

1. Theses of KKE on the character of the EU

The CPG (KKE) took its stance towards the class nature of the process of European capitalist unification in time, right from the beginning of the European Economic Community (EEC) and after that with the Single Act of the internal market and its evolution into the Economic and Monetary Union (EMU), known as the European Union (EU).

KKE analyzing the Greek and European reality, starting from the Leninist theory on imperialism and Lenin's thesis on the slogan "United States of Europe", ended up with the following estimation:

The EU is an advanced capitalist Union, that is to say an advanced form of alliance of capitalist states in Europe, which went through several stages of development. The French-German cooperation has been the leading core, known as the "axis", its goal being the after-war reinforcement of its monopolies partly against the somewhat more limited American-British alliance. Generally spoken, it was the economic and political alliance of the stronger western capitalist states to shield capitalism against the socialist part of Europe, against the socialist perspective of Western Europe.

The EEC's course towards the EMU (EU) is an expression of the common interests of its capitalist member-states. Its incentive and its goal is to enlarge its monopolies in conditions of growing competition, of periodical economic crises, of reshufflings in the international balance of power caused by uneven capitalist development (appearance of the so-called "miracles" of Japan and the "Asiatic tigers" etc).

It is an alliance of member-states of the EU to generally readjust the conditions of payment of salary work taking away achievements, which had been obtained in completely different domestic and international balance of power conditions between the forces of work and capital.

The EU's course is a course of common goals of big capital, of monopolies having their seat in European states and at the same time it is a course of competition amongst themselves, amongst the member-states of the EU, amongst their monopolies. This is so, because the absolute need of their alliance to meet international capitalist competition doesn't remove capitalist uneven development, its competition, the contradictions between the member-states of Europe nor the fact, that they are organized on the basis of nation-states, on which capitalist accumulation is grounded.

The strongest element of cohesion of this alliance (union) between capitalist states is their common approach in applying policies legalizing the reduction of labour force price related to the new levels of work productivity. As a consequence these policies mean, that wages remain behind the increase of productivity, negative changes in working conditions, a direct payment of what is needed for the reproduction of labour force as a piece of merchandise etc. (privatization of education, healthcare, welfare, assurance).

Measures are being taken as well to increase the percentage of women in paid labour, from which surplus value is drawn.

The KKE was right in anticipating the growing inter-imperialist contradictions within the EU. On the contrary, modern right- and left-wing opportunist forces aligned with the bourgeois liberal and socialdemocratic system management forces in motivating the necessity, the cohesiveness and finally the usefulness of the EU as a common one-way road for capital and labour. Growing contradictions as regards the cohesiveness of the EU became recently evident in the following way:

The “Constitutional Treaty” has not been approved by the referenda in France and the Netherlands continuing the tendency of some other negative results in previous referenda on the approval of Treaties (negative result of a referendum in Switzerland and of two referenda in Norway on the accession to the EU, a negative result of the referendum on the ratification of the euro in Sweden and Denmark. Those two countries finally do not belong to the euro zone, as well as Britain. The first referendum in Ireland on the ratification of the Nice Treaty referring to the last enlargement of the EU has been negative too).

Contradictions are growing too as regards EU fiscalities: contradictions on the amounts of the communitary budget (mainly Germany’s negative attitude towards an increase of its percentage on the Gross Product in the EU), on the utilization of communitary money (Britain being the leading country in demanding the decrease of the aid for agricultural production), on the management of fiscal deficits (primary deficit and public debt) etc.

Contradictions are sharpening as well in the preparations of a common European tax policy for enterprise, the tendency being an even greater participation of taxes on merchandise (indirect taxes) being paid by the majority, as well as a reduction of taxes for big capitalists (direct taxes on enterprises or people having large income).

Contradictions are growing as regards the relation between fiscal and monetary policy (known as the “Stability and Development Pact”). Because of the uneven development the same mixture isn’t fit for each member-state of the EU for the same year or the same period of time. Characteristic for this is the fact that the euro brought for some member-states much bigger deficits (e.g. Greece, Portugal, Italy), a much higher cost of living, but as well a worsening of their competitiveness (Greece, Portugal, but Italy as well) based on the criteria and the indicators of capitalist production.

