



The Organization of the Iranian People's Fedaii Guerrillas

**More on the Fundamental Tasks
of Marxist-Leninists
in the Present Stage of the Development
of the Communist Movement in Iran**

From the publication of:

**The Organization of the Iranian Peoples'
Fedaii Guerrillas**

Azar 1357 (November-December 1978)

Because of the present revolutionary upsurge, and in relation to this, the lessons that should be considered by those Marxist-Leninists who believe in armed struggle, we published an article entitled "The Fundamental Tasks of the Marxist-Leninists at the Present Stage in the Development of the Communist Movement of Iran".

The reception to this article and the numerous questions which were set forth made it necessary for our organization to analyse some aspects that were discussed in a condensed form in the above article and publish the results in separate articles.

One question which arose was the analysis, from every angle, of our understanding of the relation between the socialist tasks and democratic tasks in the communist and workers' movement, and in the liberation movement of the masses. The examination of the mechanical and incorrect approach that some forces have adopted concerning the relationship between these tasks was another, related question. The content of this article will be to explore this relationship.

With the ever-increasing ascendance of the struggle of people from all classes and strata in this revolutionary situation, the fundamental problem which now occupies the minds of all revolutionary Marxist-Leninists is the role and the tasks of the Iranian communist movement in relation to the working class in particular, and to the masses in general. The question is: Will an energetic effort to respond to the needs of the mass movement impede the effort to establish solidarity between the communist movement and the workers' movement?

Does the establishment of relations with the outstanding movement of the working class and the struggle for its formation as a basic task mean that we withdraw from the radical and mass movement, and remain behind this extensive, growing and

integrated movement which is largely devoid of leadership from the proletariat?

If today — while the working class has not been equipped with a revolutionary vanguard organization — we strive to establish political-organizational ties and provide socialist consciousness to the workers in order that the working class' revolutionary vanguard organization can be created, then does this mean that we have been lagging behind in our active participation in the mass movement, and thus not putting forward all the possible tactics that could contribute to the continued existence and strength of the present revolutionary movement?

In other words, what is the relation between our socialist and democratic tasks?

Before we continue, we should mention that it is our belief that if, when approaching a problem, the solution involves taking up one task while refuting another, then this is either the result of clumsy methods of addressing the question, or it is an obvious indication of an opportunistic tendency. Given this clarification, what must be done in order to respond to our tasks with regard to the working class and further, to fulfill an active role in the democratic movement of the masses?

Considering the present situation, and in particular, the unevenness which exists among the abilities of the various sectors of the masses' movement, the absence among Marxist-Leninists of any understanding of the viable relationship between our tasks towards the working class and our tasks towards the masses in general is an extremely dangerous tendency. One example of this deviational tendency is the belief that these two tasks negate each other; in order to preserve our so-called faith in the proletariat, we must direct our complete attention towards our socialist tasks, or because the proletariat has not achieved hegemony in this present movement we must reject or underrate this movement.

There are those who think that placing all of their faith in the working class and devoting all of their efforts towards fulfilling their socialist duties is synonymous with rejecting the present mass movement because the working class does not have hegemony in it!

There is no error but this one that could have such a fatal and grave consequence for the direction of the mass movement and especially for the working class.

These people assume that the hegemony of the proletariat will be ensured if they put forward in their daily program slogans concerning the establishment of the mass democratic republic and if they raise among the ranks of the people the slogans "Long Live the Leadership of the Working Class" or "Forward to the Leadership of the Proletariat!" But before raising in their daily program the slogan for the establishment of the democratic republic of the masses, they should first be certain of the real possibility for the working class to exercise a leadership role, i.e. to achieve an independent participation in the movement of the masses. The usual result of promoting and publicizing premature slogans within the movement of the masses, when its reserve forces do not possess the necessary degree of readiness, ability or organization to respond is, at the most, to isolate and seclude the designers of these slogans from the process of growth of the mass movement, and at the very least, will result in wasting energy with the repetition of hollow slogans.

This action will definitely deter the formation of the proletariat, the achievement of its truly independent identity in the mass movement, and the assurance of its hegemony.

In 1905, in response to the elements who, with their semi-anarchistic approach, were requesting the implementation of the maximum program — obtaining power in order to carry out the socialist revolution — Comrade Lenin wrote:

"Only the most ignorant people can ignore the bourgeois nature of the democratic revolution which is now taking place, only the most naive optimists can forget how little as yet the masses of the workers are informed about the aims of socialism and about the methods of achieving it. And we are all convinced that the emancipation of the workers can be effected only by the workers themselves; a socialist revolution is out of the question unless the masses become class conscious and organized, trained and educated in open class struggle against the entire bourgeoisie If any

workers ask us at the appropriate moment why we should not go ahead and carry out our maximum program, we shall answer by pointing out how far from socialism the masses of the democratically-minded people still are, how undeveloped class antagonisms still are, how unorganized the proletarians still are. Organize hundreds of thousands of workers all over Russia; get the millions to sympathize with our program! Try to do this without confining yourselves to high-sounding but hollow anarchistic phrases, and you will see at once that achievement of this organization, and the spread of this socialist enlightenment, depend upon the fullest possible measure of democratic transformations.”*

