

INTENSIFICATION OF THE IDEOLOGICAL STRUGGLE WITHIN THE IRANIAN LEFT MOVEMENT

Written by: K. Abraham, May 11, 2008
Ranjbar, Central Organ of Ranjbaran Party of Iran # 38

The assault of the impudent neo-liberal imperialists against the rights of workers, laborers and all nations of the world, namely in the capital's metropolitan countries, which has continued over the past two decades – along with the simultaneous wanton aggression of the capitalist Islamic Republic against the economic, political, social and individual rights of workers, toilers, women, youth, students, teachers, writers, journalists, artists, and the oppressed nationalities and religious minorities in Iran – has the material root of the intensified theoretical conflict over this question : How is it possible to be liberated from exploitation and oppression in the metropolitan and peripheral countries of the world?

In general, the theoretical conflict coincides with the vicissitudes of the class struggle and with the history of working class struggles which have adopted by different class linings up... Prior to the formulation of the theory of scientific communism by Marx and Engels, in the absence of comprehensive scientific theory, anti-capitalist Left forces and their predecessors were simply poorly armed in terms of theory – having only an eclectic and utopian collection of viewpoints upon which to base their struggle for progress toward their goals. As a result of the work of Marx and Engels, the worker and democratic movements were able to progress from a common theoretical base. The formulation of scientific communism accurately analyzed alignments in their dialectically developing nature; armed with this theory, communists have formed the unique alignment within the working class to lead the working class beyond immediate interests, to rely upon proletarian insight and methods to continue the struggle to overthrow the capitalist order.

Since that time, there has been no place for feudal socialism, for bourgeois socialism, for petite-bourgeois socialism, nor for utopian socialism. History has shown that the world outlook and viewpoints of anarchism, sectarianism, dogmatism, reformism, opportunism and revisionism are alien to Marxism. These detract from the revolutionary spirit of the working class, which remains indifferent to these ideologies which do not serve the fight to end oppression, repression and exploitation in class and patriarchal societies but rather serve to preserve and propagate the rule of exploitation.

Communism is the science of conditions of liberating the working class and all other toilers from the rule of exploitation and repression systems, and ultimately of liberating all of humanity from the self alienation which is the (side) effect of the private ownership of productive forces and (of possessive) individualism. Our approach toward this science cannot be casual, simplistic, naïve or irresponsible; its teachings and edicts cannot be taken carelessly when it comes to their interpretation and their expression. Scientific laws are not rigid and petrified; they are dialectical and evolving, but nevertheless undeniable.

From time immemorial, humankind has by repeated experimentation improved its quality of life, using natural resources in new ways, such as the fashioning of sharp edges on stones for cutting, the creation of fire by the striking of flints, the use of spears for hunting and fending off

wild animals, the domestication of animals, the invention of the wheel to facilitate transportation, improvements in communication and so many other innovations up to the present day and its great advances in productive forces. So far nobody has dared to reject the innovation of knife-like sharp stones or of flints for the ignition of fire. Why not? Because the most advanced cutting tools and the lighters of today are no more than the result of the further development of those same primitive tools by humankind through experimentation and acquired knowledge. Granted, the understanding of social sciences is much more complicated than that of the exact sciences of mathematics, physics, mechanics etc... but the basic point regarding the social sciences and specifically regarding the history of struggle in class societies (which is summed up by scientific communism) is that its solid scientific standing cannot be denied.

The above concepts are the ABC's of a scientific approach toward all phenomena which are to be taken seriously. But today, with thousands of excuses cloaked in colorful prose, this same simple and comprehensible scientific concept is being questioned. The denial of the achievements of the revolutionary proletariat and ignoring the most basic principle of social and class science has become fashionable these days. This ignorance has reached a point where the class essence of many social issues related to the periods before and after the seizure of power by the proletariat has been distorted by many "Left" commentators. These distortions are the reflection of the intensification of class struggles and the quest by the ruling exploiting classes to maintain the status quo; they can be summarized as follows:

A- Denial of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the continuation of the class struggles in socialism until the complete overthrow of the class systems in the world.

B- Denial of the class character of democracy, and support for the pretentious "pure" democracy (which historically does not exist). Why? Because democracy is a form of class rule, and as long as the rule of human over human is necessary, democracy also has the stamp of the ruling class upon it.

C- Denial of the reality that in a class society, each class is divided into three groups: advanced, intermediate, and backward. Current experience shows us that classes are being guided by their own political parties, each of which has very close ties to its own class and its struggles. And extra attention should be given to try to guide the political parties to be led by their most advanced elements who recognize the interests of their class in the best possible way and who defend them. This disparity within each class is basically the product of the existence of disparities within the realms of society and of production and exchange- and only by the elimination of private ownership of the means of production and exchange, the elimination of exploitation, and the consolidation of the communist society is it possible to eliminate the disparities, unless the human limitation caused by natural Phenomenon and to some extent different individual practice.

D- Denial of the principle which states that the goal of scientific communism is not just to interpret the world but essentially to change the world qualitatively. The credibility of scientific communism is based solely in its ability to bring about such change. Because theory for the sake of theory, and/or theory which does not evidence its correctness in practice, would not be of any value.

E- Denial of the precept that practice is the criterion of truth measurement and not abstract reasoning and theorizing without the aspect of practice. Theory without scientific evidence creates chaos within the workers and toilers movement.

F- Denial of the principle that the knowledge of a complicated social phenomena and attempting to change it, without the knowledge of its fundamental contradictions and without the knowledge that in each period of time which contradiction has become the principle one and necessarily requires solution in order to be able to eventually change it would not be possible. The theory of communism has resulted from human practice in various realms – especially from the realm of class struggle. It has been shaped in dialectical fashion and it is not the product of subjective effort of pretentious “elites” who only preoccupy themselves with mental “exercise”.