Growing contradictions, because of the member-states’ common obligation to accelerate the liberation of energy markets, transport markets etc. This “liberation” takes place under circumstances of tough competition, of political manoeuvres aiming at exceptions or privileged relations, which would help strong state monopolies, like the EDF of France, to obtain or to keep shares. The reduction of state subsidies in sectors of strategic importance, like air transport increases contradictions too (for instance in Greece).

The last “enlargement” of the EU made internal contradictions more uneven and acute. EU’s hard core aimed at the accession of new members, mainly in Central and Eastern Europe (some of them, e.g. Poland and the Tschech Republic reinforce Germany’s alliances). At the same time the aggravation of contradictions as regards the monetary stability, the mobility of labour force, the level of unemployment and the management of competition in agricultural production is growing faster.

The perspective of a coming enlargement of the EU intensifies its internal contradictions. Right in the middle of these contradictions stands the beginning of the accession procedure of Turkey.

The eternal conflict between the American-British alliance with France and off and on with the French-German alliance as well, is reflected in this question. The line followed by the British presidency and the declarations of the representative of the State Department, that the USA had gained a reliable ally within the EU are quite characteristic in this respect.

Turkey is a rising capitalist power with internal preconditions for this kind of development (big population), but external as well (strategic position on the cross-road of three continents, very suitable for the building of European roads and energy networks, transport etc.). Because of its strategic position it has created a military-political alliance with the USA of lasting importance for the control of the Middle East, the borders of Russia, the Black Sea zone, the connection with other rising capitalist powers, like India etc. The continuous upgrading of its military forces (recently of its forces at sea too), its relative backwardness and especially its uneven domestic capitalist development, its traditional stream of migrants towards Germany, its significant staying behind as regards the assimilation of the Kurdish population, the fact too that the Turkish state remains behind in modernizing itself according to the modern structures and functions of a developed capitalist European state, all these factors together worsen its relations with the majority of the EU member-states (mainly with Germany, Austria, France etc.).

There is no doubt that the relations of Turkey with the EU will not be just positive, in spite of the fact that the accession procedure has started. On the contrary, a new phase of sharpened contradictions will be fed by them.

In the enlargement perspective of the EU through the participation of Bulgaria and Rumania there is an element of compensation of certain consequences of Turkey’s accession. It bears the feature of a more direct expansion of the EU’s hard core influence on the Balkans towards the Turkish borders, towards states with mineral wealth, like Rumania. This enlargement perspective is part of the EU’s plans to connect itself more favourably with the markets of Russia, Belarus, Moldavia, the Ukraine etc.

The inter-imperialist contradictions are also evident within the framework of the EU’s cooperation with other countries. Stable or occasional alliances are being created, axes and counter-axes or by EU as such or by just a part of the member-states in relation with

the two other imperialist centres, the USA and Japan, as well as with rising powers (e.g. Russia, India).

Some basic fields, where contradictions become evident, can be pointed out:

In the textile agreement of the EU with China different approaches are evident between countries with relatively strong industrial production (France, Italy) and other countries with still a strong export trade (e.g. Greece).

The control on energy resources and roads (e.g. the stance of the French-German axis as regards the USA in Iraq, the pipe-line Russia-Germany bypassing Poland, more generally the EU-Russia relationship for the EU's energy sufficiency).

The fight for international agreements within the WTO and other international monopoly unions. The competition with the USA on the control of strategic economy sectors after the "liberation" of international markets (e.g. air transport through the "open skies" agreements). Alliances and contradictions between member-states of the EU and the USA (e.g. in the war industry) intermingle with the contradiction EU-USA (e.g. Airbus-Boeing, respectively). The EU-USA competition is being manifested in other zones as well, in custom unions or in other types of unions (e.g. in Latin America and the Caribbean, with the trade "wars" of bananas, cattle etc.).

The EU tries to take advantage of the conflicts between other powers outside the EU (USA-Russia, India-Russia, but USA-China and Japan-China as well). Its approach to China as regards the lifting of the arms sales embargo on the second is a typical example. It is a complicated process. Inter-imperialist contradictions of the EU intermingle with its external contradictions. Therefore we notice that some member-states of the EU differentiate their attitude towards the other imperialist centres (e.g. the strategic cooperation Britain-USA).

