America became the vanguard of capitalist development, and especially in the second half of the century, when, with the appearance on the international arena of a series of new independent states of the so-called third world, and with the process of capitalist restoration in the revisionist countries and the turning of the Soviet Union into an imperialist superpower, the weight and role of Europe in the course of international events seemed to be dwindling. Such a thing could not be to the liking of the European bourgeoisie to whom, despite the whirlpool of impetuous events with economic and political consequences that took place during the first seven decades of this century, the idea of a powerful united Europe has always remained attractive. In conformity with the ratio of forces in Europe and in the world, which, as Marxism teaches, can never be fixed and permanent, as
well as depending on the internal positions of the national bourgeoisies, the «United Europe» project have gone through a process of evolution. Pan-Europeanism, flourished as a political trend, especially in the twenties and thirties in the shade of the Locarno Treaty. Among the main figures was the Austro-Hungarian count, R. Kudenhove-Kaleri who, in 1922 appealed to Mussolini to «Save Europe», and in the subsequent course of events, to Hitler and John Foster Dulles respectively. The Pan-Europeanists proclaimed the unification of Europe and its salvation in the name of the struggle against bolshevism and communism, embodied at that time in the Soviet Union. It is characteristic that the pan-European movement included such important representatives of European capital as the Rothschilds in France, the heavy industry magnates Vogler and Pegsen in Germany, etc. Everybody knows how those early efforts for a «United Europe» ended. Hitler tried to carry out this «European unification» under the slogan of the new order and under the hegemony of the Aryan race. After the second world war, pan-Europeanism was revived under US influence. This was the time when US imperialism was launching its big offensive on the world and when Europe was among its first objectives. Washington promoted the pan-European movement in the hope that by this means a suitable atmosphere would be created for the great Atlantic community. The American projects of a united Europe (the Morgenthau, Achense, and other plans) began to crop up one after the other, while the pan-Europeanists, inscribed on their banners: «Sine America nulla salus» (no salvation without America). The American efforts found concrete expression in the Marshall plan and in NATO as a future military nucleus of the Atlantic community. In the economic sphere the United States of America encouraged the creation of the «European Common Market» and the European Free Trade Association.

But even for this «United Europe» American style, it was not plain sailing. The law of the unequal economic and political development of the capitalist countries did its own work, and the ratio of forces in intercapitalist relations began to favour the side of the European countries. In France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Britain and elsewhere, they began to look askance at the plans of the great Atlantic community under American leadership, so there was a cooling towards the pro-Atlantic pan-European movement. In the mean time, among the European states, the slogan emerged of a European «United Europe», without the participation of the United States of America. This is precisely the Europe they are speaking of today. We find its outlines in the so-called little Europe, comprised of the six member countries of the European Common Market. With the present nucleus of the European Common Market and by expanding it they aim to achieve an integration of all the capitalist countries of Western Europe, in a single country with its common policy, economy, and defence. «Our aim», says Willy Brandt, «is a European government organized in a reasonable way, that can take the necessary decisions in the fields of common policy, and whose activities will be subject to a parliamentary control. Nobody in the community doubts that such a government will one day come into being, and the majority know that a failure would have disastrous consequences».

In striving for such a thing the European big bourgeoisie does not proceed at all from sentimental feelings for continental independence. It is not in the least concerned either about the independence or about the sovereignty of the European countries, but only about its own objectives and ambitions. The west-European monopoly bourgeoisie wants to dominate in Europe and by uniting all its forces and resources, to counterpose the US imperialist bourgeoisie and the social-imperialist bourgeoisie as the as it carry in order to realize its hegemonic aims in the world in the same way as they do. Tracing the metamorphosis of the European idea, we could classify it into three periods as we saw above, in which the content has been anti-bolshevism, Atlanticism and Europeanism, respectively. It is the third stage that we are in at present.

THE CAPITALIST PARALLEL: INTEGRATION AND DISINTEGRATION

Will this united Europe come fully into being one day? The very development of capitalism stimulates the process of the internationalization and concentration of capital and production and this cannot fail to have consequences in the political relations and structures. Integration is characteristic of state monopoly capitalism. In Western Europe, the integration processes have developed more than elsewhere and several economic-political interstate blocs have come to light. The explanation is not to be sought in the understanding or predisposition to integration of the bourgeoisies of the various European countries, but in numerous causes of an objective character. These include the need for the development of the productive forces spurred by the technical-scientific revolution, the concrete historical circumstances, and the special features of West European capitalism, which lost its dominating positions in the colonial countries, the narrowing of national markets and the fierce competition from the US monopolies, the consolidation of a powerful alliance between the United States of America, and the Soviet Union, in whose plans Europe is viewed as subject to their hegemony, etc. Thus, the degree of progress of the integrationist structures depends on a complex of factors.

