

# NEW FABRICATIONS BY THE ENEMIES OF THE UNITY OF THE TRADE UNION MOVEMENT

By A. LOSOVSKY.

**T**HE appeal made by the Executive Bureau of the Profintern to the Congress of the Norwegian trade unions has called forth the dissatisfaction and wrath of the orthodox Amsterdamites and other enemies of the united front and the unity of the trade union movement. Since it is difficult to appear before the workers and prove to them that the unity of the trade union movement is a harmful thing, all kinds of fantastic inventions are set going, facts are distorted and documents falsified. In this connection all records have been beaten by the Swedish reformist trade union newspapers which have printed an article written by a certain "participant at an extraordinary conference of the Profintern" which allegedly took place in Moscow in September, 1934.

From the outset I must upset the Amsterdamites by stating that no conference of the Profintern, either ordinary or extraordinary, was held in Moscow in September, 1934. Hence it is not clear where this participant at this alleged conference has come from. The Swedish reformists have performed a trick usual to bourgeois newspapers, that is, they gave one of their employees the task of writing an article, baptised this person a "participant at the Moscow conference" and published a whole collection of thin and rotten inventions made by this "eye-witness" in the press. The international reformist press, including the "Berliner Tagwacht," seized hold of these inventions, in which the wish is put forward as the reality.

Well, what did this "eye-witness" learn and what did he hear? He learned at the conference which never took place that "the policy of the Profintern, the Red Trade Unions and the Red Trade Union Opposition has turned out to be bankrupt in all countries," that "the Red Trade Unions and the Red Trade Union Opposition are being disbanded," and that "as far back as the 13th Plenum of the E.C.C.I. the hopeless collapse of the Red Trade Unions was placed on record," etc. The "eye-witness" concludes these inventions of his by arguments about "the complete bankruptcy of the policy of the Red International of Trade Unions in those countries where fascism has succeeded in coming to power."

This "participant at the Moscow Conference" declares that "neither in Germany nor in Austria has it been possible to re-establish a single free trade union," that "the Profintern has taken careful measures not to allow a single social-democrat to

be admitted to the leadership of the independent class trade unions," that "the Profintern is dragging at the tail of events" and that "disruptive work is being carried on in the free trade unions, on the instructions of the Profintern," etc.

It might have been possible to leave matters there, for the reformist press has repeated this sort of thing dozens of times, and there is nothing new in these arguments, were it not for the conclusions drawn from this article, conclusions in actual fact, to obtain which this extraordinary conference and the "eye-witness" himself were invented:

"The unification between the C.G.T. and the C.G.T.U. (the reformist trade union federation and the revolutionary trade union federation, Ed.) which has been achieved in France (this unification is far from having been achieved, A.L.), the unification of the Amsterdam and Red Trade Unions was the first step on the road to the re-establishment of a united trade union international.

"The next weeks and months will show how seriously the Communists regard the establishment of trade union unity, and WHETHER THEY ARE PREPARED TO DISBAND THE RED TRADE UNION OPPOSITION GROUPS AND THE RED TRADE UNIONS WHICH STILL EXIST IN OTHER COUNTRIES, AND THEREBY ALSO LIQUIDATE THE RED INTERNATIONAL OF TRADE UNIONS." (My emphasis, A.L.).

Herein lies the whole point of this article. The Swedish "eye-witness" repeats in his own way all that the General Council of the Amsterdam International stated at Weymouth, namely, that all the revolutionary trade unions, including the Profintern, must be disbanded if the unity of the trade union movement is to be brought about.

## Trade Union Unity Experiences in France.

It only requires a little thought as regards the idea behind and the consequence of this proposal to understand the whole anti-working class essence of such "methods" of re-establishing the split trade union movement. Actually let us look at the position which has now arisen in France. The revolutionary trade unions propose unity from top to bottom. Certain trade unions, affiliated to the reformist General Confederation of Labour (C.G.T.) are also declaring in favour of unity. The leaders of the C.G.T. and the leaders of the biggest reformist trade union federations (railwaymen, miners, textile workers) are declaring against it. On this basis a very serious struggle is going on within the reformist Confederation of Labour. The struggle is becoming all the sharper in so far as a number of local and even regional and national unions are declaring seriously for the establishment of unity not by liquidating the Red Trade Unions, but by fusing the corresponding

parallel unions (of the C.G.T. and the C.G.T.U.—Ed.) on the basis of trade union democracy. 275 united trade unions have already come into existence in France. Certain trade union federations have already fused on certain of the railroads. The National Union of Teachers and the Federation of Municipal Employees, etc., have declared in favour of fusion.