However, the process of sharpening contradictions creates and strengthens counter-tendencies as regards the unification effort.

The cohesive element though, remains the strategy of increasing the degree of exploitation of the working class and the enlargement of capital of the European enterprises.

The growing contradictions within the EU cause a lot of trouble amongst the EU leadership (some of them talk about crisis). Several institutions (Council, Commission, European Parliament) worry about how to promote the EU policies, and mainly about how to prevent the emancipation of the government pressuring movement. Based on those class and inter-imperialist contradictions they try to find different ways to manage the situation, as well as a proper ideological cover (e.g. the "anti-neoliberal" or the "neo-Keynesian" EU version).

It is not the first time that the tension between EU enlargement and deepening is growing, but this time things might be worse. This, however, gives new scope to the efforts to reorganize the worker's and people's movement, to loosen the ties of "one-way thinking". However there must be no underestimation of the new possibilities of manipulation and ideological and political entrapment of the people.

The reactionary nature of the economic procedures of the European capitalist unification is reflected as well in the reactionary nature of its institutions. They are unified in their capitalist class character as to their economic and political procedures, which bear the following main features:

A shrinking of the price of labour, increasing of its exploitation through the overthrow of the slightest employment stability realized by extending the system of hourly wages, by employee leasing from enterprise to enterprise, by using labour force on new even more unfavourable assurance conditions, by having migrants working more cheaply, by unprotected season employment, by the cheaper work of women and children, by extending pension's age etc.

The policy of privatizations and markets "liberation" (electricity, transport, telecommunication etc.) led to a new wave of expensiveness, of unemployment. For instance, the Lisbon strategy is being realized since 2000. In those five years there has been an increase in dismissals, unemployment has reached the 9% level (for women and youngsters it is double), 68 million people have reached the poverty limit (in Greece more than 20% at the moment). The concentration of capital and production and the "liberation" of the markets lead to a further extension of social inequalities, of regional differences within the same country and between the member-states of the EU.

The apparatus for the oppression of people's movements is reinforced at an all-European level. The "The Hague's Programme", that is the functioning of the anti-terrorist doctrine in cooperation with other imperialist centres, particularly with the USA, works into that direction. Within the framework of that doctrine the fight against terrorism is being developed into a fight against "radical ideology", being defined as the predecessor of "terrorist action". At the same time the so-called "EU-army" is being reinforced in cooperation with NATO through the creation of rapid deployment forces and at the European level through the promotion of mercenary armies. "Euro-police" sections are being created as well and trans-European police systems of the Schengen-type are being extended, etc.

The reinforcement of anti-communism. The mere fact that countries are accepted as member-states, in which the activity of communist parties and the use of communist symbols has been banned or is persecuted (e.g. the Baltic countries, Hungary etc.) paves the road for the reinforcement of measures against communist action and for assaults on communist parties all over the EU.

The efforts to officially condemn communism and to identify it with fascism multiply at the EU bodies and the Council of Europe. This effort is not only stimulated by ultra-conservative forces, but with the direct or indirect support of social democratic forces too. A typical example for this is the proposal for a resolution submitted to the Council of Europe.

The adaptation of the political system per member-state and at the EU level

In several member-states of the EU laws have been adopted for the functioning of political parties, aiming at a direct state control on the parties referring to financial transparency etc. The fundamental instrument to intervene in the political system of each member-state is founding EU-parties, which as a matter of principle will accept and legalize the capitalist European unification process aiming at incorporating the worker's and people's movement in the EU one-way street.

Forces and institutions of the establishment at a state level, but at the European Union level as well, intervene and monitor the orientation of certain reactions caused by the consequences of anti-popular and anti-workers restructuring measures and by the anti-popular consequences of competition at the international capitalist market. There is an effort to utilize the so-called movement against the "neoliberal globalisation" in favour of the interests of certain member-states (for instance France) or of an imperialist centre (EU).

Acts of activism, relatively "spontaneous" reactions are used to prevent a really radical, anti-monopolistic, anti-imperialist mass mobilization, to avert it from becoming a mass movement with a class orientation, an internationalist class oriented coordination of the action of the labour movement and of other social movements (e.g. anti-war, movements of women, students, farmers, self-employed etc.).

