

SPECIAL NUMBER

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

- INTERNATIONAL -

Vol. 5 No. 27

PRESS

6th April 1925

CORRESPONDENCE

Editorial Offices and Central Despatching Department: Berggasse 31, Vienna IX. — Postal Address, to which all remittances should be sent by registered mail: Postamt 66, Schliesstach 213, Vienna IX. Telegraphic Address: Inprecorr, Vienna.

Organisation Conference of the C. I.

5th Day of the Session. Moscow, March 19th, 1925.

Comrade Brown (Great Britain) in the chair.

Comrade Chabera (Czechoslovakia):

The reorganisation of the Party in the Bruenn district had at first misunderstandings to contend with because of the old social democratic tradition. It must be borne in mind that 90% of our members are former members of the Social Democratic Party. In Bruenn itself we have already established a considerable number of nuclei. Results are also satisfactory in the Ostrau mining district, whilst in Blansko, where the industry was almost completely destroyed as a consequence of the crisis, slower progress has been made. I hold with comrade Zapotocky that the question of reorganisation should not be made a question of left or right. We have some districts which notwithstanding their leftism have not done much in the matter of reorganisation. Reorganisation cannot on any account be carried out everywhere on the same pattern. We have as yet but few factory newspapers, but a beginning has been made in this direction. The Bruenn workers know that the nuclei must participate in all activity and I have shown this in connection with the high cost of living demonstrations. Comrade Piatnitsky is not right when he says that with us in Czechoslovakia the officials and the Party are two different things. The officials are only auxiliary organs of the Party, and by no means executive organs. As to the fractions we have already done much in this respect in Bruenn in the trade unions as well as in the cooperatives. In connection with the recent demonstrations the Communist fractions proposed a resolution in the Amsterdam trade unions which, although rejected, has shown the workers on what lines our work is conducted. The Bruenn comrades understand the meaning of the present reorganisation, but they want it to be prepared ideologically as well as in accordance with a definitive plan.

Comrade Tellini (Italy):

Under fascist reaction our Party has organised on a territorial basis and this enabled us to preserve our cadres during the most violent period of reaction. In the Italian industrial centres, (Turin, Milan, Genoa, Trieste, Venice, etc.), the reorganisation of the Party on the factory nucleus basis has

already been accomplished to the extent of 70% of the Party membership. In Milan 75% of the Party members are grouped in 45 nuclei. At Genoa, Trieste, etc. the number of nuclei is practically equal to that in Milan.

At Turin and Milan the factory Council movement allowed us to form Communist groups within the factories. The suppression of the labour movement destroyed the factory councils, the communist groups and the people's clubs and institutions; only our old territorial organisation remained. But a few months after the fascists seized power, our Party regained contact with the factories and reformed the old Communist groups. These groups which made particular headway in Turin, greatly helped us in reorganising the Party into factory nuclei and also in our recruiting campaigns. They are led and controlled by our nuclei.

Our nuclei meet outside the factories and publish the following illegal newspapers: *L'Ordine Nuovo*, *la Veifa*, *l'Officine*, *la Portolongone*, etc. which are issued at the time of all important political events. More than 200,000 copies of these papers were distributed at Turin and Milan during 1924.

The nuclei perform very important work within the trade unions and call to action those of our comrades whose attitude was hitherto passive in the Party.

Comrade Gywan (Berlin):

I must say a word of warning concerning the unjustified criticism of comrade Piatnitsky which is liable to undermine the authority of the Executive among the rank and file members of the Party in Germany. Comrade Piatnitsky gives as an example the January demonstration in Berlin, singling out three Berlin districts, which are supposed to have coped with reorganisation better than the other districts and whose participation in the demonstration was therefore the most satisfactory. It is nothing of the kind. It is a fact that the third district occupied first place in the demonstration although it has not done more nor less towards reorganisation than the other districts. The demonstration was held on a Sunday, and one cannot judge of the progress of the organisation by the attendance, because the workers who live mostly at a great distance from their places of employment joined the residential organisations on the occasion of these demonstrations. Comrade Piatnitsky

makes a serious accusation against the German Party when he asserts that the officials of the German Party are merely appointed. I want to emphasise that at least 95% of the officials of our Party are factory workers who would most decidedly refuse to be appointed. Comrade Piatnitsky could only have accused us of holding nuclei meetings only once a month because he does not know the actual working of things in Germany. We will endeavour to carry out the reorganisation of the Party as rapidly as possible, but we cannot ignore the difficulties which our speakers have already pointed out. As to the reports of the representatives of the various Parties they make the impression of being at times too rosy. This impression was particularly strong when the youth representative was making his report, and I can say from my own experience that the reorganisation of the youth in Berlin was by no means as easy as the report of the youth representative leads one to believe. I am extremely sorry that we have not had here a report from the Russian Party which could have no doubt taught us much.

Comrade Wellmann (Germany):

There is one thing which struck me particularly in comrade Piatnitsky's report, and I should like him to explain it in his concluding remarks. He declared that the German Party functionaries refused to begin with the reorganisation of the Party on a factory nuclei basis. I should like Comrade Piatnitsky to tell us from whom he has received this information. This assertion is contrary to the report given us through the press correspondence. The various reports which we have already received from the German comrades have pointed out the difficulties under which we have to work. In answer to Comrade Piatnitsky's assertion that we did not conduct the work with sufficient energy, I can only remind you of the catastrophic state of affairs in our organisation after the October defeat, the result of prolonged reformist leadership. We had to proceed very slowly with the reconstruction of the organisation. From the reports of the other sections, I should like to deal only with the reports of the Czechish comrades. The report presented by comrade Chabera, who said that the Czechish Party in his district had captured several institutions, is all very well, but what is the good of it if there is no clear conception within the communist fraction how the strict and straightforward Bolshevik line of action is to be carried out. We in Germany can also say that we are capturing the trade unions. But we go very cautiously about it. If we have so much influence in Czechoslovakia, how is it possible for a consumers' cooperative in which communist influence predominates, to refuse to have the vote taken on the resolution adopted at the communist cooperative congress. I would also like to refer to the discussion in the Czechish parliamentary fraction which considered the advisability or non-advisability of carrying out a decision of the Central Committee. Our members are well informed of these matters, and they take care that such things do not happen in Germany.

Comrade Harus (Czechoslovakia):

Is think it is unfortunate that whenever a delegation comes here from Czechoslovakia, it represents various viewpoints. But I cannot agree with everything comrade Zapotocky said in his report on the reorganisation of our Party. I shall have to deal with this matter from another standpoint and will have to make several corrections. The various districts have stated here their points of view. With us, reorganisation met at first with many objections not only on the part of the workers, but what is much more important, on the part of the higher officials. Comrade Zapotocky himself had to admit that we are still very weak in the big industrial concerns. He also declared that in the question of reorganisation there is no difference between right and left, and that in the Pilsen and Ostrau districts which have the reputation of being left districts, reorganisation is in a bad way. And yet the comrade who represents Ostrau here declared that as long as there was a right district secretary in Ostrau, the reorganisation made no progress, whilst one hundred nuclei have already been established in the district since it has come under a left leadership. On the other hand, we see that in Prague, where the right wing holds sway, reorganisation did not make any pro-

gress for a long time. It has been said that one must be particularly cautious with reorganisation, because it is precisely at this juncture, that the State apparatus may be very dangerous to us. Of course one must be cautious, but the fact is that there has been no reorganisation plan until the left leadership produced one. In our efforts to form fractions, we meet with the opposition of many officials, both of the Party and of the Red Trade Unions. When Comrade Chabera says that we hold everything in our hands in Brünn, I can only repeat what the German comrade said: what is the good of it all if we lack the right communist policy. I myself was threatened with expulsion from the organisation if I were to try to form a fraction.

Comrade Winterich (Germany):

Those who have seen the organisation commission at the Fifth Congress will have to admit that considerable progress has been made since that time. In answer to comrade Piatnitsky's arguments, I must say that the German Party has learned by its own experience to use the necessary caution also in the matter of reporting. We have seen how the former central committee frequently got into awkward situations because it allowed itself to be deluded by the districts. The reports of the sections, including the German Section, were perhaps not sufficiently detailed, and thus I account for the aggressive attitude of Comrade Piatnitsky towards the German Party. On the other hand, I am compelled to say that the reporting of the organisation department is also far from perfect. As to fixing an exact date, I must say that there cannot be anyone who believes in all earnest that the entire complex question of reorganisation can be solved within a fixed space of time. By confronting the members suddenly with a whole complex of questions, confusion only will result. The factory nuclei question must be discussed also where there is unemployment. The prolonged unemployment of our comrades in the German Party has produced in a certain section of our members a certain amount of passivity. Through the establishment of factory nuclei, new blood is to be introduced into the Party by the workers engaged in the process of production. Comrade Piatnitsky was particularly hard on the German Section. But it is only just to point out that we in Germany are this year entering already into the third election campaign.