G- Denial of the reality that changing the world is not subjective. Thoughts only serve to change objective reality if they are converted to revolutionary practice of the masses in changing the world. The proletariat and the toiling masses are the main force for change. Meanwhile, the struggles of these great history-making masses would go to waste if they remain without class consciousness, without a correct revolutionary theory and political line, without a united, centralized and vanguard revolutionary leadership, without forming independent organization and without a direct proletariat role in political power after the victory of the revolution, their struggles will otherwise be co-opted by the political forces dependent on non -proletarian classes.

H- Denial of the dialectical view that only when scientific communist theory is applied in experimentation and along with practice can it develop and grow; and the trend of “Progress from theory to practice, and from practice to theory” can then lead on to higher and higher levels in a continuous manner, as is characteristic of the other sciences..

I- But, The Iranian Left movement presents itself as a defender of the working class, Marxism and socialism. However, due to severe class conflicts, the infiltration of traditionally reactionary ideas, and its vast petite-bourgeoisie base (which because of its class character is unstable), there are quite a few organizations which partially or totally ignore scientific communist principles and even offer viewpoints that resemble to anarchistic and opportunistic interpretations of the past hundred years that scientific communism has denied them.. They even seek to put a “revolutionary proletariat” stamp of approval on these incorrect ideas.

Anyone who is scientifically conscientious is who is willing without any prejudice to investigate the teachings of Marx, Engels and Lenin in the past 100 years or more regarding the way a vanguard proletariat organization is formed, would realize that both the founding fathers of scientific communism and Lenin, their loyal student and the developer of their views in the new historical era, endorsed to proletariat practice and emphasized the building of the communist party. Without the pre-eminent role of the vanguard Bolshevik Party in the workers movement of Russia, the workers social democrats of Russia would not have been able to propel the revolution of October 1917 to victory. The history of the revolutionary struggles of the Russian proletariat is congruent with the history of Bolshevism. The unstable positions and struggles of the left, right and centrist factions only functioned to block the advancement of the revolutionary working class of Russia.

During the same period, there were a number of party leaders who instead of creating a vanguard proletarian organization, picked up the banner of defending “freedom to criticize” and “mass recruitment” in a liberal manner, thereby opposing Lenin and other Bolsheviks and finally splitting the new Party.

Since they were not able to impose their opportunistic views on the Party program, they instead sought to implement their opportunism through the organizational activities of the Party, and in this manner, consciously or unconsciously created obstacles to the advancement of the Workers Socialist Democratic Party of Russia. About this intellectual anarchism Lenin wrote: “Inseparably connected with Girondism and aristocratic anarchism is the last characteristic featured in the new Iskra attitude towards matters of organization: namely, its defense of autonomism as against centralism. This is the meaning in principle (if it has any meaning) of its outcry against bureaucracy and autocracy, of its lament about, ‘an undeserved disregard for the non-Iskra-its (who defended autonomism at the congress)’”. (Lenin, “One Step Forward, Two Steps Back”, *The Crisis in Our Party*, Volume 7, *Collected Works*, Marxist Internet Archives)

History shows that many of the high ranking leaders of the proletariat like Kautsky, Plekhanov, Martof, and others converted to social chauvinism and ultimately to social imperialism – who in the guise of defending the working class and Marxism actually adopted strategies which would have confined the working class within the framework of capitalism. In addition to that, by rejecting revolutionary proletarian theory, they were pushed in the direction of serving the bourgeoisie.

These unstable personalities were not loyal until the end to the revolution. At the same time, the left and right opportunists both within and outside the Russian Social Democratic Workers Party did not bother to help strengthen the revolutionary faction of the Bolshevik Party and instead even after the victory of October 1917 tried to weaken the revolution. These opportunists have shown that communists must hold firm to revolutionary proletarian principles with no departure from their basic strategies and tactics. They must also be diligent in strengthening the revolutionary leadership of the Party because without these proletarian principles, organizing workers and laborers around the Party’s policies will not be possible, and the Party will not be able to advance class struggles in the interest of the consolidation of workers power and the continuation of the revolution until the complete elimination of class society.

Bourgeois imperialists, knowing the significance of proletarian revolution, reacting with horror to the October 1917 Revolution, unleashed their might either in direct confrontation (through military and political interventions, etc) to bring to its knees the newly born socialism or by infiltration of the ranks of the working class (to create divisions and discrimination such as by attracting white collar workers to their cause or by contaminating the Party’s cadres with non-revolutionary practice or by the granting of concessions in the parliaments and government apparatus, etc.). These contaminated cadre were used as wolves in sheep’s clothing to undermine scientific communist theory, to question revolutionary theory, and ultimately to distort revolutionary principles. Finally, they gained a strong foothold within the Party and conquered the fortress from inside.

It was in this manner that the Second Workers’ International, which had a significant influence upon the workers movement in the industrialized countries (especially in Europe), fell victim to

reformism and social chauvinism, and then to social imperialism due to the infiltration of revisionists into the leadership. If the anarchists within the First Workers International could not create a serious split within the workers movement due to the efforts of Marx and Engels, this was accomplished by revisionists at the Second International.

Has there ever been enough sense among the Left movement of Iran to ask: Why did Kautsky and his like, who called themselves the “party of the working class” vote for the imperialists’ war budgets in their parliament? Why did they pull the working class, which was struggling to achieve its rights, in the direction of reformism and deception? Why did they try to undermine the October Revolution, especially in Germany where they were directly involved in the defeat of the workers uprising and in the murder of the prominent proletarian leaders Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxembourg?

The history of the class struggle of the proletariat under the leadership of the communists and the social democrats after the declaration of the Communist party Manifesto shows that if at the outset the party building efforts of weak vanguard proletarians faced many challenges and that the class basis of many of its variants had not fully emerged. However, after nearly three quarters of century, it became clear that the communist party is the only true defiant proletarian party which, if armed with the correct political line, is able to resolutely lead the struggles of the working class. Meanwhile, experience has also shown that in those instances of retreat by the leadership of any communist party from the proletarian revolutionary line, the most important responsibility of the loyal supporters of scientific communism is to criticize and ostracize the incorrect views of the Party and not to bring scientific communist theory, which is a tool for party building, into question. Any defeats experienced by proletarian party activism can be explained by misguidance, not by defects in scientific communist theory.

