

LOVESTONE - LORE - BRANDLER

By MAX BEDACHT

Lovestone's burglary of the National Office of the Communist Party and his theft of materials and documents from that office, and his subsequent detective story designed to attack and undermine the Party and to break the morale of the Party membership, are not the only activities of Lovestone in his capacity as an agent of the American bourgeoisie. Lovestone also, and very definitely, is engaged in building up an American gathering basin for the growing radicalization of the masses, in order to serve the bourgeoisie as a deflector of the revolutionary energies of the masses.

It is in periods when a decided leftward trend of the masses manifests itself that the opportunist becomes most valuable for the bourgeoisie and most dangerous for the working class. In such periods, the bourgeoisie expects from the opportunist traitor that he divert the flood of radicalizing sentiment before it reaches revolutionary consciousness and revolutionary proportions. The task of the opportunist is to direct this sentiment into channels of pro-capitalist action, the basis and purpose of which are covered by pseudo radical theories. This is the root of the present attempts of Brandlerism to build up a new international to fight the Communist International and to support the "socialist" international which is already too much discredited to play this treacherous role alone. This is why, just at this moment, in the third period, we are confronted with the splitting attempt in the American Party. This is why just at this moment, Lovestone is playing his role as a leader in the fight against the Communist International and its American section.

Lovestone tries to keep secret his national and international connections with the openly recognized and easily recognizable opportunist agents of the bourgeoisie. He protests against being put into the same pot with Brandler. He gets indignant when he is mentioned in one breath with Lore. He vociferously cites his zeal in the struggle against Cannon to disprove accusations which link him with Cannon. But all of these protests cannot eradicate the fact that Lovestone today speaks the language of Cannon, that he fights the fight of Lore, and that he carries on the propaganda of Brandler. To prove that, we need no artificial constructions or interpretations. The bare fact suffices. Cannon's "Militant" prints Lovestone's argument on Gastonia and on the Trade Union Unity League Convention and Lovestone's mimeographed sheets repeat Cannon's arguments on the same points. Lore's "New York Volkszeitung" is fighting Lovestone's battle against the Comintern and Lovestone is using Lore's arguments against the Comintern. Brandler's paper "Gegen Den Strom," anticipates all of Lovestone's slogans and arguments against the Comintern even before Lovestone uses them.

An outstanding monument to the shame of Lovestone's renegade activities is the New York Volkszeitung of Friday, September 20. In this issue, Lore devotes fully two pages, and over, to the struggle against the vilification of the Comintern. The theme of this specific manifestation of Lore's favorite pastime is Lovestone's so-called appeal to the Comintern. In this issue of the Volkszeitung, Lore reprints from Brandler's paper, "Gegen Den Strom," a seven-column article entitled "American Tragedy" or "The Clique Which Rules The Comintern." Not satisfied with this quotation from Brandler, which in turn, is a quotation from Lovestone, Lore writes a four-column commentary on it entitled "How a Mass Party was Systematically Destroyed." In these two articles, we find the Trotskyite Lore and the "anti-Trotskyite" Lovestone voluptuously wallowing in the same mud.

In Moscow, although still in the ideological and physical bondage of factionalism, I had long and repeated arguments with Lovestone, Wolfe and Gitlow, on the question of the perspective of the fight which we were then carrying on within the Comintern but essentially against the Comintern. Blinded by the poisoning influence of years of factionalism, I, too, saw in the struggle of the Comintern against factionalism in the American Party, a manifestation of the bad quality of the Comintern leadership, yet in some saner moments, I raised the question: where will that lead us? I contended that under no conditions could we allow this struggle to develop to a point where we would fight the Comintern from the outside. First, because in doing so, we would have to accept the alliance of all of the enemies of the Comintern, mentioning specifically Brandler, Trotsky, Souvarine and Lore; and secondly we would have to accept, as the only justifiable theoretical basis of such a struggle, Trotsky's theory of Thermidor. My own greatest crime in connection with our campaign in Moscow was my failure to bring these discussions out into the open and to raise these issues out in the open. Had I done this, the activities of the dedegation of our Party in Moscow would very probably have taken a different course. Certain it is, however, that if I had done this, Lovestone would not have dared to dish out all the lies that he, together with Brandler and Lore are now peddling concerning my attitude in Moscow. These lies are, of course, not directed against me individually, but aim to discredit the Comintern, the Party and its leadership.