Why have a number of reformist trade unions declared in favour of fusion? Because not only the masses of members, but also a certain section of the reformist trade union officials know that the revolutionary trade unions and the revolutionary workers were always in the front ranks of the struggle for the interests of the working class, and have become convinced that the introduction of a revolutionary spirit and of revolutionary methods of struggle—as a result of the fusion of the reformist and the revolutionary trade unions—will strengthen the working class in its struggle against the capitalists.

What would it imply, in the conditions existing in France, if the Red Trade Unions were to be disbanded and liquidated. It would imply that the revolutionary positions won by the international proletariat would have to be given up, that the revolutionary energy concentrated in the revolutionary trade unions, the experience of struggle accumulated over many years of struggle against the capitalists and the revolutionary creative power and fighting spirit with which the revolutionary workers are imbued, would all be scattered, and every worker without interesting himself in the question as to what policy the given trade union will carry on—a policy of class struggle or one of class collaboration—would individually enter one or other reformist trade union.

What would this give the French proletariat? Would this strengthen their position? Would it not be of advantage to the bourgeoisie to disband the revolutionary organisation? On what grounds must the revolutionary workers give up their organisation? Have their tactics proved to be incorrect? Has not their analysis of the situation been confirmed wholly and completely? The Profintern and its Sections are displaying the greatest energy and sharpness in raising the question of trade union unity. They have intensified the struggle for trade union unity not because facts have allegedly proved the weakness of the policy of the Comintern and the Red Trade Unions, as the Amsterdamites lyingly assert, but because a new situation has arisen. This is also urging on the reformist workers to take the path of the class struggle, which is increasing their leaning towards a united front with the revolutionary workers, a situation which ensures the success of the militant tactics of the revolutionary trade union opposition.

### To Disband or Fuse?

It is one thing to disband and liquidate the revolutionary trade unions, but it is another thing if two parallel trade unions—reformist and revolutionary—fuse, and organise a joint congress on the basis of proportional representation, elect leaders on this basis, and establish a united trade union on the basis of developed proletarian democracy and the class struggle, and fortify the united front between all workers with a view to carrying on the struggle against the capitalists. Such a unification raises the fighting power of the workers, gives them new means whereby to defend the rights they already have and to achieve new rights, whereas to simply disband a trade union organisation, to liquidate it and to scatter the masses of its members will only be of service to our class enemies. This is why the DEMAND MADE BY THE LEADERS OF THE AMSTERDAM INTERNATIONAL THAT THE REVOLUTIONARY UNIONS BE DISBANDED, MUST BE CATEGORICALLY REJECTED.

This does not mean that in certain cases we cannot ourselves liquidate one or other small union, whose existence we would not consider advisable from the point of view of the development of the struggle of the broadest masses. But this has nothing in common with the slogan that the revolutionary unions must be liquidated, it has nothing in common with the dream of the leaders of the Amsterdam International that an end must be put to the revolutionary trade union movement at all costs.

The author of the lying article in the "Berliner Tagwacht" asserts that "the Profintern is dragging at the tail of events" as regards Germany and Austria. Let us examine the facts. Who stood at the head of the free trade unions in Germany and Austria? The friends and colleagues of the Swedish reformists, the leaders of the Amsterdam International. What did they do to struggle against fascism? Why, even a section of the social-democratic press was compelled to subject the conduct of the leaders of the German trade unions to criticism, and even Vandervelde, Mertens, and Friedrich Adler were compelled to upbraid their German friends for the fact that they capitulated.

### Lessons of Germany and Austria.

Can anybody deny that the leaders of the German reformist trade unions gave up all their positions without a fight, that they offered their services to Hitler, and that they were prepared to continue their work under the political leadership of German fascism? No, nobody can deny this. These are facts which have cost the working class of Germany very dear.