If we note that Lenin expressed these thoughts at a time when there existed a vanguard working class organization in Russia and when the workers' movement had a great role in the general mass movement, then we will realize the full dimensions of the erroneous notion that slogans can achieve an independent and distinct identity for the working class and ensure the hegemony of the proletariat in the democratic revolution. The design of such slogans in a propagandistic style only intensify the contradictions between the non-proletarian forces and the workers' movement in the present situation. And no wise mind can imagine that the intensification of the hostility within the people's movement is the same as being a friend of the working class. Quite the contrary, any increase in the understanding between the forces associated with the different popular classes and strata of the masses will benefit the proletariat more than any other.

The elements who have, by their actions, been conspiring to place obstacles in the path of the organizational development of the forces related to the radical petit-bourgeoisie believe that they can increase the proletariat's share in the mass movement and more rapidly lay the groundwork for the growth of the Communist movement by ignoring the customs and logical principles existing in the relationship between the different factions of the mass movement! They have in fact created both the very worst and the most complicated difficulties for the development of the Marxist

* Lenin - Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution

currents by eliminating the basis for mutual understanding which was forming after years of pessimism and hatred within the people's movement. And, by vindictively disintegrating the formation of left factions within the currents related to the radical petit-bourgeoisie, they have contributed in incredible dimensions to the expansion of the scope of action and infiltration of anti-Marxist factions within the petit-bourgeoisie.* Today it is the responsibility of the entire communist movement to rectify and correct these immature friendships with communism and the working class; this will be possible only through the fully conscious and total efforts of all revolutionary communists. If these mistakes by the various Marxist elements continue, it will only make the atmosphere more stifling for the development of the communist movement.

These facts prove how harmful it can be to be affected by viewing things from only one angle and by not understanding the viable relationship which exists between our tasks towards the working class and towards the mass movement. We frankly fear that some of the dispersed Marxist elements that are being hampered by the suffocating pressures from factions related to the petit-bourgeois forces will suffer the same disaster which the Tudeh Party experienced with regard to Mossadegh (the national bourgeoisie) by being irreparably affected by these infantile or purely imaginary disorders confronting the present non-working class leadership of the mass movement. The working class movement is still paying for that disaster and continues to be treated as a scapegoat. Because of these disasters, in Iran today, it is those and only those who have understood the general theories of Marxism and especially have faith in the legitimacy of historical

* Reference here is made to the Marxist faction within the Organization of Mojahedin of the People of Iran (OMPI), which took on the organization's leadership in 1975. Their aim was to immediately convert the OMPI cadres to Marxism. This and other ultra-left tendencies alienated the membership, creating serious obstacles for the consolidation of a strong petit-bourgeois organization. A split occurred, and today the isolated Marxist faction has formed The Struggling Group for the Emancipation of the Working Class. (ED.)

materialism who can believe in the possibility for ensuring the hegemony of the proletariat in the mass movement. In our comparison there is only one difference between that period and the present situation. In those days, "the left" considered the leadership of the other sectors of the masses to be reactionary and accused them of "flirting with the U.S."; today the leadership is considered reactionary because of its "religious coloration".* While we declare our firm belief that for the success of the democratic mass revolution, it is essential that the independent and organized working class participate as the principal force of revolution and ensure its hegemony in the revolution, we also believe that we must take into account the peculiarities of our society and the composition of the participating forces in the democratic movement. Besides the rural toilers, the participation of the petit-bourgeoisie and the other toilers of the city, and the unity of these forces with the working class is of utmost strategic importance.

There are those who have not recognized this importance because they have either not paid enough attention to the problems of the society and the movement, or have relied upon an invented analysis of the process of development of the socio-economic relations of our society** and have disregarded reality; and by their infantile admiration of the workers draw the working class

* It should be mentioned that the nationalist forces, either consciously or unconsciously, due to their character over the course of history have always benefitted from these covers, maneuvers and tactics in order to protect and expand their class interests and advance the anti-colonial struggle.

**It would be improper for us to elaborate on and analyse our criticisms of the above mentioned problems in this article. These problems are such that they deserve to be examined separately. But for the time being, in order to clarify our position for our readers, we wish to point out that by relying on the specific analysis of the characteristics of the comprador bourgeoisie in Iran and the changes in the class composition of society that its growth has been able to create, it is incorrect to believe that our society is moving in the direction of a disintegration of the petit-bourgeoisie and a proletarianization. The comprador bourgeoisie has decreased its role and its share of production and distribution in the system of production and distribution as



movement into seclusion and even attract hostile confrontations from the other sectors of the masses. The belief in the strategic importance of the participation of the other forces in the process of the revolution, and the belief in the necessity of expanding and preserving the foundations for cooperation and solidarity with them will be proven and concretized, not by hollow refutations or a slurring of criticisms, but by revolutionary activity and daily material movement.

