

ONCE AGAIN THE NEED FOR THE INTENSIFICATION OF IDEOLOGICAL STRUGGLE

K. Ebrahim, August 31, 2012

If we review the history of the last half a century of the left movement in Iran in its general Lines of the 1960 decade, accompanied by consecutive failure and weakening of the Tudeh Party of Iran and the pessimism engendering toward the leadership of this Party in guiding the worker and mass struggles, and in struggle against capitulationism and revisionist line of the leadership of this party, with new organizations splitting from the Tudeh Party of Iran (namely, The Revolutionary Organization) and consistent with the international communist movement (especially the Communist Party of China), repudiate Khrushchev's modern revisionist line for the creation of the revolutionary communist party from the unity of the Iranian Marxists-Leninists toward leading the New Democratic Revolution, were created. Also, the guerrilla movement with rejecting the leadership view of the Tudeh Party regarding peaceful transition of the state power, adopted the line of "The Armed Struggle, Both Strategy and Tactics" (adopted) toward acquisition of the state power and also in the decade of 1970, new organizations such as Peykar basically, "rejecting armed struggle isolated from the masses" and the vision of the creation of the Communist Party entered into the arena of existence. Consequently, in those two decades, the ideological struggles were basically about the rejection of modern revisionism and how to organize the revolution on the basis of priority or coming next of the creation of the party from the unity of Marxists-Leninists and with linking the workers/peasants movement or, organizing the armed struggle and the creation of the party even after taking over the power.

This ideological struggle while achieving victories in exposing the nature of the Shah's reforms, rejection of modern revisionism, rejecting the revisionist views of the Tudeh Party's leadership and the drawing the left forces attention in learning the theoretical principles of the scientific communism, heroic resistance against the Butcher monarchy, because of severe police repression and lack of access to Marxist writings on the one hand and the base of petit-bourgeois and mainly the majority of the left intellectuals and therefore, the rule of one sidedness, limited, petty-bourgeois sectarian, the lack of a tight connection with the working class and with the masses, and the lack of accurate conclusion of the policies and the practices of leftist organizations, has not reached to a suitable results and the principle of the scientific communism and class struggle becomes governed by "anyone from his own understanding".

The guerrilla armed struggle not only faces with defeat, but with the influence of the Tudeh Party revisionists within its ranks, after less than ten years of its inception, gradually a large part of its leftist guerrilla movement and the left intellectuals were taken over by revisionism. Struggle to establish unity among Marxist-Leninist parties, either due to ideological struggle that were being waged by guerrilla movement and the revisionists against it and other reasons such as "self-centeredness views" and other ideological differences, did not lead in to unity among the lefts and instead led in to the defeat of the guerrilla movement and engendering of discord at the international level in relation to the global strategy of the working class and the disturbance of the revisionist theory of "Three World" by the leadership of the Chinese Communist party after Mao's death in 1976, the trend of split within the early left organizations intensified. In this period none of the left forces were able to compose the revolutionary theory with revolutionary practice in Iran. Theoretical weakness, loss of firm connection with the working class and consequently inability in creating a single ideological, political and organizational center with the

authority, wise, firm and militant, with firm worker and mass base in the current of workers and masses movement against the Shah's regime, revealed itself and deviations in the left movement became more exposed.