Can anybody deny that while the Austrian workers were engaged in an armed struggle against the onslaught of fascism, the leaders of the trade unions

not only did not stand at the head of this struggle but disrupted the general strike and the strike of the railway workers? No, nobody can. These are facts about which no single class-conscious Austrian worker can speak without being furious. What did the policy of class collaboration and the "peaceful" tactics of the leaders of the reformist trade unions in Germany and Austria lead to? They led to the trade unions being smashed up and to the victory of fascism. But who in these countries fought against the tactics of capitulation, who called the workers to struggle, who called on them to organise strikes and to undertake an armed struggle against fascism? The Communists and the supporters of the Profintern. In these countries the social-democrats had the support of the majority of the workers (in Austria of the overwhelming majority of the workers), from year to year they carried on a policy of class collaboration and carried on a constant and uninterrupted struggle against the united front, and therefore fascism was victorious.

Well, and after the fascist dictatorship was established? The day after the fascist dictatorship was established in Germany, the Communists issued the slogan that the rank and file organisations of the free trade unions must be preserved at all costs, and that **INDEPENDENT CLASS TRADE UNIONS MUST BE SET UP, IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC WORKERS AND FUNCTIONARIES, i.e.,** that a struggle must be carried on so that the re-established free trade unions should be independent of fascism and carry on the class struggle. When we saw that certain of our comrades were incorrectly counterposing the independent trade unions to the free trade unions, we drew their attention to this, and made the open declaration that **WE ARE FIGHTING IN GERMANY TO RE-ESTABLISH THE FREE TRADE UNIONS.** We are fighting to re-establish the mass working class organisations which have historically been built up in Germany so that they become really free from the bourgeoisie and bourgeois ideology. We desire not only to re-establish the free trade unions but to bring about a situation where these trade unions are class fighting unions, and that they are headed by firm proletarians and not by incorrigible capitulators, by people of the type of Leipart, Tarnov and Grassman who have brought the working class of Germany to such heavy suffering.

As soon as the armed struggle in Austria came to an end, and the government disbanded the free trade unions, the Communists and the supporters of the Profintern issued the slogan of the struggle to re-establish the free trade unions. Our Swedish "eye-witness" asserts that "it has not been possible to re-establish a single free trade union either in Germany or Austria." This is a lie! Let the Swedish reformists ask their friend Otto Bauer, and

he will tell them that the Communists have succeeded, in conjunction with social-democratic officials, in re-establishing quite a big number of free trade unions. The "central commission to re-establish the free trade unions" set up by the Communists and local officials of the free trade unions has done tremendous work, and now has about 14,000 members in the illegal free trade unions united by the central commission. What are the former leaders of the free trade unions doing in this situation? Instead of supporting the work being done, and strengthening the unity of the free trade unions set up with such difficulties, they have taken the path of splitting the unions. Shorsh and other trade union emigrants have created a "central committee of revolutionary free trade unions" in order to disrupt the work done without their aid.

Who is fighting for unity and who is splitting the trade unions? There is not the slightest doubt that Shorsh has done this not without the knowledge, but with the energetic support of the leaders of the Amsterdam International. Who is splitting the trade unions? Who is undermining the unity of the workers? What must be done by the workers who are re-establishing the free trade unions in Austria under most difficult conditions? Hand these trade unions over to Citizen Shorsh, hereditary perpetual leader and anointed by God? The workers cannot hand over the leadership of their trade unions to those who led them to defeat. And if Shorsh and Co. have taken the path leading to a split, the worse for them. Will not the Swedish "eye-witness" and the Amsterdam International which stands behind him, give instructions to liquidate the Austrian and German free trade unions set up in the name of the "unity of the trade union movement"?

\* \* \*

If the example of France, Austria and Germany shows how harmful for the working class movement is the slogan of the liquidation of the class trade unions, advanced by the reformist leaders, then still more clearly evident is the harm and absurdity of the Amsterdam slogan that the Profintern should be liquidated. We do not doubt that the Amsterdam International would not be above liquidating the international centre of the revolutionary trade union movement. We do not doubt that such a liquidation of the international centre of the revolutionary trade union movement would cause great satisfaction to the leaders of the Amsterdam International. But what grounds are there for adopting such proposals? What would they give to the working class? Can the members of the reformist trade unions assert that the Amsterdam International is an international fighting organisation?

