

PETER KLISSAROV

PLATFORM FOR MEP ELECTIONS



How to transform
the European Union,
to be a true union
of sovereign nations

Contents

ADDRESS TO VOTERS.....	3
INTRODUCTION	5
I. HISTORY OF THE EU.....	6
II. ADVANTAGES AND SHORTCOMINGS OF THE EU ...	11
ADVANTAGES.....	11
SHORTCOMINGS.....	12
III. NEGATIVE DEVELOPMENT OVER THE LAST 5 YEARS	20
IV. TRANSITION OF REAL POWER IN THE EU FROM THE EUROPEAN COUNCIL (OF HEADS OF STATE AND GOVERNMENT) TO THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT	22
V. FIRST SCENARIO: DISINTEGRATION OF THE EU	28
SECOND SCENARIO: THE EUROPE OF CORES	31
THIRD SCENARIO: THE EUROPE OF FATHERLANDS	33
FOURTH SCENARIO: UNITED EUROPEAN STATES (UES)	35
IV. BULGARIA IN THE EU	38
SUMMARYWHAT AM I GOING TO DO IN THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT.....	39

ADDRESS TO VOTERS

In Bulgaria, there has never been a MEP elected off a party ticket. Bulgarians are not particularly interested in MEP elections for two main reasons:

1. They know the European Parliament is the job destination for people who lack the vocation to contribute to the EU development, defend the Bulgarian interests; instead, they are obedient, poised to fulfil the will of their mentors. Not to mention the absence of leaders and visionaries full of energy and insight how to transform the European Union and the world.
2. People (not only in Bulgaria) consider the European Parliament as a place too distant, having no care for them and unbound to their will. This alienation severely harms the legitimacy of EU institutions.

In Bulgaria, the MEP elections are seen as a warm-up for the parliamentary elections. It needs to change because regardless of how we feel about bureaucracy in the Union, it has a significant impact on all of us. Moreover, the decisions of European officials increasingly affect key areas of our lives, while, we, the citizens, are unable, to speak up or stop them.

Standing on the rostrum of the European Parliament, I have much to say, much to offer and to defend before MEPs so that both the EU and Bulgaria enjoy better and more successful governance.

I will make sure to highlight the outrageous crimes and betrayal of politicians to Bulgarian interests, as

well as their tolerance by the EU. It will happen even against the will of the media, which usually do their best to cover up such affairs, since it is in their own interest or in line with their owners' policy.

I have proven over the years that I am nobody's errand boy and I do not work for any behind-the-curtain interests. I have established my name for almost two decades in the capacity as a representative of Atomic Energy of Canada while it was a competitor for Belene NPP project. I was also head of the Bulgarian division of the world's largest consultancy AE-COM, engaged by the Bulgarian government to prepare the documentation required for the country's EU accession.

Since many Bulgarians doubt having fair MEP elections, one third refrains from casting the ballot simply because there is no party to vote for, about 2.4 million (according to official data by the Foreign Ministry over the past years) have emigrated across the world and face limited opportunities to vote, while "dead souls" on election lists are nearly 1 million, all hope seems lost! But even the darkest cloud has a silver lining.

It is time to turn the tide on our behalf.

People are disillusioned, but not me! I believe and I can change things because faith and hope have never left me.

Truth comes first. It has been persecuted in our country and it is high time to give it a chance to come forward.

Thank you for your trust!

INTRODUCTION

Europeans can proudly look back on half a century of peaceful integration. But this success fails to guarantee future viability in a rapidly changing world. A Europe of Expert Circles, constructed by the Founding Fathers, is a thing of the past – citizens raise their voices and want to actively participate in governance, i.e. to determine their own destiny.

The European Union must dynamically develop its unity in diversity, while facing the worst economic crisis in recent times, in particular. Whether it is energy issues or the euro, climate protection or all-new conflicts – Europe’s international self-assertion stems from its internal strength and unity. The European Union’s social structure design and especially its future development is of fundamental importance, because it is the only way to ensure continuous functioning and enhancement of the economic and monetary union. Only a Europe of solidarity can compete with both old and new powers and defend its core values and interests. Whether the EU is today the model for peaceful and free communication between national states and citizens – it is a question that demands an urgent answer.

I. HISTORY OF THE EU

Let me start with some notes on the EU history, not to recall well-known facts, but to point out that a **number of less known or distorted facts**. Because unless we know the exact facts, there is no way we can do a thorough analysis, and unless we have a fair analysis, we cannot formulate the patterns of development and evaluate the trends.

In Europe (and not only there), people are convinced that France and Germany are the drives of the EU. It is widely accepted they are at the core of the current European structure and will strongly depend on EU future development.

But is this so?

