Session 10 – 30 June 1921, 12:30 p.m.

**Tactics and Strategy – Report**


**Koenen** (chair): The congress is now in session. The delegation of the Socialist Party of Italy has requested to be permitted to present a statement on the resolution that we unanimously adopted yesterday. Comrade Lazzari has the floor.

**Lazzari**: Dear comrades of every country, permit me to submit the following statement on behalf of the Italian Socialist Party delegation.

**Statement of the Italian Socialist Party**

As delegates of the Italian Socialist Party, we must take note of the resolution relating to us, all the more in that it is in full accord with the Bentivoglio resolution adopted by our congress in Livorno.

Nonetheless, we cannot conceal the painful impression on us of several particulars in the motivation that you have linked to your decision, which in our opinion do not correspond to the real situation in Italy after the Second Congress. However, we promise you that we will do our best to secure the adoption of your resolution by the next congress of our party. We are fully convinced of the necessity for revolutionary unity in the organisation of the Communist International’s different sections.
Costantino Lazzari, Fabrizio Maffi, Ezio Riboldi

Koenen (chair): We take note of this statement and anticipate that the Communist Party of Italy will do everything possible to clarify the issues within the Socialist Party in the interests of the Third International.

We also have a statement by Comrade Höglund of Sweden on yesterday’s decision. The Presidium has been asked to make this statement known as well. The statement reads:

Statement by Höglund

In his report, Comrade Zinoviev made some critical remarks regarding the Swedish Communist Party, which I wish to set straight. In order to understand our party’s present situation, you must bear in mind how the party was formed and how it developed. The party was formed in March 1917 as one of the first that broke from the old Social Democracy. Three distinct opposition currents united in the Left Social-Democratic Party of Sweden. First, there was the revolutionary Marxist current, which developed primarily out of the youth league. Second, there was the humanist-pacifist current of the well-known mayor, Lindhagen, who wavers between Lenin and Christ. There was also the centrist current that was based in the parliamentary fraction. Obviously this created a degree of unclarity about the party, its programme, and its tactics. Nonetheless, in the most recent congress, the Twenty-One Conditions were approved by a large majority. Lindhagen and the centrists left and formed an independent party. Our party then took the name Communist Party of Sweden and adopted the Communist programme.

Comrade Zinoviev says that the programme does not contain the demand for arming the proletariat. That is not correct. This demand is advanced explicitly, and the party has carried out propaganda along these lines both among the masses and in parliament.

Comrade Zinoviev’s comment about the party’s position on the governmental commission is based on a misunderstanding. The situation is that members of certain parliamentary commissions are formally named by the government. The decree criticised by Comrade Zinoviev aims to assure the party of the right to determine when the party will delegate members to such commissions and who it will name.

As for our newspaper, Politiken, I do not deny that its editing has shortcomings and contains errors. But the comments heard about it in the Swedish party are of quite a different character. There it is said that the paper is insufficiently theoretical and too focused on popular agitation.