### **Is the Amsterdam International a Workers' International?**

Formally, of course, the Amsterdam International is an international organisation, for it has statutes, an executive committee, it issues a bulletin, it has its press, and calls congresses, etc. But any kind of international organisation abounds in these things, whether it is a stamp collecting society, whether it is a church music lovers' society, or anything else of that kind. But we are within our rights in demanding something more, something greater, of a workers' international than from all kinds of voluntary international societies and organisations. From a workers' international we demand first and foremost that it should carry on a constant and systematic struggle for the immediate interests of the working class, that it should organise the class struggle against the whole of the capitalist system, that this international should carry on the struggle against those of its members who replace the class struggle by class collaboration, and who betray the interests of the masses of the workers. We are within our rights in demanding of a workers' international that the interests of the workers of a single country should be subordinated to the interests of the entire international proletariat, that this international should carry on a really practical struggle against fascism, and that it should carry on a constant and unswerving struggle against war.

If we look at the Amsterdam International from this angle, then can we call it a really proletarian international? No, we cannot, because it declares openly against the class struggle, and is in favour of the policy of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie, because it has not only not taken any measures to sharply condemn the leaders of the free trade unions in Germany and Austria, who betrayed the working masses in the eyes of the whole world, but supported these leaders and declared its solidarity with their policy. This international has not expelled from its ranks those individuals who led the working class of Germany and Austria to defeat, thereby indicating its solidarity with them, and support and justification of their policy. What is more, the entire policy of the Amsterdam International is directed towards making the policy and tactics pursued by the Austro-German trade unions an example for all countries. We are within our rights, therefore, in asking the following question: What guarantees have the workers in England, Sweden, Denmark, Czechoslovakia and Poland, that the leaders of their trade unions who maintain the same political position as did their Austro-German colleagues, will not lead the working class in these various countries along the German path?

### **Liquidate the Profintern?**

What would happen if we were to accept the proposal made by the Amsterdamites, and were to

liquidate the Profintern? Who would gain from this act? The workers? No! They would lose, because the Profintern has, over a period of 15 years, done all in its power to support the workers in all countries in their struggle. It is the bourgeoisie who would gain, the bourgeoisie which would be rid of an hostile and anti-capitalist revolutionary organisation. So then, for what purpose have we to liquidate the Profintern? The leaders of the Amsterdam International say that we must do this so as to bring about the unity of the trade union movement. But why must unity be established on the basis of the liquidation of the revolutionary international? Unity cannot arise out of the liquidation of the Profintern. The result of such a step will not be unity but simply capitulation to the policy and tactics of the reformists. The reformists demand the liquidation of the revolutionary trade unions and of the Profintern so that they may continue their policy unhindered and without penalty. But this policy has gone bankrupt! It has led the working class of Germany and Austria to defeat. So that, the whole point of the proposals regarding the liquidation of the Profintern emanating from the leaders of the Amsterdam International may be reduced to the following: **DON'T PREVENT US FROM LEADING THE WORKING CLASS ALONG THE AUSTRO-GERMAN PATH.** Such are the hidden motives of this international chatter about liquidating the revolutionary trade unions and the Profintern, which is being published in the entire reformist press.

The Amsterdamites have two further arguments in reserve, namely: (1) The Communists, they allege, split the trade unions, and therefore they must disband their organisations; (2) The reformist trade union organisations are very old organisations, and the social-democrats are historically the only inheritors of the best traditions of the working class movement. Let us examine these "arguments" as well. The split in the working class movement along political and trade union lines began fundamentally at the beginning of the war. Can it be said that the war policy of the German, Austrian and French trade unions corresponded to the traditions of the working class movement in these countries?

The historians and politicians of the trade union movement in these countries express their views on this theme unwillingly. Where and when did the congresses of the Socialist International declare that the slogan "Proletarians of all lands, unite!" should be replaced by the slogan "Proletarians of all lands, slaughter one another!" Where and when did the international congresses or national congresses of the free trade unions decide that the workers must unite with the bourgeoisie of their respective countries and that they must reject the class struggle and pass over to class collaboration? Such decisions were

made, but only at the congresses of the catholic and yellow trade unions. The trade unions which were affiliated to the pre-war trade union international did not make an official declaration in favour of class collaboration.