The parties of the working class are before the challenge to face in a class consistent manner the traps set up by the internal and external imperialist contradictions of the EU; to conduct within the social movements an independent ideological, political and syndical intervention that in the course of the class struggle cannot be confined or totally identified with certain governmental options of parties in power, which demand a certain degree of flexibility in order to cope with the internal economic sufficiency problems and circumstances of hard imperialistic encirclement of their countries.

For instance, the EU concludes agreements with third countries, at a bilateral or multilateral basis (WTO) sacrificing a part of the agricultural production of member-states leading the poorest farmers to their violent destruction in order to guarantee better market conditions for the promotion of industrial products to those third countries, which mainly can export agricultural products.

EU seeks, through these agreements, to secure cheap raw materials for its industries, to exploit the cheaper –in comparison with its member-states- labour in agriculture, to obtain better conditions for exports in relation to its competitors eg the US.

If a state with a large agriculture output, from Africa or Latin America, considers as advantageous a bilateral economic cooperation with the EU, it is up to this state to make the agreement and secure a short-term economic benefit.

However, such agreements do not justify a communist, workers' party to beautify the EU construction and record it as a "counter-pole" to the US imperialism.

The clear-cut positioning towards the imperialistic character of the EU it is to the benefit of the long-term national and internationalist class interests and to the benefit of the tasks of the labour and communist movement. At the level of social and political movement the incorporation in the structures of the EU should be excluded. Its internal contradictions should be utilized and deepened in favour of the workers' and peoples' interests, as well as the destabilization of its mechanisms and the obstruction of its policies so that the class struggle and the anti-imperialist struggle of the people will lead to the weakening of the EU, to the detachment of countries from it, and finally its dissolution.

A comprehensive rejection of the European Constitutional Treaty together with the rejection of its previous fundamental treaties, the total rejection of the EU is a question of critical importance for the perspective of class struggle in Europe and beyond. The same goes for the rejection of the interstate imperialist agreements and unions promoted by the US.

The workers movement should say NO to the centres of imperialism regardless of their geographical seat.

The communist and workers movement cannot choose between "good" and "bad" imperialism, it cannot opt for the support of one or another transnational expression of the class enemy. The EU competes with the USA over markets control. Latin America, Africa, the relations with Russia and its allies (e.g. Belarus) and the relations with India and China are battlefields of competition.

The differences that occur between EU and US imperialism in international questions are clearly dictated by inter-imperialist contradictions and not by the different nature of both powers. In many cases indeed, if not in most cases, they did not hesitate to agree, when this guarantees the interests of both. Examples are the role of the EU in the disintegration of Yugoslavia, the war against the FR of Yugoslavia, the stance of European countries in the war against Iraq, the agreement of the French-German axis with the USA on questions of the Iraq occupation, the attitude of the 15 – under Greek presidency – towards Cuba, the classification of FARC, the People's Front for the Liberation of Palestine, and other people's liberation movements as terrorist organizations, the EU's participation in NATO's plans for the Middle East, the campaigns to "democratise" countries of the former USSR, the approval of the coup against Chavez etc.

Of course, the working class movement of each country, when organizing its struggle, takes into consideration the inter-imperialist conflicts. People's movements should utilize

these contradictions in order to weaken the class enemy and to strengthen the class struggle aiming to overthrow capitalist power and to conquer the power for the working class and its allies.

In the eyes of the peoples the legitimacy of the European Union wanes. Slowly, but steadily there is a tendency towards more and more acute social and political conflicts. The opportunist thesis, that the unified internal market and the EMU after it would be the expression of an objective step forward, an adaptation to globalization with progressive elements for all, was not proved to be true in praxis. In the same way as the older slogan of the development of the EEC of monopolies into a “EEC of the peoples” became depreciated, so the “one-way street of Maastricht”, the euro as the device to take the edge off unequal development, the “grey” acceptance of restructuring measures in working conditions and in the liberation of markets have been proved false.