At first sight a number of them drive towards integration, towards a united capitalist Europe. But another law inseparable from capitalist development is the manifestation of opposite phenomena. The permanent capitalist parallel is integration and disintegration, irrespective of the fact that at any particular period one trend may become more prominent than the other. Integration itself is a form of capitalist competition. It does not change the essence of the capitalist mode of production and its laws; indeed it gives rise to contradictions in new forms and new fields. The internal contradictions of capitalism are inevitable even in sup-national forms of the organisation of capitalist production. Thus, in the European Common Market an increase in the proportions of two typical problems of capitalism-failure to utilise the capacity of the productive apparatus, and the growth of unemployment can be seen. Utilisation of the productive capacity of the processing industries of the European Common Market countries fell from 91 per cent in 1960, to 79 per cent in 1965, and to 78 per cent in 1970. According to the data of the U.N. economic commission for Europe, the rates of increase of industrial output in West European countries fell by 1.5 per cent in 1970 compared with 1969. The army of
unemployed the EEC countries amounts to some 2 million persons. One of the consequences of integration is the contradiction between the national systems of state-monopoly capitalism and its supranational form. The experience of the EEC with the continuous contradictions over agricultural and monetary problems, the preservation in the hands of national governments of such powerful levers of state monopoly capitalism such as the taxation policy, national legislation, control over the market for capital, state subsidies, etc., shows that even under the conditions of the EEC which is the most developed form of capitalist integration, it is very difficult to achieve unification. Even among the most optimistic Pan-Europeanists they do not speak of a monolithic West European solidarity. This is understandable because the interests of the monopolies of the various countries united in little Europe, are in constant collision because of their antagonistic character. Even if the big united Europe is created, the division of profits will be done on the basis of strength. And strength changes during the economic and political development which brings to the forefront first one power and then another; thus clashes of opposing interests are an integral phenomenon of every capitalist union. The French-West German rivalry in the EEC and outside it is a very eloquent indicator. Both France and the Federal German Republic aspire to leadership in Europe, both at the moment and in the so-called united Europe, which has created a new tangle of France-West German contradictions. Paris supports the project of a confederative type of united Europe, whereas Bonn wants one federation. So complicated is the road of the creation of a capitalist «United Europe» that disillusionment is being more and more openly expressed in various circles of the European bourgeoisie. The West German DPA wrote, «Europe has striven for political unity for the last twenty years, but so far the old continent has been unable to agree about one type of tank, submarine or airplane. Each country produces armaments because each country has its own ambitions.» The projects of a «united Europe» are viewed with some doubt by both the United States of America and the Soviet Union which have agreed between themselves, within the framework of the Soviet-U.S. alliance, on the division of the European continent; the West under the Americans and the East under the Soviets. In one form or another the two super-powers incite the contradictions between the European countries, set one country against another, and, also strive to orientate Pan-Europeanism towards themselves. Meanwhile the United States of America and the Soviet Union have increasingly excluded Western Europe from their negotiations over world issues, which west-European capital, with its tradition and interests, cannot accept. The most distressing thing in Europe is that Europe does not exist, and that she is not present in world affairs. Everything would be different if at last a (united -author's note) political Europe were to come into being, which must not be a satellite either of the Americans or of the Soviets, but on the contrary, a collaborator of the former and the latter. These words of Pietro Nenni, a former Italian Foreign Minister, clearly express that objective of the European bourgeoisie for the united Europe which, divided by the internal struggles and fierce contradiction right from the start, is seeking to rise to the rank of a world superpower so that, she too, may sit in on the division of the zones of influences. But even before this «United Europe» has taken its first tottering steps the other two superpowers, are striving if they cannot liquidate it, at least to make it a partner in the sense of a dominion. The United States of America poses, as and even proclaims itself, the lawful heir to the European property. While Nixon, has accepted this «United Europe» as «one of the centers of world power in the future», as he did on July 7, 1971, on the other hand, he continually reminds his allies that «our policy presupposes a new form of leadership and not a refusal of the leading role». The talks which the White House chief has held with a number of heads of state of Western Europe — France, Britain, Federal German Republic and Italy should be seen in the light of this policy. U.S. imperialism is seeking to reassert its position as the undisputed leader of the capitalist camp in face of Soviet social-imperialism which comes to the US-Soviet negotiations as the unchallengable boss of the revisionist camp. Washington is holding some strong cards, such as NATO, the US military presence, and colossal investments in the European countries. The Soviet Union, on its part, is not sitting indifferent towards this «United Europe» which is striving to come into being, but is making great efforts to shift it within its own zone of influence. The rhetorical appeals for a «democratic united Europe» and the underlinings by the Soviet press of the colossal economic potential which the Soviet Union and Europe could create together, are long range shots. In this context the political strategists of the Kremlin think they have found their Archimedes lever in the so-called European security conference. But while the Soviet Union and the United States of America conceive a European security conference as sanctioning their hegemonistic role on the continent, «United Europe» (its future members) views it as a confirmation of its rise to the rank of an equal partner without either of the superpowers hanging over it a conference in which the superpowers will reconcile themselves to gradual disengagement in Europe, leaving the European bourgeoisie to rule. Different viewpoints and clear contradictions.

