

(Sixth Session, February 24, 1926, morning)

Continuation of the Discussion on the Report of Comrade Zinoviev.

The Chairman, Comrade Geschke, opened the session at 11 a. m. The first speaker was

Comrade Pepper:

The discussion carried on so far has been pretty one-sided. Only the internal party problems were discussed and chiefly in connection with the application of the tactic of the united front. One of the roots of the conflicts in our sections, however, certainly lies in the uncertainty in the analysis of the world situation. Comrade Bordiga is the crassest example of this; he reduces the whole world situation to two factors — here the Soviet Union, and there the capitalist environment. It is of course no accident that Comrade Bordiga adopts a wrong tactic on the basis of this "simplification" of the world situation; his analysis is wrong and it naturally follows that his tactic must be wrong. With the exception of Comrade Bordiga, no one states any more that he is against the tactic of the united front; even Comrades Ruth Fischer, Scholem, etc., do lip service to the united front tactic here in Moscow. Of course, it is an entirely different question how their deeds look in Berlin.

Less harmony exists in the conception of the question of the analysis of the world situation. Comrade Zinoviev has already touched upon the differences as to the perspectives. He has opposed himself to those who demand simply one perspective. The tactic of the united front must naturally be supplemented by a political slogan summing up all the other demands. The theses solve this task by setting up the slogan of the United States of Socialist Europe as the general all-comprehensive political slogan. This slogan, strangely enough, has not been touched upon in the discussion so far. But in conversation, some of the comrades have expressed themselves very sceptically about it. Some of the comrades recalled the fact that Comrade Lenin had expressed himself against the slogan "United States of Europe" in 1915.

Is this slogan correct or not?

I believe that the question must be investigated whether or not this slogan is correct, by analysing the concrete situation itself.

The concrete situation is, firstly, the economic and partially political domination of America over Europe; secondly, the in-

creasing antagonism, daily growing more acute, between the United States of America and Great Britain.

The first factor of the domination of America is the tremendous accumulation, the tremendous concentration of capital in America, the formation of the greatest Trust of the world. The second factor of the situation in the United States is the purging of the dominating Republican Party of the Lefts, the splitting off of the petty-bourgeois and farmer elements, the transformation of the Republican Party into the avowed Party of finance capital. A third factor is the slogan expressed by Coolidge: a clear field for the sound trusts, the complete abandonment of the Anti-Trust legislation, in other words, the open break with the traditional policy of Roosevelt and La Follette. A fourth factor of the analysis, which is not yet a reality, but at present only a tendency, is the fight which American finance capital is beginning against the high protective tariff policy of the United States. Finance capital is supported in this fight by the farmers and the growing section of small investors. Finance capital is turning against the policy of high protection, because Europe can pay off the growing interest on the growing investments and loans of America only in the form of export of industrial goods.

The following is the fifth factor — America is trying more and more by loans and by the investment of capital to dominate Europe not only economically, but also politically by attaching openly political conditions to the loans of American bankers.

These factors in American development mean an ever extending economic and political intervention of America in the affairs of the European countries. At the same time we can say that in connection with these changes in the American situation, a partial change is also taking place in Europe.

I would like to characterise this with one word — **Locarno**. I believe that Locarno is not only a bloc against Soviet Russia; it is not only directed against the continental hegemony of France under the leadership of Great Britain; it is not only a guarantee of the investment of capital in Europe for the benefit of America; — it was the first attempt to establish a **West European bloc** under the leadership of Great Britain against the United States of America.

The picture therefore appears as follows: America is intervening in Europe to a greater degree and Europe is beginning to defend itself against this intervention.

That shows that the antagonism between America and Europe is increasing and that within this general antagonism, the antagonism between America and Great Britain is becoming more acute. Great Britain has a remarkable role in this play. Great Britain is the leader of the international conspiracy against the Soviet Union, and at the same time Great Britain is trying to form a bloc against the United States of America.

From this situation we draw the following conclusions — on one hand, as a result of the antagonism between America and Europe, a certain parallelism of interests is crystallising between Europe and the Soviet Union. It is no mere chance that while America is plaguing the nations of Europe who are in debt to her, certain countries of Europe are compelled to negotiate with the Soviet Union. On the other hand, however, and again in consequence of the antagonism between America and Europe, a certain parallelism is crystallising in the policy of the Soviet Union and that of America.