In 1940, France reached the bottom. It was occupied by Germany, and its entire elite was seduced by the winners. Charles de Gaulle was the only man one who dared taking responsibility for France. On 18 June 1940, in a radio broadcast on BBC, he called for the Resistance, but only a few months later in a private conversation he said there were only a few Jews, a few poets, and fishermen from Île de Sein, where he was residing at the time. All of France's elites established ties with the government of Gen. Pétain, known as a collaborationist, i.e. led a policy of cooperation with the German invaders. At the same time, all of Europe recognized this government as legitimate (i.e. the occupation of France), except for Winston Churchill. It means that at the end of 1940 –

early 1941, the only country that was in a state of war with Nazi Germany was England.

During the three key conferences, the fate of the post-war world (Tehran – 1943, Yalta – 1944, and Potsdam – 1945), to which US Presidents Franklin Roosevelt (at the first two) and Harry Truman (at the third) together with Joseph Stalin draw up the future configuration of Europe, but France was the great absent. It was also absent from the Washington Conversations on the International Peace and Security Organization from 21 August to 7 October 1944, which discussed the world's post-war organization and the establishment of an international peace and security organization (the future UN).

In fact, Churchill played a supporting role. The big players are the USSR and the US which split Europe. Both shared the same ambition: to establish their dominance over Europe – political and military domination. The political and economic domination in the West is called the Common Market (transformed into the EU), and that in the East – the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance, which collapsed in 1991. Military domination is also known as NATO in the West and the Warsaw Treaty in the East.

So, distinguishing the EU structure from the United States is quite artificial and unrealistic, because ultimately the US dominance over Europe is something like a medal for vassal contributions, in two aspects: the civilian – called the EU; the military – called NATO. If we consider the history this

way, it is immediately clear why the United States support so much Turkey's bid to join the EU, unlike other European countries. It would ensure NATO's military perimeter to coincide with the EU's civilian perimeter. Similarly, some EU countries that are not yet NATO members such as Austria, Finland, Ireland, and Sweden are also under being pressure to join the Alliance. Just recently, Sweden and Finland joined NATO, substantiating their decision with the war on Ukraine.

If you go back to a number of statements by French Gaullists and Communists from the 1950s and 1960s, you see that the European structure is called German-American. No surprise, because it simply reproduces in a slightly different version the European structure from Belle Époque, i.e. of the period between the two world wars. Because, after a series of in-depth publications lately, it is no secret that Hitler did not come to power out of the blue, but received a firm support from U.S. industrial and financial elites. Let us recall the role of such iconic figures such as Henry Ford (a staunch supporter of Nazism who received the highest Nazi order ever given to a foreigner) and Prescott Bush, father and grandfather of two US presidents with the Bush family, who is the main actor in the financial transactions for the Hitler regime.

After the War, close ties between Germany and the United States continued with even more intensity. At Nuremberg, only a few of the most crime-tainted Nazi leaders were convicted, seen as useless in

the new situation. Thousands and thousands of high-ranking Third Reich administrative, military, scientific and financial figures – after a brief “wash-out” stay in specialized facilities (Sunflower and Paperclip operations), were exported to the United States to contribute to this country’s development. Just to mention Wernher von Braun, designer of V-1 and V-2 rockets used for attacks on the big British cities at the end of WWII, chief designer of the first U.S. space rockets. It includes the ‘pearl’ Saturn-5, which took the U.S. expeditions to the Moon in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Let us mention another famous name – Walter Hallstein. He was tasked with the German-Italian strategic partnership after the 1938 meeting between Hitler and Mussolini, called the “New Europe”. Arrested after the War, and “washed out” by the relevant services, he was appointed German Foreign Minister in Konrad Adenauer’s government. He is among the authors of the Treaty of Rome (25 March 1957), which created the European Economic Community, the forerunner of the EU. He was also the first President of the European Commission.

So, from the U.S. point of view, Germany is the unquestionable *prima inter pares* (first among equals) on the European continent.

From Germany’s point of view, it is the United States, not France, the most important partner in the world. It is absolute truth, yet unrealised by the Europeans, that the EU is a pyramidal, undemocratic structure with Germany at the top. For 70 years, it

was a country under occupation, with 179 U.S. military bases, more than 40,000 U.S. military staff, and a significant number of U.S.-controlled nuclear warheads on its territory.

II. ADVANTAGES AND SHORTCOMINGS OF THE EU

ADVANTAGES

Security – The EU has brought to Europeans unprecedented security and prosperity, especially in its first decades of existence. Member States have learned to resolve their controversy by way of talks and to avoid even the slightest conflict.

Common values – freedom, democracy, equality, rule of law and respect for human rights, free market, peace, and prosperity, deepening of solidarity among nations.

Stability and predictability – unlike the years before the EU foundation, no world crises had started from Europe for more than 6 decades, but its existence has brought prudence, aid to distressed countries and a striving for world order.