Presently, after decades of division and disarray in the ranks of the working class of the world and specifically in Iran, the impotency of the various Left organizations which reside outside of the working class but which proclaim themselves as communists and supporters of the working class is evident. They merely create divisions among the ranks of the working class. In the leadership of the workers struggles, and given the existence of the everyday danger of the infiltration of reformism into the workers movement, the necessity of creating a single unified communist party to guide the workers movement is also increasingly evident. Under current conditions, the Left organizations, rather than adhering to the teachings of the scientific communism and to revolutionary working class theories, rather than uniting by adopting the fundamental points of Program and tactics to the specific conditions of Iran and guiding the workers movement in the correct direction, they resort to “intellectual exercises” and “seeking practical(scientific) advice” or, as Lenin said, they proceed on to “ autonomy, aristocratic anarchism or intellectualism, pursuance and Girondism”. They attack the sharp dialectics of scientific communist theory, without participating in the class struggle at the global or local scale. Not a single successful communist practice has put the stamp of its correctness on their views! These “intellectual exercises” apply to their very practical and theoretical realm.

For instance, the leadership of Rahe Kargar in the guise of defending Marxism and socialism presents a completely falsified picture of it, rejecting the dictatorship of the proletariat. To them the creation of the communist party is sectarianism. They advocate organizational pluralism, and praise economic democracy and unconditional freedom without obligations in socialism,

without having any experience in this connection that would demonstrate the correctness of their views. For them, rejection and denial is sufficient criticism!

Mohammad Reza Shalgooni, leader of Rahe – Kargar, in an interview published in Rahe Kargar Issue # 332 (May 9, 2008), on the occasion of the 190th birthday of Karl Marx [May 5, 1818], under the title “An Overview of Marx’s Thought” says: “Marxism emphasizes that there is a difference between the type of system that would be born during the transition when the proletariat takes the political power, and that system that is in place after the complete annihilation of capitalism, creating the structural changes within class relations leading to the abolition of classes”. Therefore, what he means by his second point is that socialism is a phenomenon in the process of realization and he specifically emphasizes from the beginning till the time of its maturity – because the changes are many and are important – what changes would take place.

The other point that is very important: is it that socialism is not like capitalism, in that now a group namely workers rule over the entire society? No, that is not the case. It is the establishment of a democratic order in which not only the interest of the overwhelming majority but the interest of all humanity and even the interest of every individual would be represented”. (In reality, here the interest of every individual must be granted). And this famous saying of the Manifesto that Engels also subsequently emphasized on every occasion is this: if we ever want to state in a single sentence what the goal of socialism would be, it is that ‘an order that is a guarantee for an individual would be a guarantee for all’. This order not only is democratic – not just in the sense of bourgeois democracy- but rather it ensures that individual freedom and individual liberty expand rapidly in an unprecedented way, totally different compared to previous eras, until it achieves the level of communist society”.

Shalgooni’s definition of socialism is equivocal and completely aberrant. Not only socialism but any phenomenon in as much as being material, is “in the process of realization”. Matter without motion does not exist. On the one hand he speaks from a Marxist point of view in discussing the transition period after the proletariat takes over the power, but he fails to clarify that this period of transition is a complete historical period, and that the essence of power in this period is the dictatorship of the proletariat. He does not specify the type of activity that the proletariat has to carry out until the abolition of classes is complete. On the other hand, he asserts that socialism “is the establishment of a democratic order in which not only the interest of the majority but the interest of all humanity and even the interest of every individual would be represented” and relates this statement to Engels [whose actual words relate to the higher phase of communist society] and falsifies the difference between the two historical stages of the “transition from capitalism” (socialism) and the “realization of communist relationships”. This can only confuse the reader.

Meanwhile, Marx precisely states that “Between capitalist and communist (socialist) society lies period of the revolutionary transformation of the one to the other. There corresponds to this also a political transition period in which the state can be nothing if not the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat.” (Critique of the Gotha Program, pg. 538, Marx-Engels Reader, Robert Tucker, 1978).

Marx further adds: “but these defects are inevitable in the first phase of communism as it has just emerged after prolonged birth pangs from capitalist society. Rights can never transcend the economic structure and the cultural development conditioned thereby.” [Referring to unequal

exchange, as in “to each according to his ability”.] (Critique of the Gotha Program, pg. 531 – Under lining from writer).

Of course, ideological disarray is not solely the invention of Rahe Kargar’s theoreticians. What is particularly pertinent to them is the failure to show clearly the “class character” of the era, during which the dictatorship of the proletariat is in place. And the only difference that this dictatorship has with the dictatorship of the exploiting classes is that under socialism, the dictatorship of the majority workers and toilers is enforced upon the minority of exploiters – and that this majority benefits from proletarian democracy, from the advancement of socialism globally and from its control over advanced methods of production in the world, both the dictatorship and the democracy formerly enforced by the state gradually wither away. It thus exposes its philosophical essence. Ownership becomes social. Wage labor will be abolished and there will no longer be any reason for one group of people for the sake of their own interest to suppress another group by force of violence to make them submit, and to rule over them. Meanwhile, in the capitalist system not only is the dictatorship of the minority over the majority imposed, but basically “democracy” serves the interest of the minority capitalists. And since the capitalist system is also “in the process of realization”, as the concentration of capital increases, power rises from the level of a single country to the global level – confronting humanity with the choice of “socialism or barbarism” as we are presently witnessing.

The “initiative” of this confusion between the first phase of communism (socialism) and the second or superior phase of communism is traceable to the Trotskyites or quasi Trotskyites who denied the uneven nature of the growth of the revolution, who denied the possibility of the victory of the socialist revolution and progress in the direction of building a socialist society in one country, even in its primary stages- and who resorted to interpretations so at odds with reality merely to tailor reality to fit their incorrect theory.

