

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 advocats 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 Diatnitzky'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 Org 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.