The development of mass anti-government struggles, the influx of the working class more and more toward these struggles- however, without the existence of vanguard communist leadership – in the second half of 1970, did not unwind a promising future . Because, in this period, a dangerously distorted new political line was formed. Although, before the overthrow of the regime, the majority of the left forces demanded the political hegemony of the proletariat in the new democratic revolution in Iran, but the standpoint of “Shah must go”, simply took the place of violent mass revolution to crush the state apparatus of the regime. The struggle was reduced from the level of class battle to the level of removing an individual to the extent that after the overthrow of Shah's regime and despite the decisions that were taken at Guadalupe by the imperialist powers and the religious alternative with the leadership of Khomeini were pushed forward, large sector of the middle bourgeoisie and *petite*-bourgeoisie supported that alternative. Oil workers with their great strike which economically brought the regime down, only went as far as to demand of participation in revolutionary council made up by the religious forces, and also without any insistence in this precept. Thus, the left not only fell in the trap of one sidedness of “destruction without construction” in overthrowing the Shah's regime, but an important part of them under the caption of “the struggling against imperialism and social-imperialism and their agents in Iran being the main aim”, defended the power grab of the bourgeois religious establishment. The Iranian revolution, despite the broad participation of the masses, fell out of breath half way, the state power changes hand from the big comprador bourgeoisie faction to the other bourgeoisie faction (the middle bourgeoisie and the *petite*-bourgeoisie) which with the usurpation of power, taking over the large state-owned enterprises and in this manner held the flag of counterrevolution. The bourgeois religious leader from the early stages of revolution executed an extensive plan to suppress the left forces. Although, during the first few years of the Islamic Republic Rule, the left forces were able to some extent achieve working class and mass base, but organizationally were not able to create solidity. Iranian working class was faced with a large number of newly growing **left** organizations which were strongly against each other to the extent that some conscious elements of the working class were saying, “First resolve your differences, then come in unity toward us”. These organizations were immediately attacked by the Hezbollah lumps and killing of the left forces began by the Khomeini's regime. Once again the importance and the necessity of the existence of a single communist party aiming for concentration and consolidation of the ideological-political-organizational-methodology and communist leadership unity became obvious and still under the influence of the **petty**-bourgeois sectarian and self-centered view, the creation of a party and struggle for its realization on the basis of the teaching of scientific communism “unity of the theoretical principles and the fundamental points of the program and tactics”, did not advance forward strongly and reached to no result.

Starting with the naked repression of the left forces and a few independent labor organizations, as well as the gradual collapse of the ex-socialist countries, suitable groundwork for the imported quasi-Trotskyite became available in which by rejecting the Marxist views on socialist construction; fictional account of the national bourgeoisie in the dominated semi-colonial, semi-feudal countries, rejection of union with toiling masses under the title of being “populist”, this view, making work among workers unconditional and in this manner, rejecting the actual and potential allies of the working class; renouncing armed struggle as the need to work in cities and among the working class; rejection of communist movement and socialism after Lenin's death in 1924 and including the denial of the great New Democratic Revolution in China and assigning it as a peasant/petty-bourgeois revolution and rejecting the leadership of the communist party of

China the same way the Trotskyites from the beginning of the Chinese revolution in the second half of the decade of 1920 had done. Putting forward the idea that we don't have "big and small bourgeoisie", to the extent of rejecting the nature of imperialist financial monopoly, thus rejecting the strategy and tactics of "unity-struggle" with national bourgeoisie during the advancement of New Democratic Revolution under the leadership of the proletariat and the communist party in dependent semi-colonial, semi-feudal countries; thus negating the dialectical universality of "transformation of quantity into quality", given the high concentration of capital, and the lack of distinction between the strategy and tactics of proletariat regarding different factions of the bourgeoisie; in resumption of rejecting the nation on the pretext of the existing Marxist definition of nation is meaningless and in other words, they fake their left revisionist view as revolutionary Marxism – As under such situation where the regime advanced an extensive attack in order to eliminate the entire left forces and as a result, in this period left was faced with defeat and set back. A significant section of the left forces, especially in Kurdistan (Komala) resisted against the Islamic Republic by armed struggle and enjoyed a good reputation among people. But, since it suffered from theoretical weakness, were unconditionally pulled toward this left revisionist tendency. Quasi- Trotskyites united with Revolutionary Organization of Toilers of Kurdistan (Komala) and with proclamation of being communist party, ascribed the end of the trend of party building and declared that from that time on, any left force that does not join our party, by nature is bourgeois!

