

## Comrade PEPPER:

The study of imperialist contradictions is presented here by Comrade Treint with a gesture of a discoverer. The question is an essential one since imperialist contradictions not only include the question of future wars, but they also determine in part whether the economic struggles of the proletariat are to be transformed into political conflicts, or, finally, into revolutionary battles. Despite his pose as an inventor, Comrade Treint has no monopoly in the raising of this point. Comrade Bukharin in his report dealt with the questions of imperialist contradictions in their fullest depth and extent. The only difference is that Treint's thesis is wrong while Bukharin's thesis is right. Treint cites my pamphlet "The United States of Socialist Europe". He even headed his article in "Cahier du Bolchevisme" with a few sentences from my pamphlet. He cites what I wrote about the first weak signs of a bloc-building against America. But he forgets to cite the second half of my analysis, however, in which I establish that: "The antagonism between America and Europe is growing, which, of course, contrary to the claims of the prattler Breitscheid, does not exclude, that the contradictions between the various European countries are likewise growing".

Comrade Treint claims that Pepper formulated objective conclusions identical with its own. But at the same time he

writes: "In any event one should not fight a theses just because it is original". I must state that I have nothing whatever to do with Treint's theses, and I am not fighting it because it is original, but for the one tiny reason that it is wrong.

Comrade Treint's thesis can be divided into three parts: 1. he maintains that the contradictions in Europe are declining and that a certain levelling process is going on in Europe; 2. that at the same time the antagonisms between Anglo-Europe and America, and, 3. the formation of the United States of capitalist Europe either against America or the Soviet Union or both, — are absolutely inevitable.

Within the Communist International there are found many false theories also in connection with the question of the relationship of Europe and America.

The first of these faulty theories was formulated by Comrade Trotsky. He maintained that the relationship between Europe and America would take such a form that European economy would more and more become a sector of American economy, that Europe would be put on rations by America. This theory is false. World hegemony has gone over from Europe to America economically and in part also politically, and American predominance will continue to grow, but the assumption of Trotsky that Europe will not resist is wrong, one-sided, and does not reckon with the imperialist nature of the European powers.

The second faulty theory about America-Europe was formulated by Comrade Radek. Beginning with an assumption of a co-operation between England and America that is not merely temporary, but permanent and holding good for a whole period, he has built up the theory of a general coalition of all capitalist powers. He even sees in this eventuality the only possibility for a grouping of world powers in the immediate future. It is of course a tremendous exaggeration if one overlooks the most important clash of present-day imperialism, the antagonism between America and Great Britain.

The third of these faulty theories was hatched out by Comrade Treint. If Comrade Radek advocates the theory of "Anglo-American capitalism", then Comrade Treint formulates the theory "Anglo-Europe". For Treint "Anglo-Europe" plays the role of the Siamese twins. (Interjection by Bukharin: "That is the famous French two-children system!").

Comrade Treint is completely blind to the antagonisms within Europe, which, in his opinion are in process of vanishing. On September 15th, he wrote in the "Cahier du Bolchevisme":

"Differences in the level of conditions have become weaker in the larger countries of Europe: England, France, Germany, and Italy. A proof that the internal antagonisms in Europe are giving way to the antagonism between the United States and Europe, is the energy and ease with which the League of Nations has dealt with the Greco-Bulgarian conflict".

This is absolutely wrong. Treint maintains that a levelling process is proceeding in Europe, (Bukharin interjects: "Especially in France and Italy!") that the antagonisms in Europe are giving place to the antagonism between America and Europe. And what does Treint play as his chief trump, as his proof? The fact that the League of Nations settled the Greco-Bulgarian conflict with energy and ease. What is the political significance of this claim he sets up? Nothing less than that the League of Nations is able — with energy and ease — to settle Europe's conflicts, in other words, the possibility of a lasting peace in Europe, a tranquil ultra-imperialism in Europe.

