

LOVESTONE --- LORE --- BOURGEOISIE

THE tendencies expelled from the Communist Party are of one opinion on all important questions." With this statement Ludwig Lore repulses Lovestone's attempt to deny his political relationship with the editor of the Volkszeitung and with the latter's political line. But perhaps it is bad policy to take the "poor relative's" word as proof of genuineness of the claimed relationship. We therefore must search for corroborating evidence. This is not difficult. The surprising thing in this search, however, is that a new link is discovered that is denied publicly by all the rest of them. Lovestone denies Lore and Cannon; Lore openly, and Cannon covertly, admit relationship to Lovestone; but Lovestone, Cannon and Lore are united in vociferously denying any relationship with Mr. Bourgeois. Their mutual relationship with the bourgeoisie, however, has led to a point of political intimacy that can no longer be concealed from the eyes of the workers.

RENEGADES AND BOURGEOIS PROFESSORS.

About two months ago the Soviet government in Russia issued a decree increasing the authority of the factory managers. This decree establishes responsibility for the factory managers in carrying through the specific quota of the Five Year Plan assigned to their respective establishments. It also clothes them with the necessary authority to overcome possible obstacles.

This decree has inspired Ludwig Lore to an article in the Volkszeitung. This article pictures the Soviet decree as a re-establishment of the same relationship between workers and factory management that exists in any capitalist country; the power of the workers shorn, the power of the factory management increased and the workers at the mercy of that management. What difference is there, wails Lore, between the conditions of the workers in Russia and those of the workers in America?

Lore was not the only one inspired by this decree to this conclusion. The November issue of "Current History" contains an article by Edgar S. Furniss, chairman of the Department of Social Science of the Yale University. Mr. Furniss is not a member of any of the "expelled tendencies" of the Communist Party. He is a pure and simple bourgeois professor. Mr. Furniss, in commenting on the order of the Soviet Government, says in this article in "Current History," that "under this order trade unions in Soviet Russia are placed on a footing almost identical with the company unions of this country, which have been the object of scorn and ridicule in Communist circles everywhere."

Of course no one expects a bourgeois professor to see further than his bourgeois nose.

Thus we find Mr. Lore and Mr. Furniss "of one opinion on an important question."

But where is Lovestone?

We have before us a letter written by an eminent "proletarian" member of the Lovestone-Gitlow-Wolfe "majority" group. This gentleman is now active as an emissary against the Communist Party in the mining territory. He is engaged in "saving the Lenin-

ist purity" of the Comintern. He is a traveling agent of the "Marx-Lenin" school of the Gitlow-Lovestone-Wolfe Hester Street concern, dealers in second hand goods. This "Marx-Lenin" school, as you know, is to preserve revolutionary purity in the theories of Marx and Engels. The name of this eminent "Marxist-Leninist proletarian travelling agent" of Lovestone and company is Judson.

Judson wrote a letter to a friend. It is this letter we have before us. At the end of the letter the pure "Marxist-Leninist" Judson says: "Buy the November issue of 'Current History.' Interesting article by Furniss. Take particular note of the first paragraph, upper right-hand corner, page 401. First part absolutely correct." We follow Judson's advice and find the above quoted statement by Furniss, on page 401 upper right-hand corner, "Current History." So there we have it. Lore-Furniss-Lovestone. The circle is completed.

COUNTER-REVOLUTIONARY NAKEDNESS

The "Leninist" Lovestone, the opportunist Lore, and the bourgeois Furniss are all agreed that the proletarian dictatorship in Russia is a negligible quantity in the consideration of conditions in Russia. They all agree that when the factory manager of a plant of the United States Steel Corporation and the factory manager of a Soviet steel mill issue orders to workers or make rules for them, there is no difference. Furniss-Lovestone-Lore thereby take exactly the attitude of the counter-revolutionists in Russia. It is the counter-revolutionary element in Russia which tries to win the workers of the Soviet Union over to the same attitude toward the Soviet industry as that which the workers ought to have toward the capitalist industry, one dictated by class-antagonism. The fact that the owners of the industries in Russia are the working class and that the administration of the industries in Soviet Russia is for the purpose of building socialism does not concern them.

The great revolutionary task in the Soviet Union at present is that of building socialism. No other force can be mobilized for this task but the working class. All sacrifices which this task demands, all exertions which it necessitates, must be made by the working class. Possible immediate advantages of individual workers or groups of workers must be forgone in the interest of the ultimate advantage accruing for the whole working class from the progress in the building of socialism. It is therefore a revolutionary necessity in the interest of the working class that the whole apparatus of the Soviet industry be orientated toward the execution of the Five Year Plan. The factory manager of the Soviet steel mill therefore is given authority to utilize it for the success of the revolution in the interest of the working class. When, on the other hand, the factory manager of a plant of the United States Steel Corporation exercises his authority against the workers, he does it in order to increase the profits of the capitalists against the interests of the workers. But this distinction is evidently too "small" to be recognized by Lore, Furniss or by Lovestone. All three of them are representatives of the bourgeoisie; all three of them are thinking in bourgeois terms, and all three of them are enemies of the working class.