Up to October 1923, we had in Germany about 6,000 fractions within the various organisations. After the collapse, when the new Central Committee took over the leadership only 300 fractions remained out of this 6,000. This shows what an enormous piece of work was before the new Central Committee. Comrade Piatnitsky mentioned the dwindling membership. Of course, we lost members after the October events. But we cannot say that we lost members through the reorganisation itself. On the contrary, the Party is growing stronger. We do not say that everything is first rate with us, we are aware of our mistakes and shortcomings and wish to remedy them by earnest work, in order to place our Party gradually on a healthy organisational basis. Comrade Piatnitsky is also mistaken with respect to the Party functionaries. As an example, I want to say that we are preparing in our district a district conference now. This is done by announcing the convocation of the district party congress through the press and by preparing our members ideologically for it. The Central Committee appoints only the higher officials.

Comrade Lindner (Czechoslovakia):

With regard to the reorganisation of the Czechish Party on a factory nuclei basis, I must say that there is still much to be done. There are enterprises where unfortunately, there is not a single communist member. In this respect the Party must do better in future. We must demand of the Central Committee that the reorganisation is carried out not only in a few districts, but in all districts. It is not enough to form nuclei, one must give them something to do. At the Reichenberg railway station, 300 railwaymen are organised in reformist unions. We succeeded in forming a nucleus with about 70 members, and at the last general

meeting, we managed to capture through systematic nucleus work the entire committee of this group. I should also like to point out that we have great difficulties with the comrades in the rural communes. In some districts we have reached in the reorganisation the point when the old district organisations have already entirely disappeared. But in our district we have elaborated a plan. We make it incumbent on the districts by the end of March to bring at least 20 % of workers in the enterprises into the nuclei. We have also stipulated that more nuclei be formed in the various districts.

Comrade Formanek (Kladno- Czechoslovakia):

It is perfectly clear that no one in Czechoslovakia has sabotaged reorganisation. In Kladno most of our workers are employed only 3 days in the week. This has caused a certain passivity among our members. We held in our district about 150 meetings but we did not say that this was a dictate from Moscow which must be carried out, but explained to them the necessity to introduce a new form of organisation. We have already in 1918, 1919, and 1920 political factory councils which discussed all political questions. Our district turned its attention at first to the problems of the Marxist left and of the Russian Revolution. That is why we could make such good progress in the December strike in 1920 — throughout the Republic, we were the first in this revolutionary movement. When we first started with the reorganisation it was expected that persecution would become more relentless. Efforts are being made here to create the impression that the so-called right does not carry on the reorganisation with sufficient energy. Who has worked out the plan for the reorganisation of the Party? It was the so-called right and now when all the plans are made and the statistics compiled, efforts are made to ascribe all that has been hitherto done to the new leaders. Fraction work in Czechoslovakia is making good progress. As an example of this I should like to say that in the Kladno district no one can be a member of the factory committee, or factory council who has not been at least three years in the Party.

Comrade Schuller (YCI):

It seemed here at times as if there were certain differences between the German Party and the Organisation Department. But one cannot conceal the fact that after the October events our Party in Germany had to overcome great difficulties. To this was added the Party crisis and the three election campaigns. If one compares what the German Party has achieved with the achievements of the other sections, one is compelled to say that the German report is among the best which has been heard here. On the other hand, the German comrades must not run away with the idea that a dead set is being made against them here. Friendly criticism is indispensable, and the German comrades themselves admit that they are not satisfied with the present state of affairs in the German organisation. The Berlin comrade used here an argument which is fraught with danger. He thought that the reason for the slow progress is the brilliant work done by the old residential form of organisation and the reluctance to give it up. As a matter of course we must proceed with the reorganisation in such a way that we do not lose the advantages which have already been achieved. But the more important work of the Party is in the factories. Much has been said concerning the experiences of our Berlin youth. But one should not draw the conclusion that the Berlin youth is synonymous with the German League or the entire YCI. But the Berlin youth have given themselves four weeks to accomplish their reorganisation contrary to the plan of the said German League. Nevertheless, the Berlin example is not so bad, for we can see now that the membership has not dwindled and that a steady increase of members has been maintained. The youth were here the only organisation which reported that such and such a number of nuclei had been formed, but that only such and such a number have already started work. It would have been desirable that the other sections too had been so out-

spoken in their reports. Moreover, the young comrades of the various leagues have also declared that the figures given in Comrade Gypfner's report have already been exceeded and that the number of nuclei in their countries has already considerably increased. It must be understood that efforts must be made to lose as few of the old members as possible and that we must put up a fight for every individual comrade. Re-organisation must go hand in hand with the recruiting of members, not only in order to make up for an eventual loss of membership, but also in order to double, nay, treble the membership. This for instance applies particularly to Great Britain. I agree with comrade Winterich, that compared with the last conference, considerable progress has been made, that we are not going to rest content with it and intend to go further and further.

Comrade Suzanne (France):

In the course of the discussion at the organisation conference upon the reorganisation of the Communist Parties on the basis of factory nuclei, the delegates have enumerated the difficulties met with in the accomplishment of this task.

While recognising the enormity of the task of reorganisation and the real difficulties it brings with it, it must be pointed out, however, that some of them are exaggerated, if not fictitious.

Among the latter there is the point most often brought up as an impediment to the rapid reorganisation of the Parties; the social democratic traditions still very deeply rooted within the Communist Parties born of the social democracy.

Our comrades tell us that the Party members, accustomed to old forms of organisation, accept only with difficulty, with reluctance, the reorganisation decided upon by the International, and that sometimes — cases are numerous — they have wholly refused to carry it out.

However, it would seem in conformity with all logic that this statement is erroneous, or if it be exact, it would be of value to examine the reasons for it.

When a worker in the course of the different scissions in the various Social Democratic parties abandons the old parties to follow us into the ranks of the C. I., he does it no doubt because he has condemned the policy, the activity and the methods of struggle of the Party he is leaving and has approved those laid down by the C. I. If this were not so he would not be with us.

From the instant when a worker prefers our organisation in making a choice to that of his old Party, his spirit is ready to understand, to approve and **To Carry Out** all the decisions of the C. I. to the degree that we are able to render them clear and comprehensible to him, that we show him that they serve the realisation of the goal he is striving for in the ranks of the C. I., that is to say, the preparation of the revolution.

If in a party, a considerable number of the members has not understood the entire importance of reorganisation upon the basis of factory nuclei, it is because the ideological preparation has been insufficient or because it was not presented in its true aspect.

In the French Party the campaign for reorganisation was based on the tasks set by the Fifth Congress, on the slogans of the Third, Fourth and Fifth Congresses; "To the Masses!" "Conquer the Masses!" "Become a Party of the Masses!" When in all the meetings of the Party there were explained in detail the multifarious means which the Party should employ to get the masses away from our opponents and to group, to organise them around the Party, all the active elements in the C. P. F. set to work.

The centre of initiative has moved down toward the bottom. It was at the bottom of the Party that in so short a space of time the reorganisation of the most important regions was realised, despite all the social democratic, syndicalist and anarchist traditions so deeply rooted in the masses of the French proletariat.

Another difficulty pointed out was the distance of the place of residence from the place of work. Here again experience has shown us how easily this may be overcome.

Wherever the nuclei have been able to organise their work, to distribute it among all the members in such a fashion

that each member takes an active part in agitation and propaganda within the factory, in the organisation of meetings at the gates, etc., we saw that at each meeting of the nucleus the number of members grew, attracted by the results obtained in joint work, work which has become much more interesting, much more alive, than it had ever been in any of the old sections.

At present it is not unusual to see nuclei, the majority of whose members live very far from the factory, meet for an hour and a half or even two and a half, three hours, for the questions under discussion are no longer something abstract and as formerly, purely theoretical, but are directly linked up with the daily life of the factory with what closely affects almost all the workers. And then the circumstance of getting home somewhat later than usual is now merely a very small inconvenience, largely compensated for by the satisfaction of an activity the results of which are both visible and tangible.

A third point is the fear of the loss of members inevitably accompanying the reorganisation of the Party.

Our comrades have been so disturbed by this fear that they have completely forgotten all the advantages which the reorganisation upon a new basis brings from the point of view of recruiting.

