

The Vienna Congress of the Amsterdam International

By A. LOSOVSKY.

General Secretary of the Red International of Labor Unions

Our predictions and worst forebodings are realized. The Left Wing was crushed by all the rules and regulations of the game. The saddest part of all this history is that the Left Wing failed to notice, or make an appearance that it did not notice, its own defeat.

The main point of difference, was as it is well known, the question of relations toward the Russian unions. Rosta informs, that the "Commission, after a hot debate, voted down by a majority the proposition of the English, (for reapproachment with the Russian unions) but accepted an additional resolution proposing a compromise." Wherein is the compromise?

According to the same source, the resolution expresses regret that the Soviet unions in consequence of their refusal to accept the statutes of the Amsterdam International are still to be considered outside of the International. "The Congress proposed to the Bureau of the Amsterdam International to take all possible measures to attract the Soviet trade unions into the international trade union movement without diminishing the authority in any respect of the Amsterdam

International, always adhering to the statutes and regulations of the Amsterdam International." The Rosta naively informs us that this "compromise" is evidently between the left and the right wing. Here, however, we must intercede for the right wing: they have not conceded one centimetre of their territory: in another form they once again repeated what they have often proposed before. "Accept our statutes, our authority and our League of Nations, and you will become worthy members of our well-intentioned International."

This is indeed quite clear. The Amsterdamers buried the English proposition according to the first section which the orators from the Left should have mentioned. But no, Fimmen "welcomes" the accepted resolution with reference to the question with the Soviet unions, which, to say the least, guarantees the possibility of negotiations with the Soviet unions. It emphasizes the fact that "altho the adherents of the approachment insisted upon a more definite and broad decision, however, one should be joyful (!) that it was possible to attain even such results." However, he proposes to strike out from the resolution the following words: "without diminishing the authority of the Amsterdam International!"

Indeed, one must possess a good dose of the joy of life in order to become exulted over this hypocritical

resolution of the reformists. This out of place exultation was emphasized by an experienced reformist politician, Zasenbach. He stated that the "acceptance of Fimmen's proposition created the impression that the Amsterdam International is ready to begin negotiations with the Soviet trade unions under any conditions, when in fact, negotiations are possible only in the event that the Soviet trade unions will give guarantees excluding the possibility of diminishing the authority of the Amsterdam International." After such a speech concerning "guarantees" reminding one of the memorandum concerning the guarantees of the English bankers, there is hardly any place left for illusions. However, should there be any shred of illusion concerning the possible policy of the Amsterdam International this shred should vanish after the elections of the leading organs.

In order to bind the English trade unions, Purcell is elected chairman. All possible "tendencies" on his part are guarded against by the composition of the Bureau and Council. The first vice-chairman is Leon Jouhaux, well known lackey of the French bourgeoisie. Mertens is chosen the second vice-chairman, a patriot of the Belgian fatherland, a defender of the League of Nations and the system of reparations. Leipart, is chosen as the third vice-chairman—a friend of Ebert and Noske, the most shameless

of all, who was present at the burial of Stinnes, and chairman of the All-German Federation of Trade Unions. The following secretaries were elected: an old reformist priest, Oudegest, Foxy Zasenbach, an old opportunist, and Brown, with a tendency to the left. Besides Bromley and Hicks of England, the following have been elected to the general council: Stegnius from Belgium, Luxemburg, and Holland; D'Arragoné from Italy; Grassman from Germany; Talerle from Czecho-Slovakia; Jastési from Hungary; Julovsky from Poland.

Every name here is a whole program of betrayal, treachery and shameless deceit of the workers. All these gentlemen long ago are in the role of strikebreakers and Fascist boot-blacks. There is hardly any doubt as to these facts among our English comrades with the composition of such a bureau and general council who will reign and who will rule. If one should take into consideration that the place of the International is Amsterdam, then the clever plan of the reformists will become quite clear; to place the political responsibility upon the English and to preserve political leadership in their own hands.

This political responsibility is no small one. In Vienna during the Congress, Jouhaux, the vice-president of the Amsterdam International, stated that he and the unions repre-

sented by him in questions concerning the reparations stand upon the basis of "project of the experts." The entire Amsterdam International as is well known, is for the reparations; in other words, that the toiling masses of Germany should pay the debts to the French, Belgian and English capitalists during a long number of years. The Amsterdam International is closely bound up with the robber League of Nations and the charlatan Bureau of Labor. The Congress of the Amsterdam International voted down the proposition of the English concerning the nationalization of the railroads, mines, natural resources, etc.

Would the English trade unions cover this anti-labor policy with their authority? With the distribution of the roles to the left element of England, as the result of the Vienna congress, they will have to answer for the arch-reactionary policy of their colleagues in the International. Is it possible that such honest and loyal to the working class movement comrades as Purcell, Bromley, and Cook, will take the responsibility on themselves of the reformists' anti-labor policy of Messrs. Jouhaux, Oudegest, d'Arragona, Mertens and other Leiparts? Of course not. Purcell, Cook, and Bromley are too honest revolutionary proletarians to take upon themselves such a role. What then? Let us await events, time will show.