Free movement of people, goods, money, and ideas.

Individual freedoms and high social security – in fact, after the Second World War, the “right spectrum” surrendered and, together with the “left spectrum” formulated the hybrid “welfare state under the liberal democracy setting”. The right-wing has embraced the social function of the state and adheres to it steadfastly, because otherwise a society that is already accustomed to these benefits would instantly object it.

SHORTCOMINGS

Structure of the European Union

The current structure of the European Union is transitional, i.e. ineffective, both economically and socially, and ethnically.

According to admissions of senior EU officials themselves, the EU is a clumsy and highly bureaucratic structure, struggling and overspending with decision making, which are often incomplete and lacking vision.

The loss of time is particularly painful considering the speed, planning and determination with which its main rival China implements its projects. In this way, the EU loses the strategic economic competition to China.

Communities of leaders and experts

The EU, since its inception, is built from top to bottom, from the elites to the citizens. Therefore, its entire scheme is designed to primarily serve the elites, to provide them with the necessary comfort and, above all, to enable the elites to select and lead the European officials. The overall construction is built so that the executive bodies are not electable, but selected according to unknown principles by unknown circles, and then – approved by the representative structures. The election most important body – the European Commission – is preceded by powerful lobbying and backroom arrangements between the elites, having nothing to do with the will

of the nations. That is why these elites also work in the interest of their employer, and not, as it should be, for the voter's benefit.

Over the last few years, this dependence has been increasingly exposed, and it has lost the confidence of EU citizens to government officials and institutions.

Subordination to the United States

This issue was covered above in Chapter I (History of the EU), with a roundup of the history and developments leading to this situation.

If Europe wants to have a bright future and be a super-political and economic player, peering China and the United States, it should shake off its political and military dependence on the United States.

However, it goes through a review of the status-quo established after the Second World War and especially the status of defeated states, especially Germany.

Emancipation requires the adoption of new principles on which the foreign policy of the European Union will be formulated, and above all the termination of NATO and the **creation of its own European army**. No state or alliance of states without a powerful army can be a superpower and a decisive voice in any field.

Emancipation also requires a long-term strategy for the establishment of powerful banking institutions as it is through finances and borrowed capital that the most powerful pressure and dependence on the United States is realised.

However, I want to strongly point out: everything said here does not mean anti-Americanism propaganda! On the contrary. I am convinced that the United States will continue to be the main and most important partner to the EU. But in another environment – on equal footing.

Military weakness

Although they have strong military spending, today Europeans are unable neither to protect their territory from the strong of the day nor to conduct a self-sustaining peacekeeping action in a crisis region. Their weapons are obsolete and ineffective, not to mention that many of them are, by their own statements, are brought into physical disability. The military industry of Europe does not correspond to the highest standards of the three leaders (USA, Russia, China), and is unable to provide all the necessary nomenclature of weapons. In this respect, its dependence on the US is quite obvious.

In terms of foreign, security and defence policy, the EU remains a reactive player whose actions are mostly limited to the Old Continent. Europe's navel-gazing and the lack of any global political vision shape EU's international image.

Lack of homogeneity, starkly wealthy core, and impoverished periphery

Currently, the poorest countries in the EU lag behind the wealthiest nations about 10 times by income, and about 5–6 times in real terms.

This situation has a detrimental effect on poor countries as it drains the most capable, educated, and motivated population, almost all qualified professionals in all walks of life (teachers and university lecturers, doctors and nurses, engineers, artists, entrepreneurs, and businessmen). It gives ground to considerable discontent both among the poor and the incumbent elites who feel the pressure from their constituents. Such disproportions feed the nationalistic wave and anti-European sentiments across countries. The EU can not be satisfied only with the pre-accession and accession programs but needs a strategy to close the gap – with secure funding, a legislative basis, and the adoption of pan-European income standards.

The problem lies with the high costs, which none of the wealthy states is willing to pay. Therefore, the common European construction is inevitably undermined.

Constitution of red-tape and chaos

The European Constitution is a stamped organizational scheme of chaos in competences and responsibilities, and fails to meet the expectations voiced in the great European debate at the beginning of the 21st century.

The EU scheme leads to a lethargic policy in all respects – across the domains of economy, social affairs, security, infrastructure, and finances.

It is the apparent inability of the European elite to draw a parallel with individual country interests,

to demonstrate principle-based decision-making, to build a methodology for rapidly achieving effective compromises – we have seen it in the Greek crisis, the migrant influx, and the attitude to conflict zones such as Libya, Iraq, Syria. Unity was quickly achieved only on Brexit, because everyone felt threatened and the prevailing fear of rapid collapse of the overall construction.