M.Raz , the so called editor of the translation of the Critique of the Gotha Program, who does not mention the name of the translator, proceeds to explain that “From Marx’s point of view, there was no qualitative difference between socialism and communism. Socialism is merely the first stage of communism. In socialism the classes and the state would be eliminated [when?] and each individual in such society would receive the product of that society in as much as his share in social production. Then, in the communist stage – with the qualitative growth of the productive forces globally and economic prosperity – would be ‘to each according to his need’. But before reaching the level of communist society, the society enters a specific stage of development: the stage of transition from capitalism to socialism.”

It is interesting that Marx himself speaks of “the period of transition from capitalism to communism” while M. Razi claims that for Marx “there is no difference between socialism and communism”!! (Which quality does he have in mind?) He speaks of “the periods of transition from capitalism to socialism”! If this claim is correct then, we must call into account our great proletarian teacher who wrote the Critique of the Gotha Program and proceed to highlight its inaccuracy! But do you really think Marx could omit one of these –isms, and mention socialism without communism or communism without socialism? Because according to M.Razi’s claim, for Marx “there are no qualitative differences” between them. This Trotskyite claim is just as incorrect as to say that between different stages of capitalist development, from the period of manufacturing until the period of multinational neoliberal monopolies, “there are no qualitative differences between them” and that materialism plays no role in this phenomenon which is “in

the process of realization” or that there is no difference in the concentration of capital from a primary level to a higher level! It is with this pure “masterpiece” of misrepresentation that the democratic revolutions under the leadership of the proletariat are denied. Then according to their claim, the October Revolution was not a socialist revolution since it belonged to the period of transition from the seizure of power by the proletariat and therefore not a genuine revolution advancing in the direction of socialism!! In the letter that Engels wrote to Bebel [London (March 18-28, 1875)] and which is printed at the end of Critique of the Gotha Program, he writes: “so long as the proletariat still makes use of the state, it makes use of it, not for the purpose of freedom, but for keeping down its enemies and, as soon as there can be any question of freedom, the state as such ceases to exist.”

In summing up the achievements of the Paris Commune, Marx wrote in 1871: “The Commune was exactly the opposite of empire”. “Commune, that particular form” which unlike other republics had to overthrow not only the monarchical form of class supremacy but class supremacy itself”... and Lenin adds, “What was this ‘particular’ form of proletarian republic? That of the dictatorship of the proletariat!” (State and Revolution, Collected Works in One Volume in Farsi, pg.531).

If the leadership of Rahe Kargar agrees with these crystal clear positions of Marx and Engels that the proletariat has to seize power, then, what does it mean by omitting the dictatorship of the proletariat from their program? Why are they searching to find how many times Marx referenced “the dictatorship of the proletariat” in his writings? And despite the number of times this phrase is cited, how can they claim how unimportant it is, ignoring that in class society, the dictatorship of the ruling class is a stark reality?

Lenin proclaims in “Left Wing “Communism, An Infantile Disorder, on the basis of the first experience of the period after which the proletariat seized power : “The dictatorship of the proletariat is a most determined and most ruthless war waged by the new class against a more powerful enemy, the bourgeoisie, whose resistance is increased tenfold by its overthrow (even if only in one country), and whose power lies not only in the strength of international capital, in the strength and durability of the international connections of the bourgeoisie, but also in the force of habit, in the strength of small production. For, unfortunately, small production is still very, very widespread in the world, and small production engenders capitalism and the bourgeoisie continually, daily, hourly, spontaneously, and on an extensive scale. For all these reasons the dictatorship of the proletariat is essential, and victory over the bourgeoisie is impossible without a long, stubborn and desperate war of life and death, a war demanding perseverance, discipline, firmness, indomitableness and unity of will.” (Collected Works in One Volume, Foreign Language Press, Beijing, 1975, pg. 5)

Now, we follow up on the insufficiency of commitment to the teachings of scientific communism on the part of some members of Left organizations.

All communists agree that the “Manifesto of the Communist Party” was the first program for “the communist league” and anyone who studies the prefaces written by Marx and Engels regarding this historical document and its impact would acknowledge this reality.

Marx and Engels, in the introduction to Manifesto of the Communist Party, German edition, 1872 wrote as follows: “The communist league, an international association of workers, which could of course be only a secret one under that circumstance, commissioned us the undersigned, at the Congress held in London in November 1847, to draw up for publication a detailed theoretical and practical program of the party” (under lined by writer). Ten years later, in the preface to the Manifesto of the Russian edition in 1882, they added: “The first Russian edition of the “Manifesto of the Communist Party”, translated by Bakunin, was published at the beginning of the 1860s.....Just how limited a field the proletarian movement still occupied at that time (December, 1847) is most clearly shown by the last section of the Manifesto: ‘The Position of the Communists in Relation to the Various Existing Opposition Parties’.” (Last under lining by writer)

Finally, after the death of Marx, Engels wrote in the preface to the English edition of 1888: “The Manifesto was published as the program of the Communist League, a working men’s association, which was first exclusively German and later international . . .”