The French Party had and still has at the present moment losses of members during the process of its reorganisation. But what are the elements it has lost? The intellectual, social democratic or anarchist elements, still within its ranks or inactive workers incapable of carrying on an active struggle who are only a dead weight upon the Party. But on the other hand, how many new young, fighting elements it has gained. Since the reorganisation of certain districts, it has experienced uninterrupted influx of new members, who have come to it because it is a Party of revolutionary action **Because it has Broken with all the Traditions of Social Democracy.**

The new recruits of the Party exceed by far the losses sustained as a result of reorganisation.

One little example: at the end of February 1924, the CDF. had distributed 30,000 membership cards; at end of February 1925, 60,000 cards were demanded by the districts and nuclei.

This does not mean that no steps should be taken to avoid the loss of members. On the contrary, it is necessary for the Party to retain every healthy element within it, all the elements capable of becoming good fighters, good Communists. But what we must avoid is remaining rooted on this point and forgetting the essential thing, that is, that the reorganisation of the Parties on the basis of factory nuclei must be accompanied by a big recruiting campaign.

It is toward this goal that the entire activity of the Party must be directed; reorganisation and increase of membership.

And finally, a fourth circumstance was pointed out as hindering the reorganisation of the Parties; the members fear of employers' reprisals.

We have also met with this apprehension among the members of the French Party, but we overcome it at the very beginning by working out together with our comrades the methods of underground work in the nuclei.

A nucleus meets in a place known only to its members. The distribution of leaflets and the factory newspapers, and the pasting up of posters are done illegally. The sale of newspapers at the factory gate is done by a member of an adjoining nucleus, just as in the factory meetings organised by the nucleus, a comrade from the district or from another nucleus speaks.

The rare cases in which members of the Party were dismissed because of membership in the nuclei happened only because the nuclei in question did not comply with the methods of work or because the members imprudently and uselessly labelled themselves as members of the Party.

If at this moment our Parties are weak, and if in many countries the employers have been able to persecute our members with such ferocity, that is due to the circumstance that our comrades were isolated in the factory, had little or no influence on the mass of workers, so that their dismissal called forth no reaction on the part of their working colleagues.

The situation will be very much different when our comrades firmly organised in the factories, will have absorbed all the revolutionary elements of the factory into the nucleus through collective and methodical work, and will have obtained the confidence of a considerable section of the workers. The employers will then think twice before discharging a member of a factory nucleus, knowing that the Party is no longer alone in the defence of its members, but that the masses themselves may take up the defence.

All the efforts of our members must be directed towards the attainment of such a state of affairs. This can only be brought about through the rapid and total reorganisation of our Parties in the shortest possible period.

Comrade Kopenig (Austria):

We in Austria can build our nuclei only by refraining from paying too much attention to the local organisation. Often we build our nuclei in opposition to the wishes of the local organisation whose opposition comes from the relics of social democratic ideology in most cases. Where we have left the work of reorganising to the local committees, no progress has been made. Only when the Central Committee established direct contact with the factories, was any success achieved.

In spite of all the difficulties, we have now 110 nuclei of which 60 are in Vienna and 50 in the provinces. Many of these nuclei exist so far merely on paper and have not yet commenced to function. On the other hand, many are working well and through them we have achieved successes. Where nuclei exist, our influence in the factories has increased.

The whole of the Social Democratic Party apparatus was mobilised against the factory councils. The Social Democracy works hand in hand with the employers so that the factory nuclei "in democratic Austria" have frequently to work under illegal conditions. There have been two cases in which editors of factory newspapers have been prosecuted. Communists are dismissed from the factories.

So far we have succeeded in publishing 7 factory newspapers with more or less regularity. We regard the attachment of members not employed in a particular factory to the nucleus of that factory as an important means for capturing the factories, particularly, large works where we have very few communists. We think we will have to abandon the idea of forming street nuclei as they very easily serve as a pretext for neglecting the work of reorganisation.

The defects in the discipline of the trade union fractions must be attributed to the old fractional struggles which now have been partly overcome. The revolutionary elements in the trade unions have been organised in a so-called "bloc". The organisation of fractions has either not been carried out in view of the fact that the majority in these "blocs" consists of communists or where they have been organised, they do not function. The "blocs" unfortunately serve many comrades as a pretext for ignoring fraction discipline.

Our fractions among the unemployed are well organised, and as a consequence we are able to do good work. Through our fractions we are able to influence the whole of the unemployed movement.

The reorganisation of factory nuclei demanded great efforts from the party. It is thanks largely to the work of our factory nuclei and to the fractions among the unemployed that we were able to organise an imposing demonstration, a few weeks ago, for the first time for two years in which approximately 7,000 workers took part.

Comrade Ferrat (Young Communist League of France):

There is a period during reorganisation when factory nuclei and local organisations exist side by side. But a time comes when the old organisations must be dissolved. The formation of street nuclei has been found unnecessary.

If the number of those attached to the enterprises does not in some cases come up even to 30 %, it is not tragic, as this is not likely to remain so and as, through the development of the nuclei, the number of factory workers is sure to grow.

Neither must the loss of members be taken too tragically, as the acquisition of good workers through the reorganisation more than compensates for the loss. But it is very important that the reorganisation be accomplished by a recruiting campaign.

One cannot estimate too highly the question of newspapers — they are the thermometer of party work. It is true that the factory nucleus is itself to be responsible for the newspapers, but it does not really matter very much if the executive helps the nuclei to a certain extent with the technical and editorial work in the beginning.

Comr. Piatnitsky (Closing Speech):

First of all I want to clear up a misunderstanding. Comrade Gywan has stated that the Russian Party has made no report here. Such a report was not anticipated. Why? Because all our organisational experience in connection with the organisation of the Party on the basis of factory nuclei have been taken from the Russian Communist Party. And if there are any comrades here who are interested in the Russian work, it would be better for them to visit the factories and the district committees, and see for themselves how the work in these bodies is conducted. This would be far better than any report.

First of all, I would like to state that on the basis of the reports that have been submitted here, we can state definitely that we have made great progress since the Fifth Congress. At this Conference, we have detected the errors made in our work, which we must rectify without fail. Our Conference has no power to decide. We have called it together in order to compare the experiences of the various sections and to rectify mistakes.

Now with regard to the sharp criticism that has been directed against me. The French Party, — we had reports from the two largest districts; Paris, and the North — has made considerable progress, and I believe that it has proved this by facts. I would warn the French comrades, however, not to apply their experiences mechanically to all other countries. And I must point out here again that although the French Party had to contend against hostile traditions, nevertheless, unlike the German and Czechoslovakian Parties, it did not have to contend against an old and experienced social-democratic organisation. That is why it was easier for the French comrades to carry out their reorganisation.

What is of still more importance is that at the time the French Party undertook its reorganisation there was no unemployment. If a comrade was discharged from his factory he could immediately find work in another factory. Can this be said of England, Germany or Czechoslovakia?

I would like to refer to the good experiences of the French Party. It is a good beginning that the French Party understands the necessity to transfer comrades from one place to another. That is a great achievement, for without such an arrangement, no Party can get any proper work done. The German comrades say that this arrangement has existed among them for a considerable time. Yes, that is true, but only in regard to leading comrades. It must be understood however, that a Party member may be transferred from one factory to another if it is found necessary.

The French Party says that street nuclei are not required. I am no advocate of street nuclei as a permanent form of organisation. But, for a transitional period it is necessary to have an organisation to conduct work where the Party members live. The French Party, instead of the street nuclei, has so-called workers' group, whose functions are essentially to carry on work in residential districts. I do not for a moment propose that the French Party should organise street nuclei, but we cannot demand of Parties to ignore the street nuclei when 40 % of their membership is unemployed.

I come now to Comrade Geschke's report. Geschke started by saying that the German Party was the Party which helped the Comintern to build a centralised world Party. That

is true, the German Party supported the Russian Party on this question all the time. Neither at the Third, nor the Fourth, nor the Fifth Congress of the Comintern were there any differences between us on the organisation question. What differences exist between us today? It is no longer a question as to whether we shall form nuclei or not, but as to what methods should be adopted in order that the nuclei may work well. That is the first question. The second question is, how we can link up the nuclei with the local town committees and what form our Party organisation, from its base to its apex, should take in towns or districts. On this question, there are differences between ourselves and the German Party. This is not so serious. These discussions of these differences will lead to the question becoming so clear that every comrade, on his departure from here, will understand it thoroughly.