A little less than a decade, a faction of the leadership (who had the majority at the Political bureau) split from this party and maintained that the Communist Party of Iran has not yet become proletariat and with their split, they formed Worker's Communist Party under the leadership of Mansour Hekmat. Few years later, this same party was stricken with another big split and some of these separatists declared that after Marxism, it is Hekmatism that would carry the flag of revolutionary Marxism? During the decade of 80s and 90s, the struggle against quasi-Trotskyite's deviant views in Kurdistan and then in abroad by small leftist forces continued. The outbreak of repeated splits within the ranks of that newly established party and the creation of three different "communist parties", with different names and in addition, other nonparty organizations (separated from that mother party -WCPI), was the kind of blows that was inflicted to this deviant course of action. But, this claim of calling themselves communist party has become fashioned in the left movement of Iran and also other parties that call themselves the communist parties and vanguard proletariat were created. In this manner, irresponsible style of "communist party building" and inflicting blow to the unity of the will and action of the working class vanguard became fashion. Instead of creating a single vanguard party of the working class, organizational pluralism of the "communists" took its place. However, a careful look at the views of the all so called "Communist Parties" and their influence among the working class, suggests that none of these parties in real sense, have the quality of proletariat party which their leadership claim to be, and it was a severe blow to the movement for creating a single communist party and inbred a proper ground for the continuation of discord, theoretical and organizational dispersion and thus created bewilderedness within the worker's movement! This was the best gift to the petite-bourgeoisie which was more able to secure its own mode of thinking within the working class movement. Deviating from the teaching of scientific communism and falling for bogus pluralistic theories, came readily from imperialist think tanks, was a reality which was in-line and conformity with the mode of thinking of petty-bourgeois left forces leadership's view!

In this manner, the leadership of numerous left forces in the decade of 2000, weary from the past ideological struggles and inconsequential to a high degree, typically reached an implicit ideological cease fire and some even reached to a point where an expression of a Marxist view point for promoting and reinforcing the scientific view in the articles becomes criticized in order

to set their idle talks in place of scientific communism. However, in the first half of this decade (2000-2005), regarding the organizationally mobilizing the workers, especially the quasi Trotskyites with negating the trade unions, and with their left-wing vision, instead of defending multiple forms of worker's organizations at different levels, defending the finest and the most conscious type of none worker party organization namely, to create worker's council that can be proceeded only with the rise of the worker's power movement which becomes possible to exist. This left-wing slogan which means "big rock is the sign of not throwing", was not welcomed by the workers and with the efforts of the workers in creating the independent trade unions under severe police repressions, gradually this debate lost its intensity and acuity.

Generally, while the whole activities of the left forces not only so far did not boost the proletarian united rank, but instead theoretical and organizational dispersion was provoked among them and the possibility of reaching to a unity at a higher level and communism were not materialized. Instead, the petty-bourgeois style of work over the proletarian style of work at the leadership level of numerous left forces was so dominant and such extreme liberalism manifested in the arena of theory which in order to pull the left movement from this petty-bourgeois Augeas Stable, requires the direct intervention of the worker cadres, armed with scientific communism and accurate assessment of the necessities of worker's revolution. Mostly criticisms and ideological struggles in the left movement are left unanswered or faced with indifferent theoretical struggle and transparency is not created. Here, as a "fistful, is the sample of a ton", we criticize some of these one sided and non-dialectical point of views for the proof of the influence of petit-bourgeois mode of thinking in the left movement.

First of all, do you believe that scientific communism is a dynamic scientific theory and guides proletariat for organization, advancing the tactical struggles and reaching them to the strategic level, guides proletarian revolution to victory, transition to a long period of socialist construction at a level both national and global and then the creation of the global communism? If this is the case, then in analyzing the social phenomenon, we can not deviate from the teachings of this theory which is the result and product of summarizing of the proletarian thinkers and is based on bloody struggles of the workers and other toiling masses along with taking advantage of growth of science and technology, and with total apathy not to rely on them!