Thus, Marx and Engels wrote the Manifesto as the program for the communist party and in this manner determined the relationship of the communist party to the different other opposition parties. In addition, after the unsuccessful experience of the Workers’ First International and its breakup, in connection with proletarian organizing, they more than ever concentrated on the formation of the pioneer worker parties – meaning the communist party - in which its differentiating characteristic from the other parties is that this Party defends the general interests of the worker movement. And the general interest of the worker movement is no less than the overthrow of private ownership of the means of production, and the abolition of wage labor exploitation by shattering the bourgeois state machine through the proletarian revolution and the consolidation of proletarian rule. They showed that the Critique of the Gotha Program is a model for demonstrating the necessity of accurately describing the programs of parties which apparently support socialism and communism but which put forth dogmatic and revisionist views which must be corrected. But the leadership and the cadres of Rahe Kargar deliberately failed to mention the Manifesto of the Communist Party; since they cannot completely ignore this eternal milestone, they only refer to it as the “Manifesto” and they even go so far as to say that believing that the Communist Party is the only vanguard party of the working class akin to “sectarianism”. Isn’t that alone proof of their insufficient commitment to the theory of scientific communism? Additionally, Yoosef Abkhoon in publication # 331 of Rahe Kargar talks about the necessity of the unity (grafting) of communists with working class organizations, criticizes the views of political groups which claim to be omniscient, and he offers prescriptions for the working class in their struggles, saying: “In the concepts of our Lefts, these movements, organizations and genuinely militant leaders of trade unions potentially are reactionary unless they seek self revolutionary credibility by subsuming their views to the policies of some invisible circles composed by some so called professional revolutionaries; meanwhile they do not have any real connection with the working class.....It is the material living condition of the working class that is the determining factor and not subjectivism... In other words, no matter how broad-based or how well-planned their activities may be, this organization [here he means a conspiratorial organization] could not be the political organization or a revolutionary party capable of overthrowing the system of wage labor. This goal can be secured only with the power of the working class and their practical steps in the struggle against capitalism”. Finally he resorts to quoting Marx from “the last section of the Manifesto” that the “communists are not any special party as against other workers parties....”

Yoosef Abkhood twists like a snake between various conflicting and retrograde views until finally concluding with the rejection of concept of the single working class communist party.

First- we have shown above that the program for communist organizations is the Manifesto and not the self-aggrandizing pretty words for unorganized confused communists! In addition, granted that the working class is the main force in overthrowing the capitalist system; but without being armed with revolutionary theory, and in the absence of revolutionary leadership, it will not be able to carry out the revolution. The clearest example of that are the workers in Europe: they have had trade-union and have been organized for more than 150 years yet now are struggling to bring themselves out from under the reformist and syndicalist leadership which have become handmaidens to the imperialist capitalist system for ultra profit. In the final analysis, the determinative role of the working class is not guaranteed at any and all times. If that were the case, then we need only set aside scientific communism and stand by to simply follow the spontaneous actions of worker movements. That is the present preoccupation of Rahe Kargar!

Second- if there is not any bad intentions, Marx's conclusion is that the communist party cannot be separate from the working class but is part of the class – specifically, the vanguard part of that class. The fact that in adapting to the conditions of any particular country, a party has to be underground or not does nothing to diminish the importance of this conclusion – which is the absolute necessity of the communist party. No serious Marxist believes that it is possible to build a communist party outside of the working class, along with the intellectuals and that can represent vanguard proletarian views without having any close connection with the proletariat and its movement?

Third- even if the planning and program of a party were correct to the degree that they are expressive of the general and specific interests of the workers movement, such a party, without having a very close connection to the working class, would not be able to implement that program. Correct ideas do not fall from the sky, but rather are the reflection of correct practice. There is a wide gap between sectarian principles, tactics and platforms and communist party principles, tactics and platforms. One example of this fact is that a number of Iranian Left organizations proclaim themselves to be the sole communist party of Iran without any sense of the requirements of becoming a communist party – whether theoretically, scientifically or in regard to the dialectical materialist outlook!

Fourth- There are sectarians, who maintain abstract political views, as Shamlou, the well known Iranian poet says that they are from “other hell”. What this really means is that they present petite-bourgeois viewpoints to the people as if these were genuine communist viewpoints – and for this same reason, they can never become an authoritative force in the workers movement.

Fifth-Isn't it true that Mr. Yoosef, your own organization is guilty of what you criticize? On the basis of what connection to the workers movement, on the basis of what effective leadership of the workers movement, your organization reject the dictatorship of the proletariat, advocating ultra class democracy and denying the important role of the advancement of vanguard workers party over the past 100 years in proletarian practice, can you claim to have so much serious influence in advancing the workers movement? Physician, heal thyself! Before you seek to correct sectarian groups, you must first adhere to scientific communism yourself!

In the same issue of Rahe Kargar, Taghi Roozbeh with the same faulty analysis of Yoosef Abkhood and the like takes up the pen so that he can “show the way out of the workers challenging dilemma”! Don’t we have the right to ask you under what authority you are “showing [the working class] the way out of [its] dilemma”? Do you think that the workers are infants? Since you are attempting to do such a thing, does this would mean that you see yourself being among the vanguard and militant workers? What is the explanation behind this upside down representation (false color showing)?

On the one hand he correctly emphasizes that “the immediate goal of the communists is an irreversible goal and under all conditions, the struggle is to organize the proletariat as a class. Such act doubtlessly is against sectarianism that prevents proletariat to become a class for itself.” And on the other hand he writes: “The communists look at the working class as a great, broad and pluralist class in itself. In consideration of this principle of pluralism, organizations should do away with entrenched totalitarianism (or the “I am the only one who knows the answer” attitude) inherent in the ‘Marxist’ demand for a single party and a single organization. This is one of the results of the democratic outlook and a non-totalitarian and non-ideological view of Marxism”

Once again, a lack of belief in scientific proletarian ideology and the tendency to advance the opportunist line in the organizational arena is clearly reflected in his writing.

If indeed irreversibly and under all conditions, the immediate goal of the communists is to struggle for organizing the proletariat as a class in itself, then:

First- while maintaining a single goal, in principle the communists must form a single organization so that they can better advance this correct goal. Because a single voice, alone, has no impact. And if they are not willing to unite in a single organization, then reason tells us that we have to seek out the destructive element impeding that unity – which is nothing more than sectarian petite-bourgeois ideologies that erode proletarian discipline.