Manifestations of unscrupulousness

Despite claims of sustainable adherence to principles and clear messages, the European Union has repeatedly in recent years shown its citizens and the world utterly unprincipled decisions:

1. Two of the largest and most important member states (France and Italy) were initiators of the **war against Libya**, culminating in many human casualties and a complete disaster;
2. Since the early 1990s, the EU has been preparing the **break-up of Yugoslavia**, which Western Europe created after the end of the First World War. This completely illegal and contrary to the principles of international law move ended with the breakup of Yugoslavia, with tens of thousands of victims, with the illegal annexation of the historic region of **Kosovo** and the imposition of a government of outspoken criminals, traffickers of drugs and human organs, and the apotheosis of the **U.S. bombing over Serbia**, backed by the EU;
3. The EU did nothing to stop the **war in Iraq**,

- resulting in more than 1 million casualties;
4. The EU illegally interfered **in Syria**, fuelling the civil war in the country, and often supporting terrorists;
 5. The EU was actively involved in the preparation and implementation of the **coup d'état in Ukraine**, which resulted in a pro-fascist junta coming to power, the Crimea was annexed by Russia, a civil war broke out in Donbass that claimed more than 15,000 lives, GDP over the past 5 years has almost halved. Now Ukraine is the poorest of all countries in Europe, and its population of 46 million in early 2014 is now estimated to be less than 30 million. The EU was also a key factor in forcing Russia to resort to military means in its conflict with Ukraine. It was the EU that stopped the looming agreement in May-June 2022, so-called Istanbul Accords, and encouraged Ukraine to fight to the last soldier. The USA is apparently withdrawing from the conflict, while transferring the burden onto the EU to engage with the military, financial and logistical support for Ukraine. It showcases all the bankruptcy, hypocrisy, incompetence and inhumanity of the EU governance and institutions. It inevitably drives both Ukraine and the Union to the road to complete collapse.
 6. The EU pursued an extremely unprincipled policy regarding the **migration waves** to Eu-

rope. With its policy in the Middle East and North Africa, it has largely provoked the flow of migrants to its territory, did not take the necessary measures to stop it, did not support the border states that suffered the most (Greece and Italy), allowed the decisions on this issue to be dictated by the German Chancellor and not by the authorities authorised by the European Constitution. Instead of working hard to tackle this vital issue, discussions of so-called Migration Pact dragged for years, which is simply legalization of the incessant migrant traffic across the globe and towards Europe in particular. On 10 April 2024, about two months ahead of the EP elections, the European Parliament finally voted on this legislation bundle aimed to regulate the influx of immigrants and effectively strip the countries off their sovereignty. In addition, a “blood” levy was introduced, stating that each country will pay EUR 20,000 per unaccepted migrant. No surprise that nearly 2.9 million first residence permits were issued in the EU in 2021, compared to 3.4 million in 2022 – statistics perfectly matching with the migrant wave in 2015. It means the European gene pool has been intensively replaced!

7. The EU pursued an unprincipled policy towards Turkey, which was an associated member since 1963, and since 1999 it has been recognized as a candidate for EU membership;

8. The EU lacked principles in holding the T-TIP talks when it allowed the invasion of GMOs into the EU, but fortunately it was all over when Trump came to power.

III. NEGATIVE DEVELOPMENT OVER THE LAST 5 YEARS

1. The insidious **dependence of the EU on the State Capture** is drastically on the rise, i.e. the EU governance system has been losing democratic ground and approaching crypto-oligarchy with elements of democracy. It creates powerful channels for insidious influence, remaining hidden from public eyes, beyond the civic control and inflicting the European nations with severe social distortions.
2. Europe is in danger of moving from a welfare society to an **energy-poor society**, opening the way to rapid decline in production, poverty, misery, severe restrictions, and political dictatorship that always accompany poverty-stricken societies. The “Green Deal”, as is, leads us all in that direction.
3. The **media** development follows an extremely negative path too. Severe media censorship is emerging. We have penetrated the post-truth era, i.e. era of false news, lies, extreme irresponsibility, crippled understanding of global processes, dependence on centres of power and money. It is imperative to undertake media overhaul and novel legislation to regulate media’s responsibility to the truth and fair and untwisted news and analysis.
4. The increasingly visible heavy dependence of

the EU on the USA, which crossed swords with China for global hegemony, will not hesitate to sacrifice the EU by robbing it, extracting its sophisticated productions, and bringing the EU economy to its knees. It is an ongoing and deepening process.

5. EU's **gene pool replacement** is speeding up. The achievements of European nations, due to century- and millennium-long ethnic and migration processes of formation, are rapidly being erased. Hence, the societies are heading towards a complete ethnic and racial catastrophe.