Isn't it true that this theory is based on world outlook of dialectical materialist? So, in addressing any social phenomenon, the communists are bound with scientific consciousness and in an all-round manner to study this phenomenon and its given data (or information) and its process of evolution, to reach to a material knowledge and reach to an accurate conclusion from its evolutionary process.

Is it possible to liberally approach the teachings of this theory and the study of theoretical problems, especially in the political arena which instead of dialectical method, is based on pragmatic method, the struggle of the working class for acquisition of power can be organized accurately and successfully, lead the revolution and in continuation of revolution, prevent it from falling at the hands of non-proletarian classes?

Let's start from the encountering of some of the left forces to the category of "working class". There are some lefts which apparently do agree that societies are class societies and even agree with historical materialism. In the current situation, they do accept the struggle and the class war between the workers and bourgeoisie both at the national and global level. They do agree that the worker does sell his labor force to the capitalist and the sale of surplus value produced by workers and its conversion to capital and therefore, increase of capital at one pole and poverty and distress at the other pole occurs. They do agree that the class struggle of the

proletariat against bourgeoisie providing that the correct leadership of proletariat, would lead to worker's revolution and instead of capitalist state which is the dictatorship of the capitalists against the workers, the state of proletariat that its aim is to destroy private property over means of production and exchange and to eliminate the system of wage labor as a class state. Many agree that just because being a worker and being exploited, do not cause the worker to join the revolution. But, some would consider the self-consciousness of the workers is the main issue and therefore instead of creating the proletarian vanguard political party; they put forward the worker's council and in this manner say yes to anarchism in the name of council of workers. Some others, divide the workers in to different strata and interests and the intrigues of the proletarian class enemies among the workers which for various reasons and especially, the creation of distinguished aristocracy within this class or, because of unemployment and thus, the creation of rivalry among the workers for various reasons, such as national, sexual, religious, racial with the aim of keeping the workers dispersed, cause intrigue in their unity and they cite all this as a necessary proof for the existence of different worker political organizations. They do except that in the complex process of production and evolution a part from the working class and the capitalist class, there are other vast stratum such as peasants (poor and wayer, middle and wealthy, urban petite-bourgeoisie, are vacillating among these two classes and can be united with this or that class. All these syllogisms are only to justify their pluralism.

It is claimed that the workers are formed from different strata with specific interest. Thus, the working class is not one set and the different stratum of workers at a political level can create their own organizations and parties, without specifying that such and such left organization is the representative of this or that workers' stratum! Or even it is claimed that Iran is under the condition of pre- bourgeois democratic stage and must fulfill the "bourgeois democratic" system (without consideration of the era of multi-national imperialism which is going through the transition to barbarism and has brought the world to devastation and bloodshed and so far two centuries have lapsed from bourgeois democratic system) and with these empty rationalizations shout their political-organizational pluralism. Including:

On the website of Gozareshgar (Reporter), in an article, "aberrant left regard to pluralism", August 21, 2012, Behzad Changalli writes: "The key question is: Can the left and democratic forces alone be able to build a solid political structure? Certainly not! Is the objective and subjective conditions of the society has the susceptibility tolerance, understanding and the creation of independent class line up? I think no! and consequently, would the left in the wider context of it alone, be able to create the suitable workers and toilers system without social collisions and conflicts and under this condition, by the determination of the independent dispersed and unemployed workers to organize? Without any hesitation no! Is it possible and conceivable at the future political formation of our country without certified federalisms' solution? In my understanding and others never!