These discussions in Moscow ended with a continuation of my active participation in the Lovestone policies. We finally agreed that we

would fight "to the last ditch" within the Comintern. Even to that policy I had raised the objection that it was not within our power to determine the location of this last ditch. I contended that we might believe to be still fighting within our rights within the Comintern and yet the Comintern itself, which, after all, is the only body to decide as to what is permissible within its boundary lines, may tell us, at a certain point, that we have exceeded the limit of the permissible. This argument was answered by Lovestone with the statement: Well, then we will be expelled. Thereupon I made the categorical statement which was the last one in this discussion, that on the day I will be expelled from the Comintern I will make application for re-admission, accepting any conditions the Comintern may put upon me.

3. The present stage of internal development in the reformist unions conforms to the general transitional period in the co-relation of class forces on the whole. The working class has already become sufficiently strong to be in a position to take up the counter-offensive. The trade union bureaucracy is still influential among certain sections of the workers, but the revolutionary unions and the revolutionary trade union opposition are increasingly winning over large masses of workers belonging to the reformist unions. This predetermines also the tasks of the Communists in the reformist trade unions: not to withdraw from these unions, but to contribute in every way to the acceleration of the process of revolutionization of the rank and file members of the reformist unions by placing themselves at the head of the class struggle of the proletariat.

3. THE ECONOMIC BATTLES AND THE REVOLUTIONARY TRADE UNION OPPOSITION.

1. The Ninth Plenum of the Communist International and the Fourth Congress of the Red International of Labor Unions placed before the Communist Parties and the revolutionary trade union movement not only the task of independent leadership of strikes but also of the best organization and preparation for this struggle, and the bringing about of working class unity from below, in the factories. Already at that time the disparity between the growth of the political influence of the revolutionary trade union movement and its organizational scope was pointed out. With this in view, it was proposed to reorganize the Communist factions in the reformist unions from the bottom, and also to recognize the revolutionary unions on industrial lines (in countries with dual unions), to institute democratic centralism, and to set up factory committees as the basis of revolutionary unions. Attention was at the same time called to the danger of the social-democratic traditions and of trade union legalism which was particularly apparent then in countries where no independent revolutionary unions exist (Germany) in the slogan of "compel the trade union bu-

would fight "to the last ditch" within the Comintern. Even to that policy I had raised the objection that it was not within our power to determine the location of this last ditch. I contended that we might believe to be still fighting within our rights within the Comintern and yet the Comintern itself, which, after all, is the only body to decide as to what is permissible within its boundary lines, may tell us, at a certain point, that we have exceeded the limit of the permissible. This argument was answered by Lovestone with the statement: Well, then we will be expelled. Thereupon I made the categorical statement which was the last one in this discussion, that on the day I will be expelled from the Comintern I will make application for re-admission, accepting any conditions the Comintern may put upon me.

Why should all this be recited here?

Not so much for the purpose of confronting Lovestone's-Brandler's-Lore's lies with the actual facts, but primarily in order to show that Lovestone's alliance today with Lore and Brandler is not an unconscious and incidental one but was clearly anticipated by Lovestone even before the American Commission made its final decision on the American question. It was exactly my crime and a proof to what extent factional blindness can lead one not to have seen then already the clear design in Lovestone's aims. It was my crime to believe that the unavoidable perspective of an organizational alliance of Lovestone with Trotsky, with Lore, with Brandler was only a hypothetical possibility and was not the inevitable outgrowth of an ideological affinity.