IV. TRANSITION OF REAL POWER IN THE EU FROM THE EUROPEAN COUNCIL (OF HEADS OF STATE AND GOVERNMENT) TO THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

Members of the European Parliament (EP) elect the President of the European Commission, draft and pass new laws affecting various aspects of life within the EU, from healthcare to employment. The EP has strengthened its role in policy guidance towards unification, taking an unwavering stance on all issues of the domestic and foreign political agenda. In this way, it is degrading the role of the European Council, which comprises EU's heads of state and government. This is actually a process of limiting the influence of national states and increasing the power of EU bureaucracy. Here is the paradox: the "nation's representatives in the European Parliament" mainstream the Deep State's influence, while the member states' heads of state protect the interests of nations. It was primarily achieved via all-way long-term propaganda, while subduing the entire political space and promoting severely corrupt, comprador-minded and ready-for-anything careerists in key positions, and above all through total subordination of media power to the needs of liberal-fundamentalist "Deep State".

Therefore, the further trajectory of EU's development will largely depend on who will or will not

join the new legislature. Brussels fears that the outcome of EP elections, given the current political and socio-economic situation, will bring unpleasant surprises and the existential question: who will have the upper hand – the liberals or the right-wing conservatives, and it may not be in favour of the past majority.

What will happen in the EP elections aftermath?

If we are to believe the predictions included in a special report by the highly influential European Foreign Policy Council think tank, the European Parliament elections in June 2024 will bring a right swing in many countries, as populist radical parties (i.e. conservative national parties) will gain votes and seats across the EU, while centre-left and green political forces will lose ground. More specifically, when liberal-fundamentalists call someone a “populist”, he or she is usually a normal, non-indoctrinated politician who does not fight tooth and nail for the “European values” known only to a small group.

According to the same report, another result is a significant policy shift in several key areas:

1. Declining support for Ukraine.
2. A tougher stance on EU sovereignty and migration.
3. Review of ambitious EU action on climate change.
4. Sensitive transformation of the Green Deal with effects on EU energy security.

Despite the think tank's scary outlook, the centre-right European People's Party (EPP) is expected to remain the largest faction in EP and therefore retain most agenda-setting powers, including the vote on the next European Commission President. Yet the I&D (Identity and Democracy) parties, including Marie Le Pen's National Front (France), Geert Wilders' Party of Freedom (The Netherlands), Umberto Bossi's Northern League (Italy), Party of Freedom, of Norbert Hofer and until recently – of Jörg Heider (Austria), etc., will leave a trace and will become Europe's third largest political force, right after EPP and PES.

What drives these processes?

From the position of EU's political elites, concerns about the EP elections outcome are completely justified and objective. First, the EU and its member states have experienced waves of crises – global, economic, migration, sanitary (pandemic). They are significantly aggravated by severed trade and economic ties with Russia and the confrontation (political, economic and military) with China. All of these reinforce anti-government sentiments and fuel the protest potential.

Second: The EU has been suffering economic regression for more than a decade, losing ground to USA, China and other rising economic giants, such as the Southeast Asia countries.

Third: most of conventional political parties, which the EU political elites rely upon, are in decline.

Years on end, as evident from the example of Germany, they lose ground. On the other hand, smaller parties across Europe, often called extremists, reap increasing support. Just a note on the common “populist” remarks: when liberal-fundamentalists talk about “extremist parties”, these are usually parties that prevent them from enforcing their globalist agenda. So, in their language it should sound like a compliment.

Fourth: as a result of mainstream political parties declining across Europe, the entire EU political space is quite fragmented, and the preferences of voters rapidly swing. Relying on a stable majority is increasingly difficult, as evident from the French party system evolution.

What is the reaction of political elites?

Facing the grim trends, the EU political elites are convinced they must resort to all means available to weaken the systemic and non-systemic opponents mentioned above and to preserve the colossal influence that the European Parliament has on several extremely important processes:

1. formation of the EU political course,
2. its application not only at EU, but also at national level,
3. the legislation process.

To this end, it should continuously strengthen – almost with the communist fervour we know from the past – the consensus working for the globalist

agenda. This agenda includes the climate change, the Green Deal, the Russophobia, the anti-China discourse, security and defense (especially against the backdrop of numerous global conflicts: from the Middle East to the war in Ukraine), the creeping abrogation of national sovereignty and the imposition of an unknown power that no one voted for. And this power is beyond any control.

Other key tasks facing today's elites to meet those goals:

1. To discredit and smear so-called far-right and other political opponents, while appropriating their nationalist slogans, as it is clear that citizens will no longer tolerate the immigration tide;
2. To involve citizens in the European agenda debate and to integrate it, as much as possible, into each country's national agenda to enable people to make the "right choice";
3. To undertake on the eve of EP elections a number of economic measures to normalise the economic situation, to keep the lid over the inflation, to reduce the energy and food prices to acceptable levels, to ensure satisfactory economic growth and to adopt state-of-the-art legislation, which is publicly promoted by modern advertising. Subsequently, the situation may significantly worsen, but the elections will already have passed.