The ideological adoration of the institutional procedures of the “European unification”, which would be allegedly a one-way street, because they are an expression of the “inevitable tendencies” of history, is laid bare. It has been revealed as a justification of the coalition of European capital. It reappears however, as the “anti-neoliberal leftist alternative strategy” for the people’s of Europe, as an opportunist thesis to overcome the ethnic state organization, to overcome the claiming of changes at a national level.

The ideological bankruptcy of socialdemocracy as the manager of imperialistic EU obliges the old and new opportunist forces under the title of a “renewed European Left” to try to reclassify themselves mainly through rallying in the “Party of the European Left” (EL).

This Party had to make some verbal adaptations and some seeming differentiations from socialdemocracy. For instance, at its 1st Congress it adopted the thesis of “global change” with the EU in the first role: “On the global political stage, Europe and the European Union, as it exists today, are (for us) the minimum political field as an expression of class struggle.”

In another wording the management policy of socialdemocracy is repeated, something which objectively spoken is disorientating, it keeps people away from class struggle at the national level and consequently takes the nerves out of the possibility to change the balance of power at the European level. At least it conserves the people’s hesitations and their already weak disposition for sacrifices, which would be imposed by class struggle. Furthermore it is responsible for the political impasse of the spontaneous element existing in the abrupt increase of reactions amongst the people.

In fact it leaves the exploitative nature of capitalism out of harm’s way, since it attributes all capitalism’s sufferings to “neoliberalism”.

The EL puts forward as the alternative strategy a sort of “anti-neoliberal” management of the EU. It distinguishes itself from the leadership of socialdemocracy criticizing the

latter that it did not put into practice an anti-neoliberal policy in the European version of globalisation.

It proclaims the unification policy as a means to promote the European capitalist market regulation policy without fighting, though, against the capitalist restructures, against “healthy” (capitalist) competition and against (uneven) capitalist development. It proclaims the possibility of a social policy in favour of working people without touching the economic power of capital nor its European strategy.

In the best case it is a utopian nostalgia of the capitalist “welfare state” of the past, a cerebral transfer of the latter to a European interstate (or federative) level. It is a utopian nostalgia of the system management applied by socialdemocratic and liberal bourgeois parties alternately in a completely different time, when capitalism, after the war, had to rehabilitate. That policy failed three decades ago. The restructurings of the so-called “neoliberal version of the EU” is a need of the system and not the result of a political balance at its limits.

The strategic (programmatic) impasse of the EL appears at the level of economic-social policy, not only in the “Athens Declaration”, but comparatively as well in the “Theses to the 1st Congress” or in the work project for a “European social model”.

As regards the huge social problem (right) to employment, the EL supports in its Declaration “the setting up of programmes to support employment, for new jobs and a reduction of working hours”. The programmes for “new jobs” are supported by the EU establishment as well and the “reduction of working hours”, without explicitly fighting against their arrangements, is in fact an anti-workers adaptation to the new levels of productivity. (Not even the proposal of a working group to “reduce the maximum working time per week” has been taken on board).

The “democratic control” of the European Central Bank is a complete rupture of the economy-policy relation, unless it refers to the relation of its administration with the countries in the EU bodies. As regards the claim “to end the Stability Pact”, this stays within the framework of liberal and socialdemocratic thinking on problems. It is part of political practice of German, French, Italian and other governments.

Equally ambiguous is the thesis in favour of a “strengthening of public services at a local, regional, national and European level”, because nowhere there is a reference that the strategy of monopoly reinforcement is put into question.

The thesis “against privatizations and neoliberal orders, which promote the commercialization of social goods, like water, energy, civilization, education and healthcare” is the utmost of refurbishing the obsolete socialdemocratic system management.

Their proposals referring to extreme poverty management and to keep a state sector in energy, in water-supply, in education, in the healthcare system, of course in coexistence

with a strong private sector, stays within today's policy of liberal and socialdemocratic parties.