Second – If the working class is a great, broad and pluralist class of which any segment may have a specific interest, then how is it possible to organize this entire class “as a class in (or for) itself” despite different interests!? Hasn’t history shown us that the white collar workers and fat social democrats occupying seats in parliament (who enjoy the benefits of huge profits gained by the bourgeoisie through the exploitation of workers and the plunder of the world) turn their backs on the workers and become the servants of the imperialists, persuading the workers to buy into reformism and class collaboration? Have we not seen the destructive role they play as the bourgeois representative within the working class, ever on the lookout for the right opportunity to subvert the power of the working class? Then, a class “for itself” (or “in itself”) can only be possible through creation of a vanguard party, and not merely by workers becoming organized into trade union! In other words, a proletarian class position has to do with reliance upon liberating ideas and not upon submission to exploitation!

Third- Isn’t it true that based on historical experience, that only under the leadership of genuine communist parties have workers gained victory in revolution and exposed the agents of the

bourgeoisie in their ranks – not with the victory under the leadership of anarchists, opportunists, and revisionists, etc.!

Then, the existence of different views among the working class shows that this class can only be a class for itself when it has a correct revolutionary line and is empowered with a vanguard organization that is the genuine defender of the general and specific interests of the working class. Even if we suppose that the entire working class is organized, without the vanguard leadership, again it will not be a class for itself!

Fourth- describing the Marxist viewpoint about proletarian vanguard party as “totalitarian” means that Marx himself is to blame for being totalitarian. This means discrediting Marxism in the guise of defending the working class. This is a clear expression of the petite-bourgeois ideology which widely diffused. At the end of the decade of the 1960’s, anarchism in the process of revolution showed itself within the guerilla movement, separated from the masses. Today, anarchism has again entered the battleground to discredit the communist party of the working class to mobilize the vanguard workers!

Fifth- “Attaching the characterization of democratic, non-totalitarian and non-ideological outlook” to Marxism, in the above claim by Taghi Roozbeh, without a doubt is an obscene distortion of the world outlook of communism. It has no value other than to offer to the people a counterfeit commodity – in the same manner that a wily capitalist business man would! In addition, it would never be possible to prevent the vanguard of the working class from believing dialectical materialism and historical materialism, and that a bright world future with no class, no exploitation and no oppression can be won. The vanguard proletarian would never defend such nonsense as “non-ideological Marxism”, or believe a shady salesman of pseudo-Marxism without roots or principles

You are right to be upset about “the splintered working class” referenced to the outlook excuses. But the workers cannot be blamed for being splintered. Apart from the capitalist conspiracies, the broadcast of distorted and pluralistic views such as yours, which come straight out of the likes of Kautsky, Khrushchev and Deng Xiao Ping... etc and which seek to deviate the great international movement of the working class. Were Marx and Engels the ones who caused the First International to be defeated, or was it the fault of anarchists, such as Bakunin? Did Lenin cause the Second International to collaborate with the imperialists, or was this the fault of the old revisionists, such as Kautsky? Did Stalin and Mao offer up the socialist countries with all of their shortcomings to the imperialist powers, or did the modern revisionists and the defenders of the Third World Thesis?

Taking into account all of the existing experience in the world today, whether through proletariat victories or defeats in the ongoing class struggle, the present claim by the leadership of Rahe Kargar that communist parties are totalitarian, is only a dead end; they again lead the working class toward sectarianism, revisionism and new divisions. The purpose of this organization is to not ever allow the working class to seize power and to deprive it of correct strategic / tactical lines; in practice they simply encourage the different factions of the working class to be further splintered... This is what the working class in Iran presently is witnessing! History has already exposed many communist leaders who capitulated to the bourgeoisie. But identifying the mistakes and correcting the line and methods of the communist party, and criticizing the communist party as totalitarian, are two totally different and contradictory things. The first one has the potential to bring improvement; the second one has only destructive potential!

But Rahe Kargar is not the only source of the pluralistic deviation among the working class. Rather than from the Right, the Pseudo -Trotskyite network, of which Mansour Hekmat was the leader, promoted this deviation from a Leftist position, in the guise of defending apparently the Party line; but splintering in reality. In 1981 they-"The unity of communist fighter's organization"- put out a joint program with Koomeleh (an Iranian Kurdish Left organization). In 1982 they held a congress and declared themselves the Communist Party of Iran; they then claimed that any Left organization which did not accept their program could not be communist and was therefore attached to the bourgeoisie. Then, cleverly and with the blessing of Koomeleh, they actively used any means to destroy other Leftist organizations. After the consolidation of their position in the leadership of "the Communist Party of Iran", all of a sudden they "discovered" that Koomeleh was involved in supporting Kurdish nationalism and in the last decade of the 1980s, they split from Koomeleh in a "civilized" manner and formed the "The Workers Communist Party". Beginning with its formation and continuing today, a number of splits have occurred within this new "pure" party. Its real goal was to splinter the ranks of struggling workers.

But the deviationist line of Mansour Hekmat was much more subtle than that of Rahe Kargar. Note carefully these words: "But gradually society will accept that the Party... formed from a wide spectrum of individuals who can think independently and despite of all their diversity of expression, has members who belong to a single movement. Anyone inclined to join us on the side of our political unity will be recognized. We recognize what other class movements have done and we are behind them..." (from the publication, "A Better World", # 49, April 2008, pg. 8, Organ of the " Worker Communism Union Party ").

First- No one at the higher levels of proletarian leadership has ever claimed that the Party must be like a puppet, saying the same thing with one tune and one expression! Ideological struggle has always been prevalent within the communist parties and there are tens of thousands of written pages to document this – pages which existed before Mansour Hekmat and even his ancestor were born! ("The struggle within the party brings the party energy and life", Lassalle's letter to Marx, June 24, 1852).

Second- If political unity does not accompany organizational unity, the idea of a proletarian party inevitably must be questioned. To change the world, it is so important that political unity exist and Party principle not be ignored. If these rules are (not) followed, the ideological struggle can (not) be carried out in a positive manner. While respecting the minority view, the majority must continue the struggle on the basis of its decisions. It is not up to each member to choose his own path and in a "civilized manner" or "selfish manner" any time that a divergence occurs, or to split from each other at any opportunity. Is a vanguard proletarian political organization so worthless that members can leave arbitrarily or be expelled without the opportunity for ideological struggle to distinguish the correct from the incorrect?