Comrade Geschke says that the Russians declare full speed ahead with the factory nuclei. I think this is not a reproach, but praise. Comrade Geschke worked in the Organisation Department and helped in the rushing. Now for the worst. Comrade Geschke, charged us with having fixed a time limit. I am not aware of it. It was the German comrades who proposed that we fix a time limit for the reorganisation. To this we naturally said: by all means, do so if you can. The same thing applies to the time limit for the dissolution of the residential organisations (groups of ten). I refer to my article in the *Inprecorr*, in which no reference is made to any time limit for the dissolution of the former organisations. I say, however, that the retention of duplicate organisations (permanent) cannot be tolerated because the members, for the sake of convenience, and also to avoid the persecution by the employers, would join the residential organisations (groups of ten) rather than the nuclei.

Comrade Bertz's report greatly impressed me. He has shown that in certain cities in Germany, the work is being carried on well and the Party comrades from other countries can take advantage of this experience.

Bertz brought up several questions, for instance, what shall be done about the comrades who live a long distance from their place of employment, and particularly what shall be done about them if they are also elected as municipal representatives in their place of residence. Should they do this work or should they work only in the nuclei and neglect the trade union work? They must of course do their work as representatives of the municipality, as this is their direct party work. Naturally questions will crop up in the nuclei which are at times more important, and in that case the nucleus will have to apportion the work among the comrades correspondingly. He also brought up the question of collecting membership dues in the enterprises. I think that Comrade Bertz is making a mistake with respect to this question. There are of course difficulties, but our experience shows that this can be done. Comrade Zapotocky has given us a good example of this, for to begin with he was of the opinion that the collection of membership dues in the enterprise would harm the Czechoslovakian Party financially. But he has come to the conclusion that just the opposite is the case.

Comrade Wellmann report has, to tell you the truth, not satisfied me. He has not given us facts, and this is what we want above all. Perhaps he will do so later on. He has told us that in the Hamburg district the Communist Party exercises considerable influence in big enterprises. I do not know if we are to understand by this that every action has the support of the personnel of the big enterprises. It happens that all the trade unions in Hamburg are in the hands of the Social Democrats. If the enterprises are really supporting the Party, it stands to reason that we are also exercising our influence in the trade unions, for the Party cannot do justice to its great tasks without the trade unions. Thus for instance the workers of the enterprises will perhaps decide to come out into the struggle, and the trade unions will do their utmost to frustrate their efforts. It may be that Comrade Wellmann did not succeed in giving us a correct illustration.

I am coming now to Comrade Gywan. He said that Piatnitsky's speech was a chastisement of the GCP. and wanted to know who had supplied the material. It was I who obtained the material from the Berlin-Brandenburg Bureau and partly from the German Party press. It is stated

in the report of the Berlin-Brandenburg Org Bureau that in connection with the reorganisation the district stands to lose 25-30 % of the passive elements of the Party because of the various difficulties. It was also on the strength of these reports that I spoke of the inadmissibility of combining the residential basis of organisation (groups of 10) with the factory nuclei basis. As to the material on the Liebknecht-Luxemburg demonstration I learned about that from the report of our Information Bureau as I have already stated, and what I said about this matter was more in the form of praise than in condemnation of the German Party.

The misunderstanding about the monthly nucleus meeting had its origin in the same official Berlin report according to which the **Current Everyday Tasks** are discussed at these nuclei meetings in the enterprises, and this is how I was misled.

I have yet another document: a document concerning a session of the Berlin-Brandenburg Org Bureau. Many difficulties are mentioned in this document and among them there are things for which there is really no justification. For instance, one comrade made the following statement:

"Conditions in Germany are after all different from those in Soviet Russia, as power is not yet in our hands. We must insist on the organisations which are on a residential basis not being dissolved."

In Russia reorganisation took place before the seizure of power. Already in 1905 when we enjoyed freedom for a couple of months we immediately built up our organisations in the enterprises. The same applies to the legal period of our Party work II.-X.-1917. In France too the CP. has not assumed power and yet it has been already to a great extent reorganised. And this has led to considerable results.

I should like also to mention that our Party in Czechoslovakia has also made great progress through the reorganisation which is a guarantee that further progress will be made. The Party is bound to make further progress because there is pressure from below.

The Berlin document which I already mentioned contains the following statement of a comrade concerning party functionaries:

"I have arrived at an interesting conclusion. Out of 46 cards of officials received by me there was one card from a factory official. In the 15th district out of 50 officials there are 2 factory officials."

I have one more thing to mention which is perhaps of considerable importance for all Parties. It is said in this Berlin-Brandenburg Report that there are 1,800 factory nuclei out of which only 540 active. Comrade Gywan argued that the inactive nuclei are no use to us. This is not correct. But it would be correct for the Party executive to do its utmost to make the other 1,260 nuclei also active.

Now I am going to deal with Comrade Zapotocky's statement. He said:

"The Red Trade Unions enable us to come into close contact with the factories."

That is so but that is not all, for there is the risk that the Red Trade Unions which are not entirely composed of Communists, might oppose the Party. This is not merely a theoretical possibility but a statement based on practical experience. For instance, the Central Committee of the Red

Trade Unions has refused to publish articles by our Central Committee in favour of Trade Union Unity. Comrade Zapotocky will have to admit after this that the Communists in the Red Trade Unions must be certainly under the control of the Party.

The Italian comrade had a great deal to say about the difficulties of reorganisation, but he has failed to give us an adequate illustration of this. But one question he did bring to the fore — he said that factory newspapers are interfering with the circulation of the Party press. (Interruption by Viola: "I have not said so").

Diatnitzky: Very well, but if you had said so, you would have been wrong. Factory newspapers draw the attention of the workers to the Party press. Therefore if the comrade had said factory newspapers interfered with the circulation of the Party press, just the contrary would have been the case.

In view of the present structure of the American Party, which has in every town, not one but 19 language-organisations and whose central organisation has to have its decisions accepted by 19 other organisations, time is not yet ripe for reorganisation. With this kind of structure it is impossible to get hold of the 30 million American workers. We must do our utmost to persuade the American comrades that they must adopt a centralist structure. The factories are the mainstay of our organisations. The language groups can remain in existence as agitational apparatus, but they must be under the direct control of the respective district leading organs.

I did not say that they are not elected. But I said that they are not instructed by the Party members to make decisions on questions for the sake of which they are convened by the leading organs of the Party. Now it is just possible that a comrade who has for a long time not done any active work either in the factory or local organisation, by which he was elected, comes to the officials' meeting and has a decisive voice in the making of decisions. We want every existing organisation to be in contact with the workers. The main connecting link is the nucleus meeting. Officials should only meet to confer. But they should be always in contact with the nucleus, as no decisions can take the place of continuous contact.

In conclusion I should like to sum up once more the opinion of Party members and of the conferences that great progress has been made. Nuclei exist but we must put life into them and we must also supply them with the best forces of the Party. In organisations where nuclei are functioning well the old organisations should not be maintained. We do not reproach anyone, we merely wish the comrades to recognise that there cannot be two organisations for the same work.

Work in the fractions is not yet adequately elaborated. Apart from Germany hardly any of the other countries have fractions. In conclusion a few more words on the work of the Org Department. It may be that this department has not worked as well as we would like. Nevertheless it has made all the necessary preparations for the application of the instructions endorsed by the Fifth World Congress. It elaborated the instructions on the formation of fractions as well as the statutes of the CI which were adopted unanimously. We have elaborated the model statutes and the guiding principles for Party construction. I think also that the letters which we addressed to the various sections were correct. Therefore I propose that you endorse the work of the Org Department.

Sixth Session. Moscow, March 20th, 1925.

Chairman: Comrade Suzanne (France).

The session begins with the report of Comrade Bertz (Germany) upon the building up of Communist fractions.

Comrade Bertz:

Together with the reorganisation of the Party on the basis of factory nuclei, the development of our fractions in all proletarian organisations is our most important task. We can divide these organisations, which should serve us as fields for recruiting, into three groups.

1. In **Federal Provincial and Municipal Parliaments** the development of fractions is not very difficult, since the comrades working here have as a rule years of Party experience. In illegal and semi-illegal periods, the fractions enable us to speak to the masses. There are also difficulties here, consisting in the circumstance that some comrades forget that they are officials of the Party and say that they are only responsible to their constituents. This has been manifested in an especially pronounced form recently in Czechoslovakia.

2. The so-called neutral organisations (sport and war crippled organisations, sick benefit societies, etc.) are a very important field of activity which we must cover. The Party has already made great endeavours to gain a footing in these organisations.

3. The third and most important sphere is the trade unions and the organisations parallel to them (factory councils, cooperatives, etc.).

Moreover, there are other groups into which it is very difficult to force an entrance. In Comrade Piatnitsky's article, he says that we must also enter the Christian Trade Unions and form fractions in them. That will be very difficult, especially now, when we are issuing the slogan "Into the Free Trade Unions". The slogan "Into the Christian Trade Unions" would at present remain nothing but a pious wish.