Even if the policy of class collaboration carried through by the leaders of the trade unions had been limited to the war alone, then that would have had to introduce a deep split into the working class movement, but this war policy was continued in the post-war period as well. The class struggle has been systematically driven out of the reformist trade unions. Revolutionary workers and entire organisations which have declared against class collaboration and have acted against the rejection of the best traditions of the working class movement, have been systematically expelled, in spite of the most elementary rules of trade union democracy. Thus, the revolutionary workers were obliged, in order to defend the direct and ultimate aims of the working class movement, to be up in arms against those who dragged the working class organisations into the bog of class collaboration, and to rally and unite all those who stood in defence of the principles and practice of the class struggle, for to reject the class struggle is to transform the working class into an appendage of monopolist capital. Where, then, lies the cause of the split in the working class movement? **THE BASIC REASON FOR THE SPLIT IN THE WORKING CLASS MOVEMENT IS THE PRE-WAR OPPORTUNISM AND SOCIAL IMPERIALIST POLICY AND THE POST-WAR CLASS COLLABORATION CARRIED ON BY INTERNATIONAL SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY AND THE LEADERS OF THE REFORMIST TRADE UNIONS.**

Anybody who does not understand or who does not wish to understand the cause of the split, may cry "unity, unity!" from morning to night, but no sense will come of it.

#### **Age or Policy?**

The legitimist argument is still less convincing than the attempt to throw the responsibility for the split on to the revolutionary workers. That the reformist trade unions are very old organisations is on the whole true. But age does not decide anything in such cases. What we need to ask ourselves is, why is it that a whole number of old trade union organisations have turned out to be outside the ranks of the Amsterdam International, and why is it that the young trade union movements of the U.S.S.R., China and of a number of other countries have created a new trade union international? The answer is because the Amsterdam International re-established in July, 1919, sanctified the military-imperialist policy of 1914 to 1918, because this international carried on an uninterrupted struggle against the October Revolution, and against the Party

and the trade unions which carried on a struggle against the whole capitalist world, because the Amsterdam International not only did not raise a finger to help the workers of the colonies in their struggle against imperialism, but on the contrary assisted imperialism to grind down the colonial peoples. Of what importance then, is the age of the organisation in such circumstances? What the workers are interested in is the POLICY which the trade unions are operating. That is why a silly impression is created by the talk of the reformist leaders of the C.G.T. of France about "come back to the old home," at a time when the workers of France are faced with the problem as to how to establish a united and strong trade union organisation, as to how to establish a powerful fortress for the struggle against the bourgeoisie. From whichever angle you approach it, from the historical, political, or organisational angle, there are no serious arguments in favour of liquidating the revolutionary trade union movement, while there are thousands and thousands of arguments in favour of uniting the trade unions on the basis of the class struggle.

In their search for arguments against the unity of the trade union movement, not only do they set into operation all kinds of "eye-witnesses," but they juggle with facts, and falsify documents. This operation has been performed by the assistant secretary of the Amsterdam International, Schtoltz, who has occupied himself in making historical investigations in respect to the statutes of the Profintern. Mr. Schtoltz asserts that "the trade unions and the Party are one and the same thing to the Communists." It is true that this assertion is at loggerheads with facts, but evidently all the worse for the facts!

#### **Are the Party and the Trade Unions One and the Same Thing?**

Let us take two or three countries, and we shall see that such an assertion has nothing in common with the truth. In the U.S.S.R., the Communist Party has about 3 million members, whereas the trade unions have 19 million members. Can we say that the trade unions and the Party are one and the same thing? In France there are about 50,000 members in the Party, whereas the Unitary Trade Unions (revolutionary.—Ed.) have about 300,000 members. Can it be said that the Party and the trade unions are one and the same thing? We could quote dozens more of examples, but these are sufficient to show the whole superficial nature of such kinds of arguments. Organisationally, the trade unions and the Party are not one and the same thing.