In this situation, where the antagonism between Europe and America is the chief characteristic, the theses have set up the slogan of the **United States of Socialist Europe**. And on the basis of this analysis we must state that it was absolutely correct to set up this slogan.

You will remember that Comrade Lenin declared himself quite clearly and sharply against a similar slogan in 1915. Is the setting up of this slogan, at the present time, a revision of Leninism? I believe not. Why not? 1) because the content of the old slogan in 1915 was entirely different and 2) because the world situation today in 1925/26, is entirely different from that of 1914/15.

The old slogan was a slogan on a capitalist basis. It was: **United States of Republican Europe**. Our slogan is: **United States of Socialist Europe**. The fundamental conditions have changed. We are no longer fighting Monarchism in Russia, Germany and Austria, against which the old slogan was directed. The Socialist Revolution is on the agenda of the most important states of Europe. Lenin did not oppose the old slogan on political grounds. He even said: politically the slogan is untouchable. But

he opposed the economic content of the slogan, and for the following reasons: he declared that the slogan is either impossible to carry out or otherwise it is reactionary. A lasting union of the imperialist countries of Europe is impossible because the balance of power is continually changing, and on a capitalist basis there is only one method of deciding — force. But if a temporary union of the European capitalist countries were to arise, it would be reactionary since it would be directed against European socialism, against the colonies, and against the young developing capitalism of Japan and America.

But our new slogan does not speak of the union of the capitalist but of the socialist countries of Europe. Therefore its economic content is also different. Socialist countries can scrap the question of power and will not unite against the colonies.

When Lenin fought against the old slogan, the European countries had the hegemony of the world and their union would have meant simply the strengthening of this hegemony. The leadership also was of an aggressive character. Today the United States of America have the hegemony of the world, and the slogan of the Union of the European countries has therefore a defensive character.

Lenin also opposed this slogan because it would have stifled the possibility of the victory of the socialist revolution in one single country. But since then the socialist revolution has conquered in one country. The slogan is correct today because we are already in a situation today to link up the slogan of the United States of Socialist Europe with two other very important slogans:

1. Solidarity, alliance with the struggle for freedom of all the oppressed colonies.
2. Solidarity, alliance with the Soviet Union.

In 1914 that was impossible because 1) Soviet Russia was not yet in existence, and 2) the great fight for the independence of the colonies did not yet exist in mass form.

A very important argument for this slogan is that the idea of **Pan-Europe** already exists independently of us in the form of **Locarno**, the **Dawes Plan**, **League of Nations**. It must not be forgotten that the official ideology of the II International as well as part of the European bourgeoisie is **Pan-Europe** against **Pan-America**. It must not be forgotten that millions of workers believe in this ideology. It is very important that we have not only a negative critical standpoint toward this bourgeois social democratic slogan, and that we destroy the pacifist swindle of this slogan, but that we have a positive slogan at the same time, which can really be the comprehensive slogan for our transitional demands.

But it is also necessary that every slogan be supplemented by suitable facts for our **Communist Party in America**.

The **Communist Party of America** is not yet in a position today to win over the great masses directly. The theses give the analysis of the swing to the Right of the American labour movement sufficiently clearly. Therefore, we must construct various bridges between our Party and the masses of workers. The first bridge is the **Labour Party**. The second bridge, and in the present situation perhaps even more important to a certain extent than the Labour Party, is the **organisation of the Left Wing in the trade unions**. The fourth bridge is the creation of a broad platform which must combine the fight against the State power and against the trusts, so that it can unite not only the labour elements, but also the farmer masses and the petty-bourgeois elements. It is very important that the centre of gravity of the Party be transferred from light industry to heavy industry. The theses of the C.C. of the American Party which were adopted at the end of December have already clearly and concretely shown this task.

The last and most important task of our Party is the **fight against Imperialism**. The **Communist Party of America** must become the defender of the **oppressed peoples of Latin America**. The time is no longer distant when Latin America will become the China of the Far West and Mexico the Canton of Latin America. The Gompers trade unions have set up the slogan of the "**Monroe Doctrine of the Workers**", in other words, this is a protest against the penetration of any revolutionary propaganda into America. The American Communists must oppose this slogan with the slogan of the "**Open Door Policy**" of America for revolutionary ideas.