Now for a few examples of the work of the fractions in Germany.

The Party lays the greatest weight upon having the Reichstag and Diet fractions in as close contact as possible with the labouring masses, thus to let the workers see that the Communist deputies feel themselves at one with them. Our deputies must collect material not only in parliament but also in the factories and in the working masses. We have a secretary for all the more important parliamentary fractions who is responsible to the Party for all the work of the fraction.

In the neutral organisations the development of our fractions is not as easy as in parliament. None the less, we are making good progress here as well. An example of how our fractions work in these organisations: In the Workers' Cycling Club, the Social Democratic Executive prescribed on the occasion of a festival that the divisions were to bring along black-red-gold flags. Our fraction protested most energetically and demanded that red flags should be brought along. A bitter struggle then developed about this point, in which we did not restrict ourselves to the question of the flags, but took up all timely political problems, so that a comparatively insignificant question gave the opportunity of carrying on propaganda and of winning sympathisers for the Party. We have fractions amongst the social and poor pensioners, the tenants, etc. We even have a fraction in the Radio Club.

The question of trade union fractions is most important.

The German General Trade Union Federation has 1400 trades councils organised into 300 labour cartels. It is our task to build fractions in all of these. It is characteristic that in the trades in which we have no independent unions our fractions have been able to make great progress.

In the factories we have fractions in addition to the nuclei. The nuclei have relieved the fractions of political work. The activity of the fractions consists of the organisation of economic struggles, work in the social field, etc. We also hold meetings of the fractions to which sympathisers are invited.

The Communist Trade Union fractions are organised into Red Cartels corresponding to the structures of the General Trade Union Federation. The Red Cartel delegates a comrade to the District Executive; the work of the cartel is under the rigid control of the Party.

In his article, Comrade Piatnitsky wrote the following:

"The fractions in the trade unions on a district scale, as

well as in the different localities within the district are **Doubly** subordinated; they receive directions from the fractions of their National Executives on a national scale, as well as from the fractions of the district and local trade union executives locally. This is no doubt complicated, but we cannot do without double control."

The German delegation is against double control of the trade union fractions as well as of all other fractions. The instructions of the Central Committee to the fractions must go through the political leadership of the district. This alone exercises, alongside the Central Committee, control of the activity of the fractions.

We have still another sphere of activity: the cooperatives. Almost every country reports that these are Communist fractions in the cooperatives. In Germany the comrades work rather reluctantly in the cooperatives, and that is why we have fewer fractions than might otherwise be possible. Several local executives are in our hands. The Central Executive has strictly prohibited Communist propaganda in the cooperatives. That means that the work of our fractions has already filled them with apprehension.

We had to overcome great difficulties when we began a few years ago with the formation of factory fractions. All the greater were our difficulties when we took up the formation of nuclei. The workers could not understand why we wanted to put something new in place of the fractions. Of course, we did everything to overcome this opposition.

Communist nuclei and fractions must be established by all the sections of the C.I. and must work correctly. Only thus can we have the decisions of the Fifth World Congress and of this conference properly carried out.

Comrade Suzanne (France):

In fraction work the French Party is not yet as far advanced as the Germans, as we have concentrated principally upon the organisation of factory nuclei. In the French trade unions there are of course fractions, and they existed even before the Congress of Tours. But even before the split of the trade unions our leadership, at that time Right Wing, demanded that all our comrades leave the reformist trade unions and enter the unitarian unions. The Left minority in our Party was against it, but their viewpoint was defeated with the result that our fraction work in the reformist trade unions is rendered extremely difficult, for we have only a few comrades who remain in the reformist unions. In the unitarian trade unions, however, we already have our Communist fractions.

Comr. Bodemann (Switzerland):

It would have been very interesting if the Czech comrades who have told us that they have so many organisations in their hands, had told us something about their fraction work, so that we might have seen how far the comrades have advanced ideologically already in their work. In the sport organisations we began fractional work only a short time ago, but already have very satisfactory results. We have forced the Executive of the Swiss Workers Sport Association, which is 100% in the hands of the reformists, to decide that the Red Sport International be invited to the Frankfurt Olympiade. Comrade Piatnitsky and the German comrades believe that we should also form fractions in the bourgeois sport organisations. That has not been possible in Switzerland, because our statutes oblige our members to join the workers organisations. A serious matter noticeable with us is that the youth, which of course is very weak in Switzerland, does nothing to set foot in the sport organisations. In the cooperatives we only began three months ago to build up fractions. We are meeting here with serious difficulties, since the bourgeoisie as well as the social democrats are beginning to exclude the Communists from the cooperatives. In our fractional work in the trade unions, we made grave mistakes at first. The first one was that we dictated the fractional work from above; secondly, we laid too much weight upon getting hold of the executives. We have now made a change in our work and our comrades are concentrating upon systematic propaganda for the entrance of all workers into the trade unions. At the beginning the Social Democrats declared that because of the fractions, the

members no longer come to the trade union meetings. But in the last few years the trade union meetings have had a greater attendance than ever. This has enabled us to speak to a much greater circle of workers than before. As for the trade union officials, we have had the same experience as the German comrades. Most of the trade union officials who came to us at the split, again left the Party because they did not submit to Party discipline. I do not agree with Comrade Bertz, when he says that the fractions are a hindrance for the organisation of nuclei. In Switzerland just the contrary is proved. We have been able to use the fractions to organise the nuclei. We have seen that where we already have fractions the workers have not only become active, but are also politically interested.

Comrade Lindner (Czechoslovakia):

My report will be limited to the German regions of Czechoslovakia. We have not advanced as far as in Germany in our fractional work. We already have fractions in the sport organisations. We are also doing fractional work in the trade unions. In the Glass Workers Union we created two or three years ago a strong opposition which was ordered to carry on fractional work. For the last year, however, this group has not carried on the work we demand of it. In the textile industry we have our own Red Trade Union which is dominant in our region. In strikes and lockouts our influence has always been very great. We have great influence in the tenants' organisation everywhere. Opposition is not so good in the organisation of war cripples, which is largely in the hands of the bourgeois and anti-semites. Our influence amongst the unemployed is also very great. As for the policy of our comrades in the municipal parliament fractions, our district has shown the way. We have issued instructions for work in the city councils, which were adopted by the Party Congress as binding for the entire country. There are also certain difficulties to be overcome in this field, but the Party is doing its best to carry on satisfactory work in the municipalities.

Comrade Dorsy (America):

Our Party is very small and with the exception of the trade unions, fractional work is not very far advanced. We have also founded fractions in a number of other organisations such as the sport organisations, where our foreign language groups, especially the Yugoslavian, Czechoslovakian and Finnish, are doing good work. We have comparatively good fractional work in the sick benefit societies, especially through the German language groups. Parliamentary fractions do not apply to us, for we have no representatives in parliament, with the exception of a single Western State, where we have one deputy. The fractions in the various unions are doing especially good work in the distribution of our press. Thus, our German comrades, whose organisation has only 600—700 members, are able to publish a daily with a circulation of about 20,000. Our Finnish language group is able to maintain three daily papers. Our foreign language groups have also done good fractional work in the consumers' cooperatives. The fractional work is best developed in the trade unions, where our work is developing along the same lines as in England. We have a sort of "Left Wing" movement in the trade unions, the Trade Union Educational League, at the head of which there is a National Committee, which unites various industrial committees. These industrial committees again unite the local groups of which there are 200—300. The Trade Union Educational League arose in 1921 as a result of the great struggle which had to be fought at that time to repel the attack of the employers upon the organisation of the workers. At that time it was very favourably received by the masses. We have our fractions within the Trade Union Educational League. Our work has been much more difficult during the last two years, it is true, as a result of the crisis, which has also affected the trade unions to a great degree, as well as the opposition of the reformist trade union bureaucracy. Members of the TUEL were expelled from the unions which very often meant long periods of unemployment. Nevertheless, we have succeeded in doing good work, and it is due to our influence that in one union 90% reformist trade union officials were deposed. We have not lost courage because of the difficulties, for we are convinced that only through this work can we become a mass party.

Comrade Viola (Italy):

The work of the fractions in Italy is divided into three groups: 1. Municipalities and parliament; 2. cooperatives, workers clubs, mutual aid societies, sporting organisations "free Italy" groups, ex-soldiers; 3. trade unions of the Confederation of Labour and other organisations.

Group 1.

We have our fraction in parliament, thanks to which our voice has always been heard by the masses during the worst periods of illegality. At the time of the Matteotti affair this fraction was of particular importance. By leaving parliament, the reformist and maximalist socialists have shown that they could not do anything for the proletariat, being tied up with the bourgeoisie. Our fraction is strictly subordinate to the Central Committee.