But perhaps the trade unions and the Party are one and the same thing politically? Such an assertion would also be incorrect. The Communist

Party and the revolutionary trade unions have one and the same end in view. But they are different organisations, which have their own special tasks, and forms and methods of struggle. But perhaps this is not the point, but that the revolutionary trade unions are led by Communists? I do not know what essence the author embodied in his assertion, but it is a fact that the revolutionary trade unions are in the majority led by Communists, just as the reformist unions are in the majority led by social-democrats. Why may this social-democrat stand at the head of a trade union, and a Communist not do so? Why may the Social-Democratic Party and the free trade unions act together, and the revolutionary trade unions and the Communist Party not do so? Or perhaps the social-democrats who stand at the head of the trade unions are not social-democrats, not members of their party? Hitherto we have known quite the opposite. The leaders of the Swedish trade unions have been and are now members of the Social-Democratic Party. The leaders of the reformist C.G.T. in France are members of the Socialist Party, while some of them are members of the Neo-Socialist Party.\* The leaders of the trade unions in England are members of the Labour Party, and so on. But why may not the leaders of the revolutionary trade unions and other trade unions be members of the Communist Party? The revolutionary workers will not ask the reformists whether they should join the Communist Party or not. This is not the business of the reformists, this is our business and let the reformists put this in their pipe and smoke it, once and for all.

The second circumstance discovered by Mr. Scholtz has been very simply formulated by him. The statutes of the Profintern makes provisions for contacts with the Communist International, and the Profintern is allegedly a Section of the Communist International.

#### **The Profintern and the Communist International.**

Had Citizen Scholtz set himself the task of clearing up the truth, and not of falsifying documents, he might very easily have established the fact that the Profintern is not a Section of the Communist International. There are the decisions of the Second Congress of the Profintern and the Comintern in this connection. But what in actual fact is the situation? Joint action is undertaken by the Comintern and the Profintern on various questions. Scholtz considers that such kind of mutual relations are to be condemned. But why may the Amsterdam International act jointly with the Socialist International? Why is it that the bureau of the Amsterdam International often holds sessions together with the bureau of the

Socialist International, and whence has Mr. Scholtz taken the idea that the revolutionary workers will allow anybody to forbid them to display their political views, and to ask the Amsterdamites whether they may join the Communist Party? Let it be borne in mind that the individuals who stand at the head of the Amsterdam International take the liberty of being members at the same time of the Social-Democratic Party and the Second International. Why, then, do these social-democrats imagine that the workers will agree to a situation where a united trade union organisation should be composed of citizens who have full rights (social-democrats, and of citizens without full rights (the Communists). No gentlemen, you will not get away with this!

Whether the Amsterdamites are satisfied or not we shall continue in the future to act jointly with the Communist International, to organise all kinds of campaigns along with them, and to support all actions undertaken by the Communist International, directed towards the defence of the immediate interests of the working masses, and we shall support the struggle carried on by the Communist International for the overthrow of capitalism and establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Mr. Scholtz does not like this? We are very little disturbed by this. We revolutionary proletarians like this, and we shall continue to carry on in this way. Mr. Scholtz does not like the fact that the statutes of the Profintern advance the demand for a struggle against conciliation with the bourgeoisie, and are against the idea of business collaboration between the classes and social peace. It is not surprising that he does not like this, for collaboration with the bourgeoisie, as well as active co-operation with the latter and social peace, are the foundations of the programme of the Amsterdam International. No, we do not propose to change the fundamental principles of our International, we do not propose to hack away the foundations on which our International is built.

In his anxiety about the well-being of the Profintern, and about adapting its statutes to the new situation, Mr. Scholtz writes further as follows:—

“The Profintern is directly responsible for the things done and acts committed by the countries and groups affiliated to it. Either the Profintern must alter its statutes, and from the formal point of view must endorse the line carried through by its French section, or, if this section advances its proposals seriously, it must recognise that the principles of its International have lost their weight as far as it is concerned. There is no third possibility.”