Equally contradictory is the following standpoint in the EL theses to its 1st Congress: "It is the European social model that can overcome the dramatically increasing unemployment and uncertainty. The EL is not so much against the proclaimed goals of the Lisbon Strategy, but against the fact that these goals are subject to the policies of capitalist competition and the logic of liberation". In this thesis the reactionary, anti-workers and anti-popular content of the Lisbon objectives is hidden cultivating the illusion of the possibility that they can be realized in a popular way. The EL, the socialdemocrats and forces within the World Social Forum reveal more or less openly their opposition towards the working class movement, they reject the vanguard and revolutionary role of the latter. They refrain from any criticism to the employers' unions of compromise. They prefer the term "new social movements". They put forward the "outbursts of the crowd" opposed to the movement of the alliance of the working class with other social strata and in confrontation with the role of the revolutionary vanguard in the anti-imperialist, antimonopolistic movement, in the struggle for socialism.

Their proposals on "reorientation of the European unification", on a "new social agreement", a "new social contract" and a "new social policy", on a "redefinition of the EU goals", on a "shifting of the axis of European policies" have only one programmatic, strategic denominator: to hide the imperialistic character of the EU as an inter-state political mechanism of big capital, to impose "class cooperation" and subjugation to capital's interests.

The thesis in the Decision of the Conference (Rome, 25-10-2004) of the EL as regards the Draft Constitutional Treaty about "new fundamentals for a new Europe, removing Europe from the unbridled sovereignty of predatory and war-mongering capitalism and giving her the opportunity to reconcile with social progress, democracy, an ecologically sustainable society and cooperation between the peoples" is false and leads astray.

To face today's poverty, unemployment, loss of social rights, the rapid degradation of environment, the restriction-repression of democratic rights and imperialistic wars is exactly the opposite of what capitalism needs, of its strategic options at the state and European Union level.

The needs, the claims and interests of vital importance, the expectations of the working class and the semi-proletarian masses can neither be reconciled with the strategic goals of capitalist monopolies, nor of the EU, which represents their general interests. Therefore, there is no possibility of that system being managed in an alternative popular way.

Our opinion on the alternative

KKE considers as main task the confrontation with the forces of class collaboration, with the ideology and policy of incorporation and subjugation to international imperialist organizations in the name of the "objectivity" of the unification procedures. Furthermore

the struggle to free the workers movement from supporting a certain type of imperialist union against another in order to strengthen insubordination, disobedience and rupture with the EU, NATO and other imperialist organizations.

KKE is of the opinion that the stance towards the EU has decisive importance for the programme of a workers party, particularly of a communist party which proclaims socialism. The alignment with the one-way logic of the EU, cancels any declaration in favour of a radical policy at the national level, any declaration for demarcation from socialdemocracy and opportunism.

The “neoleftist” alternative to govern the EU in a “anti-neoliberal” leads at exactly the same impasses like the socialdemocratic governance at the national state level.

The vision of a Europe of the peoples can become reality by radical changes at the level of power in each state of Europe separately. The uneven economic development and consequently the uneven developments of the correlation of forces in each country in Europe (whether or not an EU member, whether or not part of the hard core), the uneven level of political stability of capital’s power varying from country to country, are factors of fundamental importance to set priorities as regards strategy and class struggle of each communist party in its own country.

Europe’s future is inseparably linked up to the future of the anti-imperialist movement and the organization of the anti-imperialist struggle in each member-state. The antiimperialist struggle is objectively more and more linked up to the struggle for the overthrow of capitalism, of which it is an organic part. In this process, can and must come together forces at the national and European level that may have differing opinions as to the way in which the confrontation and the rupture with the EU should take place, or that may disagree with the experience of the building of socialism, or with the way in which the transition to socialism should take place. If they are prepared to fight actively against the interests of monopolies and of imperialism, against the EU, NATO and foreign bases, then their struggle will undermine the fundamentals of capitalist domination and create prerequisites for the working class and its allies to claim the political power.

The more the anti-imperialistic, anticapitalist movement will gain strength, the more the political strength of the EU will get weaker and the possibilities for a shift at the level of state power will increase.

A factor of decisive importance for that perspective is the capacity of the people’s movement to change radically the correlation of forces within as many countries as possible, whether small or big. It is also the capacity of communist and workers’ parties to form a revolutionary strategy based on the marxist-leninist cosmotheory, which fights back and questions capitalism.