Group 2.

Apart from Turin, Triest and Bari, we have not yet any fractions, but we have comrades in almost all the cooperatives. In the mutual aid societies, we have fractions just as in Turin. The fractions of the sport groups are doing good work there.

Group 3.

The trade union fractions are functioning with considerable success. We are only in the initial stage and we encounter a good many difficulties, but our fractions enable us to influence the life and the activity of the General Confederation of Labour (CGT).

Our best fractions are those in the most important federations: Textile, metal, railwaymen, builders, chemical workers, wood-workers, hotel and cafe waiters, workers engaged in food supply, etc.

For the purpose of connecting the fractions of one and the same industry, we have local committees, subordinate to the regional committees and to the national central organisation of the fractions. We are informed about everything that goes on at the trade union meetings. We have frequently been able to get our point of view accepted.

At the National Conference of our fractions, we have been able to ascertain that in the textile trade, 70% of the workers are with us, and in the metal trade 62%. If we do not play the leading rôle in these federations, this is due to the fact that the CGT (General Confederation of Labour) has ceased to convene general meetings since our first success. The results among the railwaymen are analogous. We have two federations under communist direction: the wood workers and hotel and cafe servants federations.

Among the unemployed, we have no fractions, but individual militant workers.

We also work in the white (clerical) organisations.

Agitation has been carried on, prudently in the fascist trade union during 1923—24; this has resulted in strikes, thus exposing the theory of fascist trade unionism.

We may remark in conclusion, that in view of the brief existence of the fractions, we are justified in saying that our work is going well.

Comrade Geddes (Great Britain):

Our fractional work is impeded greatly by unemployment, nevertheless the Party has understood that fractional work must be done. It has learnt from the Independent Labour Party, which although weak numerically, has been able to gain control of all labour organisations. Our fractional work is directed from the Central Office. The Party commissions each comrade with work, which may already be seen from the fact that the Party requires each comrade to be a member of three organisations: the C.P., the trade union and the Labour Party. The fractions have primarily the task of exposing the Social Democrats in practical work. We have obtained fairly great success in this sphere, especially in Scotland. We meet with one great difficulty in the fractional work in the craft trade unions, which are extremely numerous. As an example, I may mention that in a single shipyard there are 97 craft trade unions represented. Our policy in the trade unions is based upon the immediate demands of the working class. That is how we want to rally the masses. Despite our numerical weakness our influence in the trade unions is rather considerable. We have also done good work amongst the unemployed and have been able to gain influence upon the tenants. It is now

our goal to put life into the local trade councils, and we will thereby succeed in getting the entire movement into our hands. Many comrades make the mistake of considering the work in the Minority Movement something different from work in the trade unions. We agree with the theses and we know very well that without nuclei and without fractions no good Party work can be carried on.

Comrade Mitzkevitch (Org Department of the C. I.):

In the question of fractions we stand to-day where we stood with respect to nuclei at the time of the Fifth World Congress. It is however just as important as the problem of nuclei. Without fractions no proper Party work is possible. Communist Parties must win the majority of the working class; the latter, however, will not enter the Party — not even in the revolution. The Party is the vanguard, and it is the fractions which clear our way into the non-partisan masses.

In the question of trade union fractions, we have unfortunately made a step backwards during the last year in many countries. In various countries we see that many Communists have left the trade unions. That is in part a psychologically understandable reaction to the betrayal of the leaders (Germany) and to political reaction (Poland and Italy); but in part also due to the lack of strong fractions. That is shown by the report of Comrade Bertz as well as those of other comrades. I should like to add that the decision of the Comintern declared that we must also form fractions in the reactionary trade unions. But not only in the trade unions — amongst the peasantry as well. The youth delegates have already maintained that we must also gain a footing within the national revolutionary organisations.

In the question of fraction discipline there were often difficulties in the Russian Party as well, until the comrades understood that they are under the exclusive leadership of the Party. The other Parties will also meet with great difficulties in this direction, but they must overcome them.

Comrade Westphal said that in his district the work of the nuclei can also be done by the fractions. That is however false. We must make a distinction between the fractions and the nuclei. The fractions can only take up certain questions. In certain cases the nucleus can supplant the factory fractions, but not vice versa.

The most important organisational tasks of the sections besides the reorganisation upon the basis of factory nuclei, is the formation and development of fractions in each non-partisan workers' and peasants' organisation.

Comrade Bertz (Germany):

Our discussion shows that the problem of factory nuclei is an acute one. The problem of fractions is less acute; but with the growth of the unity movement, it is coming more and more to the fore.

We have seen from the report of the French Party that the French Youth has done good practical work in the sport

movement. I am astonished that the representative of the Young Communist International made no mention of the sports question.

Many comrades who could not be induced to join the trade unions up to now are now beginning to re-enter the unions under the influence of our fractions. The influence of our trade union fractions is also to be seen in other organisations in which we have fractions. When the Swiss comrades remarked that I had said that the fractions render the foundation of nuclei difficult, this only holds good for the past. To-day these difficulties have already been overcome.

Nuclei and fractions must not be confused. The nuclei do political work; the fractions are busy with economic questions. Of course, the fractions must work in close contact with the nuclei.

We expected to hear more from the Czech comrades with respect to fractions.

As for fractional work among the peasantry, I may say that in Germany we have won considerable influence of late amongst the peasants. I have already spoken about the peasants' congress which recently took place in the district Erzgebirge-Vogtland at which 50 peasants' delegates were present.

In Germany, we have not neglected our fractional work in the reorganisation of the Party on the basis of factory nuclei.

The German delegation has decided not to bring in a special resolution on this point of the agenda, but to limit itself to amendments.

Comrade Grolman

spoke on the next point of the order of business, the

Model Statutes:

As a basis for discussion in the Commission the Model Statutes of the Organisation Department were unanimously adopted. Why were we able to present Model Statutes at all? Because our Communist International is a world party, or putting it better, wants to become one. We need the same forms of organisation everywhere. In drawing up the Model Statutes, we drew upon the experiences in Russia, Germany and Czechoslovakia. We wanted to help the Parties in drawing up their statutes. Many Parties have as yet no Communist Statutes. There are Parties with Statutes which are almost social-democratic; other Parties, already have new Statutes, which however do not conform with the requirements of a Communist Party. As a basis for the Model Statutes we use the Statutes of the Comintern with respect to Party membership, the principles of Party structure, of democratic centralism and the basis of Party structure on factory nuclei. These three fundamental principles are contained in the Model Statutes. I am of the opinion that we cannot decide changes of principle as they were adopted.

After a short debate, in which various points, such as village nuclei, the question of district secretaries, etc. were touched upon, the Model Statutes were unanimously adopted and the Session of the Organisation Conference was closed.

Seventh Session. Moscow, 21th, March 1925.

Report and Discussion on Nucleus Work.

Chairman: Comrade Zapotocky, Czechoslovakia.

Comrade Idelson.

Report on Nucleus work.

The question of nuclei was the central point of our whole discussion and many points on nucleus work have already been mentioned. As far as I am concerned, the question is, should a resolution be adopted here which gives an exact picture of the work of the nucleus, or shall we speak of the experiences of the nucleus work only as regards the mistakes which have been committed? We cannot include every single country in detail in a general resolution. We can only determine general mistakes and formulate certain rules of work. We must admit that in the course of the discussion on the first point on the agenda and in various commissions, questions arose which in my opinion also require explanation in the resolution on the experiences of nucleus work. One of these questions is the distribution of work in the nuclei. Although this question

cannot be put in exact detail, it must be included in the resolution. As far as the draft resolution is concerned, I believe that the first point must also be included in the general resolution, namely, the decision whether the factory nuclei are a form of organisation which suit Western Europe and America. In those countries where we have already gathered experience, this question is already clear. I believe it can be stated that there is no longer one single Party Central Executive which would contest the advantages of the nuclei. In connection with this question it should be noted that some of the Parties, although they did not directly resist reorganisation, still proceeded pretty passively. Reorganisation proceeded very slowly in Holland and in Scandinavia, for instance, where the ideological campaign for the reorganisation seems to be very weak. It is necessary to fight a certain organisational conservatism in these countries. This phenomenon must also be included in the resolution.