Imagine that there is a third possibility. This is a possibility which Mr. Scholtz has least of all foreseen. The tactics pursued by our C.G.T.U., and its proposals regarding unity do not in the least degree contradict either the statutes or the principles of the Profintern. The Profintern wholly and completely supports its French section, for the unification of the

\* Neo-Socialists—a fascist break-away from the French Socialist Party, led by Renaudel, etc.—Ed.

trade unions on the basis of the class struggle can only increase the fighting power of the French proletariat. Why? Because the Profintern, from the very first days of its existence has stood for the united front and for the unity of the trade union movement in each separate country, and on an international scale. Hundreds of documents exist in this connection, which Mr. Scholtz, with his love for historical investigation may very easily seek out. But the following question arises: Why is it that this assistant secretary of the Amsterdam International has all of a sudden taken to historical investigation and to the study of our statutes? The answer is a very simple one, and can be found at the end of the article where Mr. Scholtz makes the following declaration:—

“As regards the statutes of the International Federation of Trade Unions, they have completely preserved their force up to date, because they contain nothing which even in the slightest degree contradicts its policy, and also the latest line of the Profintern in the sphere of the struggle for democracy, freedom and the independence of the trade unions.”

Although this statement is a very cunning one, it is sufficiently clear. The point to it is a very simple one, namely, that the practical activity of the Profintern has allegedly come into contradiction with the principles on which its statutes were built up. The statutes, then, of the Profintern must be thrown overboard. The practical activity of the Amsterdam International, on the other hand, does not contradict its principles, and its statutes preserve their full weight. Hence, the Profintern must reject its own statutes, and adopt those of the Amsterdam International, and in this connection put an end to its existence.

The picture would not be complete if we did not refer to the statements made by other leaders of the Amsterdam International. During his presence at the Norwegian Trades Union Congress, Chevenel, the General Secretary of the Amsterdam International, gave his impressions to the correspondent of the central newspaper of the Norwegian Labour Party, the “Arbeiter-Bladet.”

Chevenel considers that “the International trade union movement has good prospects.” To prove this he let himself go on a journey beyond the seas, and declared that the Amsterdam International has contacts with the trade union movements in America, Australia, New Zealand, Japan, India, Chile, Argentina and Brazil, etc.

Chevenel not only made no statement as to the character of these contacts—evidently so as not to spoil the joyous perspectives indicated by him—but “forgot” to make any statement as to the state of things with regard to the free trade unions in Germany and Austria. It has remained a secret as to whether the Amsterdam International supports the re-

established free trade unions in Germany and Austria, or not. Chevenel preferred to speak in great detail about the Storm and Defence Detachments, about the situation in the National-Socialist Party, but he did not have enough time to make any statement as to the state of affairs in the German and Austrian trade union movements. Replying to a question as to the attitude of the Amsterdam International to the united front, Chevenel replied that: “We regard it as a manoeuvre.” As regards the unity of the trade union movement, this is not, according to him, an international problem at all, for “the trade union movement is split in only one country, namely in France.”

#### **Is the Trade Union Movement Split in Only One Country?**

And so “the new and kindly” secretary of the Amsterdam International makes the assertion that the trade union movement is united throughout the whole world. We are within our rights in demanding of the secretary of an international organisation a little more information about the state of things. But we shall not interfere in his personal business, but shall take a look as to what is taking place in reality.

Apart from France, parallel revolutionary and reformist trade unions exist in Spain, Czechoslovakia, Greece, Bulgaria, Rumania, Austria, Germany, Italy, Japan, U.S.A., Chile, Brazil, Argentine, Cuba, Uruguay, Canada, China, Phillipines, etc. In a number of countries (China, Italy, Cuba, Chile, etc.) the revolutionary trade unions are far stronger than the reformist unions, while in the other countries the reformist trade unions are stronger than the revolutionary unions. There are a number of countries where the revolutionary trade unions were dispersed, and all their property handed over to the reformist unions (Finland and Jugoslavia). To make the assertion, under such circumstances, that with the exception of France the trade union movement is united throughout the whole world, is, to say the least of it, to certify one’s own ignorance.

But Chevenel none the less displayed a certain knowledge of geography when he called to mind the existence of the trade unions in the U.S.S.R. And the key he has to this question is as follows:—

“On an international scale unity can only consist of the Russian trade unions affiliating to the Amsterdam International.”