**«UNITED EUROPE» AND THE PROLETARIAT**

Speculating on the growing feelings of the peoples against the imperialist Soviet-U.S. alliance and its plots, the European monopolist bourgeoisie is striving to convince them that a «United Europe» responds to the interests of the labouring masses. This is not true at all. Capitalist integration, under whatever pretext it may be undertaken, cannot have an effect beneficial to the working class. The European capitalist bourgeoisie is seeking to unite its forces in order to suppress the revolutionary movement on the European continent, to intensify the exploitation of the toiling masses, to increase its super-profits and strengthen its competitive position against the US capitalist bourgeoisie and the Soviet revisionist bourgeoisie. The «United Europe» project bears the seal and the class nature of its creators, V. I. Lenin in his life-time gave a crushing reply to the theories and practical effects of capital for a «United Europe». «The United States of Europe under the conditions of capitalism is either impossible or reactionary. Certainly, it is possible for temporary agreements to be concluded capitalists and between states.
From this point of view it is also possible to create the United States of Europe, as an arrangement of the European capitalists... but what for? Solely for the joint suppression of socialism in Europe. To create the United States of Europe under the conditions of capitalism means to organise reaction, wrote the genius of the revolution in 1915 in an accurate assessment which is still valid today.

The 13-years experience of the existence of the European Common Market, which is considered and accepted by the capitalist planners as the nucleus of the future united Europe, is the best indication of what the consequences of capitalist integration are for the working masses. The average rise of prices in the EEC countries is 6 per cent per year, while the cost of living rises 5 per cent per year. Unemployment has become a chronic ulcer which the numerous programs for the so-called planning and coordinated movement of the work force within the «six» are unable to heal. The situation of the peasants in regard to which the EEC agricultural policy has been loudly publicised as the way to improvement, is particularly difficult. In the last decade the incomes of the peasantry have diminished by 10 per cent. The prices of commodities purchased from the peasants remain the same, while the prices at which they are sold in the cities have doubled. Thus, in Belgium the town-dweller pays 10 times more for potatoes than the peasant receives for them from the merchant entrepreneur. Credits and subsidies from the EEC institutions are paid only to the big capitalist enterprises which make up less than 5 per cent of the total number of farms in the EEC countries. These are some of the consequences of the so-called little United Europe for the working masses. It goes without saying that for the big United Europe they will have to pay a higher price both in economic sacrifices and in social and political sacrifices. On a world scale, the role of the United Europe cannot be other than an imperialist and counter-revolutionary one; the consequences of which will be borne by the European peoples, just as the consequences of the frenzied aggressive policy of the White House are being borne by the American people. In the book «The future of Europe, the Choice of Europe», published in London by the Institute of strategic research, which deals with the models and objectives of the United Europe, it is stressed that the federation of the type of the United States of Europe «will assume responsibility for questions of security in some regions and together with the United States of America will maintain law and order in the world».

The slogans and projects of the United Europe are reactionary and they represent nothing of benefit to the working class and all the working masses of Europe. The proletariat can never see its future in a community of interests with the capitalist bourgeoisie. And the United Europe will be the Europe of bankers and industrialists, the Europe of capital against the revolution and the proletariat. It is not a positive alternative as the bourgeoisie and the revisionist cliques in Western Europe are striving to present it. Implementing the line of integration with the national bourgeoisie, they have embraced this slogan, prattling about a «United Europe of peace, collaboration, and friendship». The European working class rejects these efforts with contempt. It sees the positive alternative for its future in the revolution and socialism, in the destruction of the system of capitalist and imperialist oppression.
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