However, all these are palliative measures that will not change the negative trends in the EU. Their reversal can only happen if the EU returns to the idea of the Union of independent and sovereign states, as was the European Economic Community, or “Common Market”. It is necessary to remove the huge, cumbersome, and harmful European political system with its bureaucracy and behind-the-scenes political decisions. National states must also be strengthened, as well as their cooperation and interaction mechanisms. Only in this way will Europe return to its rightful place. When decisions are openly made by the people, not by the opaque “State Capture”.

V. FIRST SCENARIO: DISINTEGRATION OF THE EU

More recently, there has been a talk about the future of the EU and the future breakup of the EU. There are plenty of reasons – clashes between some countries over the immigration crisis, struggling to gain advantage during the COVID pandemic, and cross-border disputes between neighbouring countries, and sanctions against some “non-obedient” states, such as Poland and Hungary, and the war in Ukraine.

Of course, the EU will not fall apart from action within EU structures. It can only be disintegrated by the conscious will of the nations in the individual countries to defend their national identity and sovereignty. And it does happen within countries. There are too many significant obstacles to such a radical policy:

- First, the position of the EU’s two big founding countries Germany and France is important. As long as they hold the EU, the decline will be very difficult.
- Second, there are a number of smaller countries in the EU which, coming from under the EU’s periphery, will feel weak, neglected and exposed to all the dangers of a hostile and ruthless world. Bulgaria belongs to these countries.
- Third, there are several large countries, such

as Italy and Spain, which are so intra-focused on economic problems that they would quickly fail outside the EU. That is why they are also acting for European unity.

- Fourth, people in the EU Member states are still under the influence of the Western Europe magic of the second half of the twentieth century – the most attractive, cultural, free, beautiful, diverse, and enjoyable place in the world. Despite its rapid decline, Western Europe, the core of the EU, continues to attract people as a magnet, especially for Central and Eastern Europe, former socialist countries.
- Fifth, many still believe that the EU, as a unity, is competitive enough to economic giants such as China and the United States, and with its collapse it will free up a large economic space that will quickly be absorbed by the giants. – Etc.

Along with the above-mentioned centripetal forces, however, the centrifugal forces are also on the rise, such as:

- A widening, instead of narrowing, gap in the development of the central and peripheral regions.
- Ideological controversy between the centre of liberal politics and conservative societies, mainly in the Catholic parts of Europe.
- Ubiquitous red-tape, hindering economic development due to its clumsiness, slow and inefficient procedures, inability to formulate

and implement large-scale pan-European projects.

- Weaker economic competitiveness among the three Great Economic Powers – China, USA, the EU, leading to relative, and in the future, absolute impoverishment of European nations.
- The centre’s inability to solve large-scale migration problems, forcing states to forget about European unity and to seek to solve the problem individually.
- Increasing distrust in the EU construction and doubts about the democratic and responsible nature of its institutions.
- On-going decline of the globalization and return to the model of sovereign nations.

In conclusion, there will not be a blasting break-up. Moreover, global development shows that some form of inter-state interaction will survive. It is mostly about opportunities for easy movement of people, capital, and goods, i.e. for multilateral customs and visa agreements. Obviously, there is a downward trend in visa restrictions – an increasing number of countries, even on different continents, enter into visa-free agreements. The same for capital and trade.

SECOND SCENARIO: THE EUROPE OF CORES

There is another scenario that brings us back to the thesis of the EU's collapse. We have seen centripetal and centrifugal forces. Now imagine a scenario that could lead to the break-up of the EU in the longer term.

It is largely the concept of a “multi-speed Europe”. Lacking consensus among the Member States on the future development of the European Union and the feeling that poorer countries are the burden on the rich pushed a group of Member States to work outside the contractual framework. They pooled efforts within the European Union to gain advantages in economic and political decision-making.

There are processes resembling the cell division in biology. Within the enlarged cell (EU), one or more nuclei grow to become individual structures. Then the big cell breaks up and releases new cells. Are there any formation processes of such nuclei in the large cell? Yes. For example:

- Nucleus 1: The Visegrád Quadruple, uniting some Catholic Central and Eastern European countries. We start with it because this structure has already been implemented.
- Nucleus 2: The periodically emerging and violently debated idea of a “multi-speed Europe”. It highlights the core of “high speeds” – the countries occupying the former Carolingian Empire territory of Charlemagne and united

much of Western Europe under the common power of Christianity: today's France, Germany, Northern Italy, Switzerland, Belgium, and the Netherlands. Generally, those are the EU founding countries, to which we can add the neutral Switzerland and Austria.

- Nucleus 3: Nordic countries (Denmark, Norway, Sweden) with centuries-old experience of coexistence: the three states entered the Calmar Union in 1397, with Sweden leaving in 1523, but the other two continued to coexist in the alliance for 434 years – until 1814.