KKE’s position on disengagement from the EU

KKE considers that the disengagement from the EU should become goal of all European peoples and movements in order to rally forces in that direction. Concentrating forces for that goal will contribute to create a very strong opponent to capital, something that lacks nowadays both in the level of the people's movements and at the level of power as well.

Disengagement from the EU doesn't mean national isolation or breaking of international economic relationships. It means detachment and at the same time seeking economic relationships based on mutual benefit.

The tendency towards detachment from the EU will be developed simultaneously with the tendency towards cooperation of the countries that have left the EU, towards cooperation and ties too with other countries, that move in the same direction. Those tendencies are guaranteed by the fact that class struggle is internationalized.

KKE considers that this line of action weakens imperialism and strengthens the efforts for an independent development and an equal cooperation of those countries, where the working class will gain the power. The more the communist and labour movement will grow within the line of non-discipline and confrontation with the EU and its policies, the more in each member-state more favourable political conditions will be created for loosening the ties with the EU and finally disengagement from it. This will also lead to more favourable conditions for economic cooperation with countries fighting against the imperialist plans of the USA, like Cuba. Some developments in other continents, e.g. the American continent, confirm this. The fact that Venezuela was freed from USA's "embrace" contributed to the development of economic relations with Cuba and this in its turn was of mutual benefit to both peoples. Defending a socialist country, like Cuba, also depends on the stance of the international communist movement: whether it is a stance of acceptance or of struggle against any imperialist organization, like the EU, a stance of putting forward claims and pressure.

The more the tendency of leaving imperialistic organizations becomes a general trend, the more the need for bilateral, multilateral and regional cooperation on an anti-imperialist basis will be realized. Of direct and critical importance is the question what each movement does to accelerate those tendencies and to weaken imperialism with its organizations.

There is only one way to go as regards the tendency of European monopolies to grow with the help of common state policies, that is as regards the tendency of Europe's capitalist unification, at the cost of its peoples: to free people from capital's exploitation and consequently from having unequal rights and being dependent, which are features of the imperialistic system and its organizations. A complete safe-guard of sovereign rights, economic relations of mutual benefit, protection of the weakest country, its economy and people against exploitation: those are goals, which have no place in the alliances of capitalist states, in their imperialist organizations, whether they are built up in Europe or in another continent or in some region.

Creating worker's states, socialist states is a prerequisite for the future cooperation of the peoples of Europe in all fields – economic, cultural, political.

Today, the communist movement is more mature, it has learnt from its mistakes, and will have the capacity to work out the directions of cooperation of popular economies, of socialist economies in such a way, that the indispensable sufficiency of each country separately and on the other hand the advantageous exchange of raw material and products, technology, scientific and cultural achievements can be realized. Furthermore inter-state planning in such a way, that raw materials can be saved and more productivity of work can be realized to the extent in which it is influenced by production and climate circumstances.

The possibility for scientific knowledge, technological achievements and more generally cultural achievements of one people being transferred to another bridging capitalist backwardness, can become reality at the favour of the majority of the people (and not only of a numerically limited social group or class) only in circumstances of a socialist way of production, of a social organization based on social well-being and not on capitalist profit.

Coordination and common action of communist and workers' parties

In opposition to the EU's intervening in the political system of each country and of the reformist bloc set up by the EL, it is absolutely necessary to open a discussion on the coordination of class forces at the national, European and international level how to fight against the strategy of the EU and other imperialist organizations.

Projecting socialism as is the only alternative solution to today's imperialist system, the common action and cooperation of communist and workers' parties could stimulate the effort to build up a reinforced international anti-imperialist movement based on the working class movement, on movements representing other popular strata, peace movements, youth movements, women's movements and any other campaigns with a progressive radical direction.

The coordination and common action of communist and workers parties will be the lever for the peoples to influence positively international evolutions and to contribute to the strengthening of the anti-imperialist movement in such a way that:

Forces against monopolies and imperialism rally together at a national, regional and international level.

They can fight against capital's forces in a decisive way at all fronts: political, social, cultural as well as against the military interventions.

They can help the working class movement and its allies to formulate their claims of political struggle, claims which are determined by imperialism's historical position as the

highest stage of capitalism, meeting today's needs of working people and demonstrating the historical necessity of socialism.

The Political Bureau of the Central Committee of KKE
November 2005