In contrast to these buts and ifs and inept attestations, we can ask from this supporter of the impossibility of realization of the bourgeois-democratic system in the present stage of capitalist development: Are the working class of different Iranian nationalities enemies of each other, or they have common class interests? The answer for common interest is definitely yes and not for being each other's enemy! Is it because of different languages and religions, that the workers and toilers of Iran have confronted one another and have killed each other? Obviously the answer is NO! The exploiting classes and especially the capitalists in the capitalist countries, have they implemented all the times "the right of nations to self determination up to separation and formation of their self government" that the communists have carried out nearly 100 years ago? The answer without a doubt is NO! If the governments are the puppet of the ruling class and exert the class dictatorship over other classes, the dictatorship of the worker state which

provide the most widespread democracy for the great majority in the society and exert its dictatorship against the remnant exploiting and oppressive classes to the extent of preventing them from return to their cruel power, isn't it the best democracy in the world? Surely the answer is YES! Isn't it true that the peasants and the urban *petite-bourgeoisie* which are under the oppression of the ruling bourgeoisie have common interests with the working class? The answer is YES! Then, what is your problem about this claim that: "pluralism can educate and guide the determination, thoughts and collective action" (right there). It is on the basis of what class practice? This mere claim without backing and without practical cover is in the societies that existed until now in them according to the scientific communist stipulation, the class dictatorship of the minority over majority have always called the shut! So, this reflection of yours is like Khomeini's hypocritical lip about "let's all be together" that has not brought any result, but dictatorship, since the conflicting class interest in the society, are in severe battle against one another. Therefore, your utterance is an expression of *petty-bourgeois*' desire in disguise of "the workers divide in different strata and different interests" which is the expression of a **hardliner *petite-bourgeoisie* which is tied to its stratum that claims to be communist!**

Another example of *petty-bourgeois* mentality transfused in the left movement can be found in the manifesto of the session of 25 "communist and left Parties, Organizations and Institutions" in Colón, Germany in which in that manifesto, the participants in that session called them communist and not only smallest reference was not given to the need for the organizational unity of the communists in a vanguard party of the working class, but there is more effort in bringing more organizations to be attracted to this gathering so, in this manner pluralism becomes more complete and the struggle for a bogus "socialist alternative" , but not like a single, integrated, but in one indeterminate pole in which everyone has his/her own understanding from socialist alternative and contrary to the teaching of scientific communism and under the leadership of a single working class party, have gathered only in the extent of a political front. This superficial and one sided view is arising from not seeing or not understanding the importance of a single commanding headquarter of the working class in a complex and complicated class war.

Kaveh Dadgari, in the publication # 239, pg. 15 of "Jahane Emrooz", (first half of August, 2012, Communist Party of Iran's publication) justifies as such: "What does **currently** the precept of Iranian proletariat **need** against bourgeoisie that is in preferment and advancement? The answer is very clear, **immediate and almost continuously**: To make aware, to organize and mobilization of the working class, trying for **coordination and cooperation** among different sectors of the labor movement activists and leaders, wherever and whenever and to any degree that it is possible, making worker's movement widespread and unified in the version of active interference in current struggles of the working class....how is this precept being done and what process, program and plan as the program of guideline plan should be followed? The answer to this question....no need for complex thought, idealization , and astonishing and ingenuity plans... **the radical activists of the worker's movement of Iran must pursue with all their efforts and energy and as the first and fundamental duty the "unity in action" from the bottom and at the top up, level and depth among leaders, activists, partisans and in every where, continuously....the ploy of "unity of action", is our ploy of today, tomorrow and everyday and is concerned with the entirety of our activities and struggles, before and after the overthrow of the bourgeois Islamic Republictherefore, the communists and worker's movement activists and vanguards, are to advance all their energy and resources coordinated in daily struggle against bourgeoisie's stronghold areas of economy, politics, culture and society and clearly set before the one's eyes the "unity of action" as the organizational program and organizational structure of struggle... This orientation in policy, correctly has proclaimed by the "Communist Party of Iran" in the arena of effort to create " left political pole"**

and also specified practice in this direction has been achieved “(End of quotation, all of emphasis on words and sentences are ours) and then, Nosrat Taimourzadeh for more emphasis on this policy in an article titled “joint session of the communist and left forces, response to which question”? (“Jahane Emrooz”, issue # 297, pg. 6, August 27, 2012), writes:

“Contrary to bourgeois forces which mislead the people and instead inject their own class interests to theme as national interest of all sectors of society, the communists loudly proclaim that society has been divided into classes. Each class of society through their representatives, or their parties, offering variety of policies and sets its programs for public spectrum to see. Therefore, the working class, parties and organizations which identify and define themselves as part of this class, it is essential to call upon society toward the revolutionary working class alternative...Do communism and left as a powerful pole of the community are able to change the fate of the community or bearing on the struggles for social changes in Iran too be affected with the fate of the revolutionary struggles of the region and as a result, have been stalled half way or reactionary and imperialist alternatives **to be replaced** with Islamic system”.

This view of Communist Party of Iran and all other pluralists is a new “discovery” in an infantile manner which summarizes battle between life and death and complex class struggle of communists with local and global bourgeoisie to the extent of “unity of action” of the” parties, organizations, left and communist institutions”, without noticing that “practice” is not a single subject or event and continuously outbreaks in different forms and unity over that, given the multiplicity of the left organizations, are impossible or if we are optimistic, it is going to take long time which fades away the opportunity for immediate action in the daily class struggle. If the purpose of the “unity of actions” is all the acts of the communist struggle, like the way some invoke that with formulation of “lasting unity of action”, suppose such unity becomes possible, such motive that praises this unity between the communists, but when it comes to its realization, is not willing to unite. Now, what other thing beside petty-bourgeois factionalism and sectarianism is inconsistent with the teaching of scientific communism? Is the organizational unity of the communists is essentially part of the advancement of the revolutionary practice? Therefore, if comrade Kaveh Dadgary, and Nosrat Taimourzadeh do speak frankly, they must have had stated that we are the Communist Party of Iran and we are willing to unite with all of you lefts and naturally, such frankly speaking is in violation of the session of Colon, Germany which has been issued a statement as the communists and not by the Communist Party and other none communist organizations!

Another examples of transfusion of the petty-bourgeois view within the proletarian view, is how to approach with the decision in a communist organization. An observer comrade as a representative of a participant organization at the session in Colon, Germany proudly states that their organization has the following interpretation of Democratic-Centralism in their organization and their congress has approved it: “the decisions are taken on the basis of majority vote, but the minority is not bound to follow” (quotation to mean).

In scientific communism, the emphasis on the execution of Democratic-Centralism to mean “minority has to follow majority” in practice and by maintaining one’s own view and continue the struggle within the party to defend the legitimacy of this minority view. Since the communists here do not only want to interpret the world but their aim is to change it (Marx), the majority view would be implemented by the entire party member as a relative truth or agreement in practice until the correctness and incorrectness of majority view to be determined. But, the petty-bourgeois interpretation of Democratic-Centralism by the observant comrade and his organization, the majority decision will not be implemented in practice with certainty, since in practice the same minority would obstruct these views so it won’t be implemented in practice

and this circumstance also create the semen of splitting. The ideological origin of this deviationist view is individualism which denies any collective work under the pretext of the petit-bourgeois' "majority dictatorship" and in fact is the propagandist of anarchism in which its flag holder is the minority and individualism!! Naturally, the debate is about the decisions that do not contradict the basic party or organizational principles, practically and theoretically. Otherwise, after severe ideological struggle within the party, split becomes necessary and not denying the proletarian democratic-centralism.

Given the above issues and the last three points of deviance, the necessity of the ideological struggle for surmounting the prevalent petty-bourgeois mode of thinking spread in the worker's and communist movement in Iran which has been penetrated in them a lot more than these examples, is important in advancing the conscious worker's movement and the creation of the wise and militant leadership of this class. For this reason, we invite all communists that are faced with such problem within their organizations to advance a genuine, rational and steady ideological struggle against this harmful phenomenon in the communist and left movement in order to help seriously advance the class struggle of the workers and toilers in Iran via uniting the communists in a single communist party.