In such cases the French say, “C’est simple comme bonjour!” (As simple as saying how do you do.) Mr. Chevenel “forgets” that the trade unions in the U.S.S.R. have two and a half times more members than there are in the whole of the Amsterdam International, and that the trade unions of the U.S.S.R., are unions functioning in a country where the proletarian revolution has been victorious. He forgets that to have carried into life the programme and

tactics of the Amsterdam International in the U.S.S.R. would have meant the restoration of capitalism and the advent of black counter-revolution. In addition, Mr. Chevenel proposes that the Comintern should reject its own policy, and "put an end to its sabotage of and activity against the trade union movement," and then, he alleges, real unity will be brought about.

If we add the foul lies published in the Norwegian paper, the "Medelelsblat," by Chevenel's colleagues who declare that "the Communists have already brought about unity and unification with the national-socialists and fascists," then we will understand in what direction Messrs. the Amsterdamites are dragging the international trade union movement.

How are we to explain such a line of thought in the minds of the leading officials of the Amsterdam International? We must explain it by the fact that they do not wish to recognise the causes which led to the destruction of the German and Austrian trade unions. Chevenel is kind enough to allow the Soviet trade unions to affiliate to the Amsterdam International. This, of course, is stupendous liberalism on his part. Chevenel would have done better had he done a little thinking prior to giving the interview and then he would have come to the conclusion that the problem of the unity of the trade union movement, even if there were no longer any revolutionary trade unions outside of the U.S.S.R., could not be solved simply by affiliation to the Amsterdam International.

One of my opponents has been very much upset with me at the statement I made that "Communism means victory, while reformism means defeat." My assertion was based on the experience of seventeen years of struggle waged by the C.P.S.U. and the revolutionary trade unions in the U.S.S.R., and on the basis of 16 years of struggle by German social-democracy and the German trade unions. If my opponent is dissatisfied, let him show us where and when reformism has brought victory to the working class. He can hardly base his case on the Labour governments in England and on the social-democratic governments in Sweden and Denmark. There were such governments in Germany and Austria, and everybody knows how things ended there.

Thus, both the Swedish "eye-witness" and the Amsterdam secretaries, Scholtz and Chevenel, are driving at the one point which amounts to the following: "Disband the red trade unions, liquidate the Profintern and then a united trade union movement will be re-established on the basis of the principles and tactics of the statutes of the Amsterdam International."

The fact that the Amsterdamites are beginning to repeat these proposals of theirs more and more

frequently, does not make them any more convincing and acceptable. The unity of the trade union movement is being hammered out in the ranks of the working class in spite of the leaders of the Amsterdam International. It is being hammered out in the joint struggle of the workers against the capitalist offensive, and against fascism and war. It is being hammered out at joint conferences and congresses, where the delegates define their policy and tactics. We are prepared to re-establish the unity of the trade union movement on a national and international scale, in spite of the lies and inventions of the enemies of the revolutionary trade union movement. We have displayed our will for unity in France. The Amsterdamites displayed their will to split the movement, at Weymouth, in the speeches made by the leaders of the reformist trade union movement. But we are not losing heart, we are convinced that the will of the masses for unity will overcome all obstacles.

And there are still many obstacles in the way. Above all, the entire bourgeoisie is against the re-establishment of the unity of the split trade union movement in a solid front. Why? Because a united trade union movement on the basis of the class struggle implies a rallying of the forces of the working class, and this is something which is necessary now more than ever. Who must bear the burden of the crisis, the bourgeoisie or the toiling masses—this is the problem which stands out sharply in all countries. The bourgeoisie have hitherto been able, by exerting and concentrating all their forces and thanks to the split in the trade union movement, to place the whole burden of the crisis on the backs of the toiling masses. Every day brings ever new misery for the working class, fascism runs rife in a number of countries, and a new imperialist war is advancing on toiling mankind. Anyone who acts against the rallying of the workers' forces, against the unity of the trade union movement, is the worst enemy of the working class, whatever his subjective intentions may be. This is why the sharpest struggle must be directed against those leaders of the reformist trade unions who seek out thousands of arguments in order to disrupt the will of the masses for the united front, for the unity of the trade union movement.

We know that the unity of the trade union movement is of advantage to the working class and, therefore will be victorious. But we also know that the unity of the trade union movement is being built up, and can be built up and be of use to the working class only when it is built up on the basis of the class struggle. This is the kind of unity for which we have been fighting since 1920, and this is the kind of unity of the trade union movement for which we will fight to the end.