Third- For a vanguard proletarian party that believe in proletarian democracy, principally must be better than the current bourgeois democracy, which is based on individual and group interests. What is it that the communists must learn from the movements of other classes? Isn't bourgeois democracy in the service of the bourgeoisie? And if this is the case, then what can communists learn from the bourgeoisie to refashion the democracy of the bourgeoisie to serve the proletariat?!

Fourth- When the bourgeoisie trying to denigrates workers and the communist movement, and creates divisions among the people, and pursuing its strategy of "divide and conquer", if there is

anything to learn from the other classes, it would be to do the opposite of what they are doing – and to continue to apply the profoundly proletarian democratic method in a resolute and committed manner.

Fifth- Addressing an issue in a confused manner doesn't mean that we have to behave like the bourgeoisie whose aim is not unity but division among the people.

Within the spectrum of organizations which deny the necessity of the existence of the communist party, there also exists a centrist approach in which speaks eclectically about unity of action of the Left and communist forces. And they declare such unity as the only remedy for bringing these forces together.

Helmat Ahmadian (member of CC of Communist Party of Iran) – under the title of “Socialist Answer to the Present Political situation: Obstacles and Possibilities” (The World Today, #207, mid-April, 2008) – maintains that: “Unity in action and convergence under a common strategy, in response to the needs of the social movements – especially the workers movement – in Iran: these are some options and possibilities through which, under the present situation, political forces can become attracted to or repelled by each other.” He adds that “Past experience has shown that the conditions for forging a common program and platform, for full cooperation have not effectively been in place among these forces. Why not? Because political forces or organizations never have any shortage of programs or platforms, and as it has been mentioned a number of times in the past, it is possible to base a common program for all, with slight change to the existing program of each one of the existing parties and groups.”

“As we have also experienced in practice, the physical merger of these forces and their effective organizational unity has not been and will not be an easy solution. Why not? Because even under the best conditions, for all of these groups to become truly committed to this new umbrella organization that can only be converted to an organization slightly more powerful. Meanwhile, as we have also seen in practice, this kind of umbrella organization will be considered as only a secondary affiliation for many of these groups. (What is the reason behind it?!Writer). “Two main factors can serve as the main axis of cooperation and unity among the forces that have socialist tendencies. First is the socialist perspective and (its related) strategy, and the practical reinforcement of this trend within social movements. Second is the response to the real needs of these movements in Iran, at the head of which is the workers movement. Why? Because in reality these two factors are the ones that will break down the walls, borders and demarcation lines in the objective and realistic itinerary and will create solid common ground upon which the different elements of the spectrum of Left and communists forces can stand in unity.”

The pragmatic style of comrade Helmet is probably useful to a degree in the workers movement in terms of fighting to satisfy workers' economic demands. However, the history of the workers movement in Iran, including the time of the drawing up the platform of the “Coordinating Committee” has shown that in this movement there exist different factions – with bourgeois, petite-bourgeois and proletarian ideologies – which stand against each other and which are easily split from each other. But note also:

First- Your party, as you call it the Communist Party, and which you have proclaimed that is the ultimate outcome of party building, has never taken up the serious issues regarding the creation of a party. You are thinking that the vanguards of the working class have been united in your party. Therefore, you are more focused on unity in action with other Left forces – and this is

reflected in your past party resolutions. Naturally, unity with you only is obtained when these forces that you would call Left move closer to your party and accept your program. In any case, acceptance of unity in action by communists is the rejection of the essence of being communist. Communists for purposes of strategic unity are united in world outlook and in viewpoints; historically they cannot deny unity and if they fail to unite, it means that there has been an intrigue afoot among the working class ideals!

Second- in any communist movement or, in any real communist party, class contradictions in their most severe way reflect themselves in the formulation and testing of strategies, tactics and even the party's work methods. Why? Because within the communist party, there is no place for bourgeois and petite-bourgeois compromise. The science of class struggle does not proceed on the basis of "do as you wish, please" to resolve problems. The true communist way is to proceed through a principled struggle and in a comradely manner, to sit down for a dialogue and based on their understanding, finally choose the best view. This method of thinking is different from that of the tradition of Mansour Hekmat who provokes divisions within other organizations and then "attracts individuals toward himself"!

Third- It is true that in the various specific claims and the general issues of different organizations, there exist shared points of view in their programs and their platforms. But, it simply is not possible to merge each one of those programs and platforms into a single program while only making minor changes. You do not even do that yourself; you persist in your views and you would insist on the legitimacy of your views. Now, if it is not the case, then, state clearly for us with which program or platform are you in agreement? But, in our view, the case is more complicated than that. The unity of communists resides not only in the program and in tactics. In addition, the unity of communists is also grounded in theoretical principles and revolutionary work methods

Fourth- Your mechanical approach to the unity of the groups is a clear expression of your lack of emphasis on the unity of communists. A communist party without a correct platform does not make any sense. Deviation from that and factionalism within a party indicates that some individuals or organizations may have united with other organizations but, their unity in nature is tactical and not strategic; naturally, such unity is artificial. This situation reaches a point where the individuals and factions call themselves "the headquarters of the party" and totally ignore the authority of party building and the party itself. In fact you witnessed of it in your own party in which your ideological leadership and the leader / founder of Koomeleh acted this way! These types of behavior have nothing to do with proletarian party unity. To claim that the addition of few individuals to an organization does not engender any changes is an extremely short sighted view; it ignores the change from quantitative to qualitative on the one hand and presents a positive revolutionary model to social movements and in particular to the working class on the other.