There certainly are difficulties not merely in the reorganisation and development of the nuclei, but also in the work

of the nuclei, and I believe that the difficulties in the work of the nuclei are much greater than those connected with the formation of the nuclei. It is no fault of the resolution if we have not enumerated all the difficulties, for they are not the same in the various countries. Certain difficulties, however, are common to practically all countries, for instance, the distance between the place of work and the homes of the workers, unemployment, terror of the employers, as for instance, in Germany. The resolution, however, must stress the fact that these difficulties must not be used as an excuse to neglect the formation of nuclei. These difficulties sometimes cause a certain amount of passivity among the workers, who say to themselves that if they have so many difficulties to encounter, they might as well retain the old forms of organisation. In such a case the Party leaders must convince the workers that the difficulties must be overcome without fail. Of course, if the Party leaders themselves are inclined to overestimate the difficulties, then no progress will be made. In a Party, however, where political passivity reigns, there can be no question of a good reorganisation.

Those countries which have advanced with the work of reorganisation, have surely attained a certain degree of success already. The very fact that nuclei are now in working order where there are masses of workers, in the factories themselves, has made the workers much more enthusiastic. We received information from France which proves that the organisation of nuclei called forth great enthusiasm. From Czechoslovakia too similar letters have been received.

It is necessary that the nuclei feel themselves an indispensable part of the whole Party, and that they feel that the work they do is necessary for the Party. When this has come about, the nuclei will assume a concrete form. On the other hand, the whole Party apparatus must be adjusted to the nuclei. Until now most of the Parties have been working much too mechanically in this respect. I believe that the French Party has made some progress in this respect. It has arranged the meetings of the secretaries of the nuclei and the meetings of the Rayon Committees and their secretaries in such a way that questions are discussed there which later come to the nuclei. But even here the preparatory work must receive more attention. Hitherto we have not noticed very much that the political work of the Central Executive is based on the nuclei. In an official report from Germany, which arrived immediately before the discussion, the comrades from the Orgbureau (nucleus) complain that a gulf exists between the political leaders and the organisational leaders. That is a rather general phenomenon which must be overcome. All important questions must be discussed in the nuclei. The necessary suggestions for these must be distributed by the Central Executive. If the Party passes over important questions without the Party members, that is the nuclei, are discussing them, then the Party will not be Bolshevised, but rather proceed in the opposite direction. The Parties must understand how to bring these events up for discussion in the nucleus in such a way that they will interest the workers and are adjusted to their experience. Then it is absolutely necessary to see to it that the nuclei definitely understand their tasks. I will point to the experience of the RCP in this connection, where every single nucleus knew exactly what its definite work was, even today, where every Party member knows clearly what the highest task of the Party is. It is absolutely necessary that every comrade in a nucleus must know the entire tasks of the Party for a certain period, and that he knows besides that the concrete tasks which directly confront it. The conclusion to be drawn from this is that the whole Party apparatus must be so adapted that it serves the nuclei. A special task for our Parties is to strengthen the leadership of the nuclei. Comrades very often complain that the existing nuclei are not capable of maintaining themselves because the leaders do such bad work. Often a nucleus is not in a position to utilise political events and regards everything too much from a local standpoint. The Party leaders must see to it that the question which are discussed in the nuclei are always linked up with the general political policy of the Party. If there are some nuclei which are weak, it ought to be possible to send comrades to it who have had some experience. It is specially necessary in Germany, where our best comrades have been driven out of the factories. The German comrades have already collected experience in this respect and in their theses on Party structure, it is suggested that comrades with more experience be grafted onto the nuclei. They propose, for instance, that every

member of a Party committee be a member of a nucleus without exception, in order to work there. The bureaux of the nuclei must be so equipped that they are in a condition to distribute the work, and control the manner in which it is being carried out. Some comrades claim that the sphere of work in the nuclei is limited. Comrade Piatnitsky has indicated 15 different kinds of work in one of his articles. But another 15 could easily be added. Some work which is very important is entirely neglected by the comrades, for instance, the work in the trade unions. In the nuclei there are often too few comrades who know the conditions in the trade unions thoroughly. Only if a comrade knows the work in the trade unions very well, will it be possible for him to gain authority in the factory among the members of the trade union and to get various trade union jobs. The same applies to the factory councils. The fractional work in the sport clubs, in choral societies and such like is also to be carried on in the factories.

A certain degree of confusion exists in various nuclei on the character of the underground work of the nucleus. Our circular letters, in which it is stated that the nuclei must not come out into the open were interpreted by various comrades as meaning that the work was to be done illegally. That would separate us from the workers and lead to sectarianism. This spirit must be combated. Underground work does not mean that we exclude the workers, but simply that we do not come out into the open as far as the employers and the police are concerned.

The last point of the resolution refers to the question of the street nuclei. Certain countries are in favour of retaining the street nuclei, whereas others are opposed to it. We are of the opinion that experiences in the future will prove whether the street nuclei are necessary or not. We are not advocating a form of organisation which will hold good for all times. We can attain results only if we are always ready, at any moment, when conditions require change in the form of organisation, to carry it through.

Comrade Zapotocky (Czechoslovakia):

To simplify discussion I propose to go through the resolution before us point by point.

Comrade Sauvage (France):

I do not think it necessary to discuss every point of the resolution, as the latter has already been sufficiently deliberated upon. I am in favour of adopting the draft resolution in principle.

Comrade Zapotocky (Czechoslovakia):

Do the comrades agree to this proposal?

Comr. Gyptner (Young Communist League):

We were of the opinion that the draft resolution would be handed over to the editing commission which has been appointed, and that every section has the right to hand in their proposals to this commission.

Comrade Sauvage (France):

As no mention was made here either in the report or in the commissions that our parliamentary fraction is entirely subordinate to the leading organ of the Party, I should like to draw attention to this fact. Every member of parliament, every editor and every member of the Central Committee must be a member of a nucleus. We agree with comrade Idelson's draft resolution. It is absolutely necessary to carry out reorganisation work in all countries, and this should be done in a uniform manner. Not for instance as in France where our experience was that some region is picked out and reorganisation carried out there at a forced pace. This happened in Paris with the result that this region ventured to go too far, whilst the influence of our Party had not grown commensurately in the provinces. With respect to the paragraph on the secret character of nuclei work it should be stated that it is only secret as far as the employers are concerned. The French comrades accept the passage on the street nuclei, as it is stated in the resolution, that experience will show if street nuclei are to be formed in a country or not. I should like to point out that the workers groups which exist in France are not of a permanent nature, but are formed temporarily for the purpose

of carrying out special work, at present for instance to help in the municipal elections. In regions where the Party has no nuclei the work must be done by the district committee which decide what comrade is to work in this locality. I should like the editing committee to take these suggestions into consideration.

* * *

On the next item of the agenda

Conduct of Campaigns

Comrade Geschke (Germany), was called upon to speak.

Comrade Geschke (Germany):

We have in Germany a slogan: The CPG is the only workers party. Just as the Communist Party of Germany the Communist International is the only workers party, the Communist International is the only workers party on a world scale. It is the class enemy of the world bourgeoisie, and we must view the nature of the campaigns from this standpoint. Speaking of a class enemy we cannot help speaking of the class struggle. A campaign is just such a military-strategic manoeuvre as the battles waged between two enemy powers. They require the same strict organisation as a military operation. An important premise for the success of a campaign is of course the harmonious collaboration of the organisational groups, on that part of the front where the battle is to be fought. The International leadership and the leadership of the various sections must be well informed about the strong and weak points of the class enemy. It is absolutely necessary that from the ECCI down to the smallest local group there should be complete and precise cooperation. But all our efforts will be in vain if the attack on the enemy is not carried out at a fixed time and according to plan. Nothing must be left to chance.

The Comintern decided in what direction the general agitation should be conducted, as well as the nature of the main slogans. The slogans for the general everyday work must be adapted to the economic and political conditions of the respective country. The Comintern has already taken the lead in a number of such campaigns. I should like to mention in this respect the campaign against intervention in Soviet Russia, against the imperialist war and the Dawes' Plan, as well as for alliance with Soviet Russia for the de jure recognition of Soviet Russia, etc. In all these campaigns various shortcomings come to light. We must criticise very severely the work which has been done hitherto. It has happened that the material did not reach the various sections soon enough to be properly utilised.

Some campaigns recur regularly on certain dates, for instance March 18th, The Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht memorial day, etc., for such campaigns everything must be prepared in every organisation according to plan. Care should also be taken that these campaigns be not conducted independently of the Party apparatus, but that they should be in close contact with the general Party apparatus. But what we have to criticise most in all the past campaigns is lack of uniformity. We have not yet been able to establish close contact between adjoining sections. I think that we would make progress in this respect if the smaller sections were attached to the larger. The German section was the only one to extend the campaign over weeks and months, bring it to a culminating point on a certain day. Very few sections have as yet prepared their campaigns systematically using all their Party forces. Our experience in Germany has been that the conduct of the campaigns was not centralised enough. If a campaign is to be successful every department of the respective sections must be well informed concerning the nature, the method, the aim, and the task of the campaign, and must arrange its work accordingly.