Lovestone, Lore and Brandler maintain that Bedacht proposed an organizational alliance with Brandler, after our delegation had received information about the condemnation of Lovestone in the draft of the Thesis of the German Central Committee. If it were possible to straighten out the crooked channels of thought in the head of Lovestone I would, as an answer to his ridiculous assertion, recall to his memory the following facts: First, that I protested in the presence

of the respective Party Committee. The Comintern decisions on the question of trade union fractions are not satisfactorily carried out. Trade union fractions have not yet been organized everywhere where they should have been, in accordance with the decisions of the Second International Organization Conference; and where they do exist, they are not always properly organized. In many places where the Communist movement is illegal (Poland) side by side with Communist fractions are so-called Red fractions. The Red fractions should be so built as to represent the widest possible masses organized around the Communist fractions and sympathizing with them. But Red fractions can by no means substitute Communist fractions, and the Communist Party must not organize Red fractions without securing the leading role of the Communist fractions within them.

6. Finally, in the Communist Parties themselves, there is as yet no clear understanding of the singular importance of trade union work in the present phase of development. Trade union work is regarded as ordinary work of the "department." The Party does not concentrate the whole of its attention, and especially the attention of the factory nuclei, upon current trade union work, particularly, however, upon the preparation for leadership of economic fights. This shows an underestimation of the political significance of revolutionary trade union work and of current economic fights.

7. In countries where there are independent revolutionary trade unions (France, Czechoslovakia), the chief defect up to now consists in the under-estimation by a certain section of the revolutionary trade union militants of the fact that the masses are becoming radicalized, and also in an underestimation of the new character of trade union reformism. In France the unitary trade unions were taken unawares and were overwhelmed by the movement. ("The movement developed over the heads of the unitary unions, our organizations lacked initiative," said Monmousseau at the October Plenum of the Unitary Unions.)

In Czechoslovakia the tactics of the liquidators amongst the leaders of the Red unions were characterized by the top combinations between them and the leaders of the reformist organizations, by collaboration with the corrupt reformist factory councils, which was advertised as the united front tactic, by their legalist attitude towards the bourgeois state authorities, by their opportunistic attitude in relation to the strike tactics and particularly in relation to the unorganized. As a result of this, in the first big conflict in which the Communist Party and the new strike tactics, the liquidators responded by breaking away from the revolutionary trade union movement.

A great danger in those countries is also legalism, a respect for capitalist laws. While fighting to the utmost for all legal possibilities, the revolutionary trade unions should not cherish any opportunistic illusions with regard to the bourgeois state and capitalist laws. The strength and influence of the Red unions depend exclusively on the active organization and independent leadership of the economic fights of the proletariat. One of the main weaknesses of the revolutionary unions is their inadequate penetration into the factories, the absence (or extremely bad functioning) of the system of trade union delegates in the factories.

(To be Continued)

of Wolfe, Lovestone, Gitlow, Ella Wolfe and Hankin against the intimate political conferences into which our so-called social relations with Ewart had transformed themselves in Moscow; second, that I protested against the re-establishment of an alliance with Pepper after we, ourselves, had condemned Pepper in the sharpest terms not only before the outside world but among ourselves and, thirdly, that I proposed after we got knowledge of the German thesis, to leave a comrade in Germany on our way home, to appear in the Convention of the German Communist Party as a representative from the American Party to combat the proposed condemnation of Lovestone. The only difficulty in the way of my proposal was our inability to assign such a representative on our part, and the necessity to have the selection of such a representative affirmed by the Political Committee in America.

Incidentally, I might take this occasion in declaring categorically that Lovestone's statement that I wrote the cable of the 15th of May is an unmitigated lie.

The articles appearing in the "New York Volkszeitung" of September 20 establish with undeniable clarity Lovestone's connection with Brandler. Lovestone either himself wrote the article which appeared in Brandler's "Gegen Den Strom" and reprinted by Lore, or, he sent his so-called appeal to Brandler. The article is, in the main, composed of quotations from Lovestone's appeal. This appeal formulated by Lovestone under the pretense of appealing to the Comintern, was the appeal of an enemy of the Comintern against that body, addressed to other enemies of the Comintern and designed to make new enemies for it.

How the followers of Lovestone can still maintain their pretense of pro-revolutionary aims and desires in the face of the fact that the pronouncements of their leaders make most welcome anti-Comintern propaganda in the hands of Lore is more than they can explain to the Party.