Fifth- In the struggle for unity of the communist movement we cannot act on the basis of pragmatism (alone). We must apply an extreme accuracy and have a scientific approach toward the program of the class struggle. As we noticed above, many outwardly talk about "the socialist perspective" and "communism" but, each one of them has their own interpretation and do not accept any other interpretation. Then, to be contented thinking that in the process of mutual struggle to help the growth of the workers movement and so on, it is possible to reach unity, only means that the existing organizations and the individuals in Left movements have no firm belief in their own basic viewpoints and it is only in practice that they trust each other and finally achieve theoretical dialogue! Of course, moving close to each other in practice is a necessary condition but, it is in no way a sufficient condition; and history has shown that unity is not forged

on the basis of joint practical activities but rather through ideological struggle around theoretical principles and around the practical activities which result. Otherwise, with a red pen, we would need to cross out all of the ideological struggles of the past 160-year history of the international communist movement. Even though today's present ideological struggles, and the Iranian communist movement, have not achieved striking results, it is not because the struggle has been incorrect but, it is the corrosion of non-proletarian views and ideologies within these forces that is the real cause. Individualism and factionalism, as the reflection of non-proletarian views (and specifically petite-bourgeois views) are intensely corrosive.

And finally, recently, at last, a few of the isolated Marxists on May 20, 2008 put out a summons and proclaimed that: "Today, both inside and outside of Iran, we are faced with a swarm of politically isolated individuals who come from several generations of political activities and from different organizations and with different experiences...The existing political organizations have not been able to organize themselves around the above demands (belief in social revolution, abolition of commodity production, elimination of any kind of social inequalities among women and men... and liberation of humankind in general) and till now due to their being politically sectarian, with their pyramid -type organizational structures. These have been the main reasons for the isolation and shameful failure of many of these activists of the socialist movement to make progress toward abolition of wage labor. In other words, we are faced with an isolated and unorganized communist movement. Besides the political and theoretical reasons, in our opinion, the other reason for the lack of success of these political parties and organizations is their organizational structure – which is not any different from that of the bourgeois parties. Why? Because this pyramid type structure is hierarchical, from top to bottom, and non- democratic; it limits individual freedom, sanctifies the leadership as holy, fosters asymmetric relations of power- and it legitimizes its rule within the framework of that organization." "To determine what specific forms we Marxists must have in order to get organized, and the broad investigation of how to go about organizing these isolated ones abroad, we call for a dialogue to find a solution to this issue with the joint participation of all...via the creation of a forum and an electronic Marxist publication..."

First- The existence of the many politically isolated individuals from different Left organizations is an indicator that ideological struggles have not been correctly advanced among these forces. The leadership of these organizations has not been able to create principled unity within their own organizations which is in itself an indicator of weak ideological, political, organizational and leadership methods. This is a principally correct criticism.

Second- This large number of isolated individuals must ask themselves to what degree have they insisted upon the Marxist criterion in ideological struggle within their organizations and what results have they achieved? Was it a deviation of their leadership from the standards of Marxism which led them to leave these organizations? Were they a model in implementing party activities? Or, did they blame the problems on others?

Third- If these individuals oppose deviation, why is it that this large number of individuals with so much past experience has so far have been unable to step forward and create an organization of their own which rejects deviationism, providing a positive model for the Left movements and endeavoring for unity in the Left movement?

Fourth- To reject the pyramid organizational structure is at its best no more than inaugurating an altogether new system or form which in practice (except in some limited instances) has no

application. What meaning can this have? Do you think the communist party and the top leaders of the communist movement such as Marx, Engels, Lenin, Mao and others have performed incorrectly and that they had to cross a red line on the concept of party building? Do you think that a simple worker, who believes in your above stated criterion, necessarily has the particular and essential characteristics to guide the proletarian class struggle? And if that is the case, what is the need for an organization? Contrary to your view, the masses of workers live every day in class struggle and they witness all kinds of crimes committed by the capitalist system. But they have not carried out a revolution; nor have they established communism.

On the basis of the unsuccessful and incorrect experience that you had, you cannot ignore the subtle and precise laws of class struggles and simply point out similarities to compare communist parties and bourgeois parties. Perhaps, contrary to your views, in bourgeois parties there is no commitment to party principles. Unbridled liberalism rules the day and individual membership is decided solely on the basis of which party is more financially beneficial to join. Of course, in the bourgeois parties there exists hierarchy as well, and as we pointed out above, it is a reflection of the unevenness of socio-economic development. As long as there is private ownership of the means of production and exchange, individuals in society will not be at the same level; but if they come to be at the same level, does this mean that the bourgeoisie has established a just system?

Fifth- Attributing that the leadership of the communist parties have a tendency to become "totalitarian", means that either (1) the leadership of these parties have not yet changed from the bourgeois self centered ideology and do not apply the teachings of the scientific communism; or (2) the party members themselves follow the leadership like sheep and do not stand up against inequalities and incompetence of it; or (3) you have simply heard this description from the supporters of the bourgeoisie and you admired it! In any event, denigrating communist parties under any circumstance will only serve the interest of the bourgeoisie and promote its propaganda. Correcting defects does not mean the rejection of the existence of the party and party building.

In this manner, presently it can be noticed that the intensification of the class contradictions in Iran, now more than at any other time, clarifies the necessity of unity within the working class in their organizations and in addition, the unity of the vanguards of the working class in their party. Against this clarification and out of fear of the evolving situation, the bourgeoisie has started to repress communists and their vanguards, the workers movement, women's movement, students' movement and others and has pushed society into extreme poverty. Through demagoguery and propaganda among the people and especially among the impoverished peoples, the bourgeoisie is trying to create an atmosphere of fear and submission. Casual approaches to the scientific theory of communism or tampering with its principles, advocacy of organizational pluralism, falsification of communism by putting a totalitarian face on it, and the creation of doubt and distrust in the workers and communist movement about the efficacy of its weapons, is consciously or unconsciously serving the interest of the Iranian bourgeoisie. Genuine communists, the ones who have learned so much from the past 160 years of the working class, unhesitatingly take up the responsibility of applying the teachings of scientific communism in regard to party building. They do not fall in the trap of revisionism, dogmatism, opportunism, sectarianism and anarchism. "Without revolutionary theory, a revolutionary movement is not possible."