There are three types of campaigns: firstly, campaigns for the whole Comintern with the same slogans and aims for all sections, for instance, against the imperialist war and against intervention; secondly campaigns for groups of countries of the same kind with similar economic structures or similar political conditions. Thirdly, international campaigns in connection with an international event which concerns only some groups of countries directly, for instance campaigns against the Versailles Treaty and the Dawes' Plan and for trade union unity.

As to the main slogans we can recommend two of the

slogans which have come hitherto to our notice as model slogans. One of them comes from comrade Lenin: **All Power to the Soviets.** This was a class struggle slogan against the bourgeoisie. The second came from Karl Liebknecht: **Class War against Class Truce.** This was a slogan which every worker could understand. With our recent slogans we have not always been able to capture the masses.

I am going to deal now with the preparation of the campaign. The Agitprop Department of the ECCI has to lay down the plan for the international campaign. This plan must include the main slogans and also the slogans for the various countries. But the various sections must be allowed to adapt them to the structure and the political situation of their respective countries. In the event of such an adaptation the ECCI must be informed of it. This plan should also determine the debates of the campaigns. It should also contain political and organisational instructions in addition to the general instructions. The material must reach the sections in good time to enable them to send instructions out in good time to all local groups even the smallest. If some sections have to send out material to the local groups this material must also be supplied to the ECCI for information. Just as the ECCI elaborates a plan, the various sections must also make their plans sending them to the Party officials in the various Party organisations, including the smallest nuclei, so that the whole Party apparatus should know what to do on such and such a day.

Now I am coming to the conduct and organisation of the campaigns. The Central Committee of the Party must conduct the campaign on an international scale, the ECCI taking the lead. Consultation must be held concerning every date and every slogan in the apparatus, every phase of the struggle must be strictly controlled, and where weak points are discovered they must be immediately remedied.

The experiences made during the campaign must be communicated to the Party members of every section including the smallest nuclei; in order to enable the section or the Comintern to draw the necessary conclusions from them. If we do this we will draw the masses to us. We will be able to recognise our own mistakes and then we will be what we intend to be, the world Party of the proletariat.

Comrade Sauvage (France):

As the French comrades received the draft theses only yesterday I propose that we hand over the draft to an editing commission which is to come to an agreement with the various delegations concerning eventual alterations.

Report on Party Organisations.

Comrade Bertz (Germany):

The Commission which was set up to discuss this point has not yet decided on a definite resolution. A resolution has been handed over to the drafting commission, which will also introduce some amendments. The most important questions discussed on the commission were the establishment of street nuclei, the questions of the central committee of the various sections, and the question of corps of functionaries. A lively discussion took place also on the thesis on fractions. The amendments were submitted by the youth and the German section and transferred to the drafting commission. I suggest that the resolution should not yet be voted upon here.

Comrade Zapotocky (Czechoslovakia):

We can accept the thesis on party organisation in principle and transfer the amendments to the drafting commission.

Comrade Idelson:

On the principal questions the commission has come to a decision, and it is now only a matter of formulating the text in the drafting commission.

Comrade Gyptner (Youth):

Comrade Bertz' report is not satisfactory. The Commission has come to a decision on all the questions, including the question of the street nuclei, the question of the central committees, and the question of the corps of functionaries. On the question of the working groups the commission submits three formulae, that of Comrade Sapitsky, that proposed by the youth and that proposed by the German comrade. After

a discussion, the draft proposed by comrade Gitnisky, was accepted against the votes of the German comrade and the representative of the youth, although there was nothing identical in their drafts. Now it is merely a question of style which will be finally decided upon in the commission.

Comrade Bertz (Germany):

It was precisely on the important question of the working groups we are expressly of the opinion that it is necessary for the organisation conference to meet again, because the question at issue was one of principle and it is not known how the draft will finally emerge from the drafting commission. Therefore I propose that no vote be taken now, and when the draft is received to call another meeting.

Comrade Sauvage (France):

I am of the opinion that the commission yesterday settled this question in principle. The French delegation accepted comrade Piatnitsky's proposal and could not agree to the proposal of the German comrade to make the working groups permanent bodies.

Comrade Piatnitsky:

With regard to the working groups, the commission resolved to submit this question after the meeting of the Enlarged Executive to the Organisation Department and to the representatives of the larger parties, who will remain in Moscow for them to study it and then come to a decision. If, after this, it will still be found necessary to form working groups, we can first have the resolutions. A difficult question which has roused much discussion is that of the functionaries. The proposal made by the German comrade that the functionaries corps be bodies with powers of decision, was rejected without discussion against the votes of the German delegates. I am of the opinion, therefore, that the draft resolution can be accepted as a basis and if serious differences of opinion arise, on the drafting commission, with a large minority, then another meeting should be called before the meeting of the Enlarged Executive comes to a close.

Comrade Bertz (Germany):

In the name of the German delegation I declare that we will vote for this compromise.

* * *

On a vote being taken the proposal was carried.

Factory Newspapers.

Comrade Fried

on the report of the Commission: No great difficulties arose on this question. One comrade proposed that international correspondence should be published in the factory newspapers, but to this it was objected that the international communications for the nuclei was a separate point. Apart from minor questions of wording the only point that must be referred to is that of respect for national minorities and foreign workers where such exist. It is noteworthy that in factory newspapers, there are also one or two columns written in the language of the national minority or of foreign speaking workers. Apart from this the theses proposed by the organisation commission were accepted unanimously by the commission.

* * *

Report on the International Liaison of the Nuclei.

Comrade Idelson:

Regular communication is maintained today only between the Russian and the German nuclei. Communication is being established with the French nuclei. Our experience shows that the establishment of these communications has been justified. The letters which are received in Germany and in Russia make a great impression upon the workers, and we find that they also serve as a purely organisational means of advancing the work. This international exchange of correspondence serves

as a good method for the mutual exchange of experiences. It fosters the international spirit. An important question is how to regulate this international correspondence. It is essential that the central committees read these letters from the factories, and make suggestions as to what should be contained in subsequent letters. We propose that at the Plenum we should merely assert the fact that the international exchange of correspondence has resulted in good experience and should be encouraged in the future. With regard to the technical difficulties that exist, the organisation department should consult with the representatives of the various sections.

Comrade Geschke (Germany):

In connection with this point I would like to refer to an interesting experience. The report of the British Trade Union Delegation, which came to Russia, made a profound impression upon the social-democratic workers in Germany. They suddenly perceived that earnest trade union leaders belonging to the Amsterdam International pass an opinion on Soviet Russia which is directly contrary to the picture of Soviet Russia presented in the social democratic press. An endeavour is now observed among the social democratic workers in Germany to obtain direct information themselves concerning the state of affairs in Soviet Russia, and we receive repeated requests in our central committee concerning the possibilities of making investigation tours in Russia. As this presents a possibility still more to break up the social-democracy, I propose that this point be considered. It will also be an advantage in our conduct of the campaign for trade union unity.

Comrade Fried:

Comrade Geschke regards the international communications between factory nuclei from the standpoint of agitation and information. We in the organisation conference must regard it from the organisation standpoint. The factory nuclei and the Russian factory nuclei particularly, must communicate their experience to the nuclei in other countries. In fraction work also it would be easier to achieve successes. Our Comrades in Czechoslovakia, for example, who refuse to form fractions in red trade unions will be interested to know that even in Russia, fractions are formed in the Red Trade Unions, and that these are under the strict discipline of the Russian Communist Party. In connection with work among women, this international correspondence will teach the workers that women's departments serve exclusively for the purpose of conducting agitation among the masses of indifferent women.

When comrade Geschke criticises the organisation department, because of the slow progress made in establishing communication, I must reply that the fault lies with the various sections, who in spite of our repeated requests, have done nothing in this matter.

Comrade Bogoutsky (Poland)

demanding that the establishment of communications be extended not only to worker correspondents but also to the broad masses of the workers. The publication of a monthly for workers correspondents would be useful of course, under the strict control of the Party.

Comrade Gywan (Germany)

demanding that greater attention be paid to the sending of delegations to Soviet Russia.

Comrade Sturm

demanding that international communications be bound up with the conduct of campaigns.

After Comrade Idelson had briefly replied to the discussion comrade Fried read a draft resolution dealing with point one on the agenda.

The conference accepted the resolution as a basis and transmitted it for final drafting to the commission, with the instruction that in the event of differences arising, which cannot be settled on the commission, a meeting of the Plenum will be called at the request of a delegation at which the resolution will be decided. In the event of the commission being unanimous, the organisational conference will be deemed to be closed. The resolution after endorsement, is to be published.