In an article written in October, viz., after Thoiry, Comrade Treint even went so far as to deny the possibility of rival bloc-building by the imperialist powers in Europe, since the organisation of "Europe as a whole" was commencing. And this Treint writes after Thoiry, in the face of the fact that it showed, on the one hand, the Franco-German bloc, and on the other, the Anglo-Italian. In the face of the disintegration of the League of Nations, the disintegration of the so-called "European unity", the revival of hostile bloc building inside of Europe — Treint comes and declares all reality null and void — in the name of his erroneous theory.

These theories must logically lead to a revision of the Leninist analysis of imperialism. These theories of Comrades Trotsky, Radek and Treint are wrong because, deviating from

the Leninist conception, they seek to isolate abstractly the struggle of the imperialist powers for stabilisation, viz., the universal historic interest of the bourgeoisie, from the concrete forms of this struggle, i. e. the struggle for stabilisation that can proceed only in the form of these imperialist powers' struggles against each other. To claim a levelling process in capitalist Europe, as is put forth in the theories of Trotsky, Radek and Treint, is to contradict the Leninist conception of the law of the inequality of capitalist development, the concrete application of crisis and prosperity periods, and, politically, the fragility of imperialist group-building in the post-war period, hence, concretely proving the increasing irregularity of development.

For one cannot deny that the United States of Capitalist Europe might come into existence as a "temporary" and reactionary structure. But it would be fundamentally wrong to reckon with the United States of Capitalist Europe as a permanent phenomenon. In a Leninist sense such a coalition of capitalist powers could only be a "breathing spell between wars", and this not only in preparation for wars against America, but also as a preparation for wars between the European Powers.

Treint's theory is closely related to the allegations made by Comrades Trotsky and Zinoviev at the XV. Party Conference, according to which the irregularity in the development of capitalism diminishes during the regime of finance capital. Strangely enough, the passage in Lenin's book on imperialism which emphasises in the sharpest manner the intensification of the irregularity, was not referred to at the XV. Party Conference. I should like to cite this classic sentence:

"Kautsky's talk about ultra-imperialism feeds upon a false idea that brings grist to the mills of the imperialist apologists, that the rule of finance capital diminishes the inequalities and contradictions in world economy, whereas in reality, it strengthens them. Finance capital and the Trusts do not mitigate the differences in the tempo of growth in the various sections of world economy, but they intensify them."

It is fundamentally necessary, theoretically, that Stalin and Bukharin again bring to the foreground the Leninist theory regarding the law of unequal development. They thereby render the same service to Leninist theory that Lenin rendered the revolutionary State theory of Marx, which for a long time was pushed to the background by the opportunist attitude. The Zinoviev-Trotsky theory must be combatted because it is bound up with the Pacifist illusions of the Social Democratic working masses of 1924 who were then promised the realisation of pacifism by the Social Democracy then at the helm of government in a number of European countries. By 1926 the Social Democracy has sunk so low that it expects the realisation of the "pacifist ideals" from the bourgeoisie itself. The Social Democracy now substitutes for the Communist Manifesto of Marx, the Manifesto of the Morgan Bankers.

### Comrade HAKEN (Czechoslovakia):

Czecho-Slovakia is a Central-European State so small and of so little importance for world economy that it can play no leading role in the present imperialist struggle for power, it can participate only in the political and economic train of the great Western powers, particularly the French bourgeoisie. In the service of the imperialists it can play an important role only as the tool of their counter-revolutionary and imperialist designs, for instance against the Soviet Union. For this reason, and also because of the strength of the Communist Party, Czecho-Slovakia is not without importance for us.

Soon after the war, Czecho-Slovakia took a most prominent position in its consolidation endeavours in Central Europe.

The bearer of the consolidation endeavours was the so-called all national coalition, the Government composed of the Czech-bourgeois parties and the Czech reformists.

If, under the pressure of the revolutionary waves, the coalition at first had even Socialisation in its programme, it soon dropped these things as the stabilisation and consolidation of the bourgeoisie progressed. It no longer needed these declarations and adopted a more and more reactionary orientation, in which it was consistently supported by the two reformist parties.