Those alliances are expected to be quite loose, with the main purpose of facilitating solutions to emerging problems and developing joint policies on certain issues, as is done today in the Visegrád Group, but without strong impact on national sovereignty.

However, there are two categories of countries – those on the Iberian Peninsula and, to a certain extent, Italy (PIGS) on the one hand, and the countries of the Balkan Peninsula – on the other hand, while Greece is in a middle position because, like others, it belongs to the Mediterranean area of Southern Europe.

It can be assumed that the “Carolingian” countries, albeit reluctantly, will be joined by Spain, Portugal, and all of Italy, and the Visegrád Group will increase to six, with countries such as Croatia and Slovenia.

Finally, the Balkan Peninsula countries, descendants of the Ottoman Empire, are unable to make any

unification. Even between the two world wars in the first half of the twentieth century, when it was obvious that unions under 40–50 million people could not resist the Great Powers in the upcoming devastating war, the Balkan countries have never achieved any progress in this regard. Although there have been efforts by some circles and some rulers of that era to unify Greece, Bulgaria, Serbia, Romania into an Orthodox union and the common historical destiny.

Today, this is quite unfeasible because religion is no longer a factor, the economic problems of all countries in the region – enormous, ethnic contradictions – are unsolvable, and the mentality of ruling elites – contraindicative to any forms of unification.

THIRD SCENARIO: THE EUROPE OF FATHERLANDS

The Europe of Fatherlands would be a radically changed formula of the current EU: it refers to an economic community united around a free market and a unified customs area that remains diverse in other state policies. In a Europe of the Fatherlands, there should be free movement of people, goods, capital, and ideas, but without centralized power and common currency. The independence and sovereignty of the Member States should be restored to their former values. It is precisely this, the most attractive in this model, because European nations

have a long history, accumulated over the centuries by severe contradictions, distinguished by considerable differences in mentality, economic and social prosperity, traditions, communicative habits, discipline, working habits, etc. A Europe of the Fatherlands would preserve the diversity and colourful palette of European nations, which is a tremendous value. It would also preserve the identity of Europeans, which is increasingly fading and blurring.

In this model, we can expect to preserve some forms of unification from the construction of today's EU, such as the Common Market of the 60-70s of the last century. But with the removal of pan-European structures such as the Parliament, the EU, and all other red-tape, as well as the revocation of much of the European legislation restricting national decision-making.

A Europe of Fatherlands is not a denial of a common Europe of citizens but a return, to some extent, to the original idea of the Founding Fathers, headed by De Gaulle and Adenauer, seeking to build a European community independent of the Anglo-Saxon world. It is a Europe of diversity, natural appeal, interaction, and common interest. Today, however, the Europe of Fatherlands has become a great deal of resistance to the "values" that have been shelved over the last 20 years, and whose goal is the education (like the communist "new person") of a new European deprived of nation, religion, and gender. Instead of the natural love for one's homeland, the family and the faith being built with pan-European patriot-

ism and respect for the community of all European nations with their peculiarities and contradictory history, we all embrace an abstract European affiliation, unsupported by any emotional and spiritual value. The national identity was not to be crushed and rejected as a rigid and old-fashioned one, but to cultivate a consistent and intelligent European identity based on the common in history, culture, religion, and worldview, making Europeans different from the rest of the world.

From this previous “educational” activity, resembling the activity of agitators from the time of socialism, the real break-up in today’s European Union begins.

FOURTH SCENARIO: UNITED EUROPEAN STATES (UES)

The UES formula would allow for much greater homogeneity, unity of power and comprehensive leadership of the European Union with its own domestic and foreign policy, with a unified health and education system with a common budget based on by a common tax system, with common management of public debt, with common external borders, with a rapid deletion of income disparities across the European Union. This, however, would be at the expense of richer countries and in favour of the poorer states – a kind of new macro-levelling. But such a

process – obligatory for a lasting and homogenous alliance – would inevitably face great resistance from wealthy countries. In this situation, a variant with a very rich core and impoverished periphery, as is the current one, is possible. And that would not have helped and reduced the tensions within it.

Of course, the biggest trump of the UES is the common army. Because it is clear that without a powerful army, every entity – whether national or supranational – is a very weak player in the international arena.

This type of alliance would also wipe out national diversity, eradicate national self-confidence and identity of nations. In fact, this important shortcoming is the main obstacle to the implementation of such a model, following attempts to adopt a pan-European constitution after the signing of the Lisbon Treaty.

In the process of developing integration, Member States will be forced to provide the European Union with comprehensive competences. All central policy areas (internal, external, defence, social and economic policies) should be united throughout the European Union and be a major prerogative of the centre. More and more powers that have so far been within national states are being transferred to the European Union. The European Union gains more problem-solving capacity than it has in the reformed nation states that have become provinces.

The new European Parliament should be expected to be a bicameral with House of Representatives

and House of States (consisting of representatives of the Member States) and to reclaim from the Member States almost all legislative rights.

The **Europe of Fatherlands** could be an open system capable of accepting new members even in the process of becoming a state. It is possible for countries outside the European continent to wish to become members. At the same time, there could be different levels of association with the countries on the periphery of the European Union.

Certainly, the possible **Europe of Fatherlands** would be a much more aggressive international player and would claim a seat in the UN Security Council.

IV. BULGARIA IN THE EU

The peculiarities of Bulgaria's development over the past 2–3 decades refer to its EU membership, whether it wants it or not. Its fundamental weaknesses in demographics, economics, defense, and the fall of the national spirit make it an easy prey outside the EU fortress. That is why its policy cannot but support the existence and unity of the EU. In this regard, the pro-European trends in it are quite normal.

Whether the EU's decadence will come to its logical end, or European nations will find *modus vivendi* in a reformed alliance with minimal bureaucracy, our society should be aware that the poor scenario is very possible and ready to meet it. Because in the event of disintegration, our country will most likely fall under Turkish influence and not under Russian as some prophets imply. We should not forget for a moment that Bulgaria is part of the post-Ottoman space, which Turkey has never renounced.

What Bulgarian society should do in order not to be swept away by a possible geopolitical storm is a matter of another discussion. In a word, we will only say that the only protection against such severe disturbances is the strong state. Our choice should be for a strong state in a renewed European Union of Fatherlands.

SUMMARY

WHAT AM I GOING TO DO IN THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

Should I be elected MEP, I will act in the following areas:

AS STRATEGY:

Building a ‘Europe of Fatherlands’ – a common economic space with harmonized rules and laws, free movement of goods, capital and people, shared values (but not necessarily equal and binding for all), lack of bureaucracy and centralized structures, common safety, policy flexibility in all sectors.

AS TACTICS:

1. Maintaining the unity of the EU, but not through spells and force on smaller and peripheral countries, but by introducing real democratic procedures, taking into account the interests of everyone and listening to the voice of each Member State.
2. Enhancing the sovereignty and national autonomy of EU actors.
3. Strongly limiting European bureaucracy and its impact on national governments.

4. Adopting measures for an accelerated development of the economy within the EU. The total GDP of the community should grow by no less than 3% per year to maintain at least some competition with China.
5. Launching large-scale joint projects in the energy sector in the most promising areas of nuclear and fusion energy (ITER), because only in 10–15 years the two main sources of energy will be nuclear power and renewable sources.
6. Developing strategies and common policies on the most important potential threats to humanity – local wars; Great Powers of the United States, China, and Russia; problems with basic preconditions for survival of whole regions – fresh water, food, energy; threats of going out of control of techno-genic processes – GMOs, bacteria and viruses, pollution, artificial intelligence, products of transhumanism, mass unemployment.
7. Significantly reducing the gap in economic and social development between the centre and the periphery.
8. Reforming EU governance structures to ensure their rapid and efficient functioning.

I do not intend to join any political group because, at least in their present form, none of them corresponds to my political views on the establishment of Direct Digital Democracy (DDD).

I intend to be a member of the Committees on Industry, Research and Energy and Constitutional Af-

fairs, and to participate in the work of the Budget and Budgetary Control Committees. Moreover, I would like to be the founder and co-founder of a new group called “**Direct Democracy Group**” in the European Parliament.

I intend to actively promote a fundamental change in the structure and philosophy of the EU, for which I will propose a complex draft for a new Constitution in the first year.

I intend to propose and strongly advocate the following changes to EU structure and policy:

1. Abolition of the European Commission and constitution of executive power as a committee consisting of special ministers for European affairs named by each country with minimal administration to them.
2. Adoption of automatic Schengen for all member states, with free movement of money, goods, and people. Each country should decide for itself whether to accept the euro or not.
3. Non-acceptance of new members if they have not reached at least an average economic and organizational level compared to the rest of the European countries.
4. Limiting the presence of U.S. representatives at the meetings of the EU foreign ministers.
5. Creation of a parallel Internet (EU.net) not through servers and cables, but through wireless communications)
6. Creation of a European platform (EU.face) funded by the European budget without ads,

regulated for the absence of violence, fake news and hatred.

This is the vision that I and my like-minded people from our party have for the European Union. We want the European Union, but we also want our country – sovereign, prosperous, friendly and respectful of its traditions.

The future may not be so bleak. It can be radiant if we follow our idea of direct democracy. It states that power must indeed come from the people and belong to the people.

The book is available for reading,
downloading and free distribution at:

www.klissarov.eu