Further, it is a mistake to ever assume that decent behavior on the part of the communists can eliminate the barriers which exist between the popular classes and their specific interests. Only by interacting with those forces which are related to the other strata of the masses, by interacting with the radical petit-bourgeoisie, and by reliance on the real and undeniable boundaries between the two forces will the conditions be obtained for solidarity and cooperation.

These boundaries and these differences will not be eliminated by good or bad behavior by the communists, nor by the propagation of Marxism within all the classes of the masses, nor by the

→ a whole. Unlike classical capitalism, this process has not been accompanied by the transfer of these forces in heavy industrial production. The assumption that a country whose economy is basically dependent on oil exports and the importation of foreign manufactured and semi-manufactured commodities can become proletarianized will never be able to conform to the reality of the situation. Of course, this situation does not exclude the possibility for expansion of commodity production, capitalist relations and wage-earning employment, even at a remarkable speed. The petit-bourgeoisie, the toilers of the city and village, and the semi-proletariat strata always make up a wide spectrum in the class composition of the society. When we consider this reality, as well as the large number of facts which are available concerning the present role and importance of the radical petit-bourgeoisie in the mass movement, the insignificance of the liberal bourgeoisie as a participating force in the movement, and the basic differences which exist between the radical petit-bourgeoisie and the liberal bourgeoisie, we must conclude that it is incorrect to ignore the radical petit-bourgeoisie's distinct identity and instead to identify it as the liberal bourgeoisie. It is a major error if our analysis of the class composition of the society does not mention the radical petit-bourgeoisie or bury it in the guts of the liberal bourgeoisie.

imposition of Marxism on the representative organizations of the radical petit-bourgeoisie. Very little can be accomplished by either subjective factors or by essentially superficial factors. Through a profound emphasis on the class interests, and by emphasizing the social realities, we can confirm the existence of the boundaries between the classes. The path to cooperation and solidarity between all the classes of the masses should be made increasingly smooth by reliance on the existing unity of the interests of all the popular classes in the destruction of the imperialist domination and in the success of the democratic revolution.

Even though a correct and principled attitude for the communists towards other strata of the masses can never eliminate those boundaries and create a homogeneous entity, their incorrect and non-principled interaction can not only erase the grounds for solidarity and cooperation, but in some instances it can even artificially create hostility toward the non-antagonistic contradictions within the masses.

It is important to repeat in more detail what was said concerning the article on the fundamental tasks:

In a situation where the communist movement is separated from the workers' movement; in a situation where dispersion prevails among the forces of the communist movement and there exists tremendous backwardness of the subjective factors from the objective factors in all the sectors of the mass movement; and in a situation where there exists a relative backwardness in the workers' and communist movement compared with the mobility of the other revolutionary forces, and the foremost and most basic task of the conscious elements in relation to the working class at this stage is to establish an organic link between the communist movement and the workers' movement and to resolve the problems of unity within the communist movement; in other words, to establish a revolutionary proletarian organization that is equipped with the ideology of Marxism-Leninism.

The method of performing this fundamental, step-by-step task is to propagate socialist and democratic awareness within the workers' movement and to achieve political-organizational ties

with the working class.

We believe that in the present prevailing conditions of the movement, when the revolutionary situation is blossoming and heightening every minute, the conditions are definitely and positively suitable more than ever, for equipping the workers with a revolutionary theory and a revolutionary proletarian organization. Therefore, we explicitly declare that any lost moment during this glorious period in history, any delay in adopting these tasks, will contribute to the backwardness and the diffusion of the workers' and communist movement in that it will be ignoring their interests, and it will also make ambiguous the historical destiny of the mass movement because of the lack of an organized participation by the working class resulting in the inability to ensure the proletariat's hegemony.

History has proven that in the situation of the contemporary world, i.e. the epoch of imperialist domination, there has been absolutely no force capable of historically defending a victory over imperialism except the organized masses under the leadership of the revolutionary organization of the working class.

Our unwavering faith in the necessity of organizing both Marxist-Leninist forces and the autonomous organization of the working class fundamentally arises from the understanding of the tasks that history's forces have assigned to only the working class and its revolutionary vanguard. That task is to defend the interests of all the masses against imperialism during this process of the mass democratic revolution.

This in itself demonstrates the fact that by not paying attention to the socialist tasks which are the genuine levers for organizing the revolutionary vanguard proletariat, not only the efforts of the workers themselves but also the efforts of all the masses against imperialism are painfully condemned to failure and disappointment. In Russia, the leadership of the liberal bourgeoisie was able to provide at least a limited form of political freedom to everyone, and thus advance the society to a point comparable to today's European capitalist countries. But could such a process take place in today's Iran? Could political freedom be achieved and then

preserved in today's Iran without the complete liquidation of the contradiction with imperialism and without the mass democratic revolution?

During the epoch of imperialism in dominated countries like Iran, a profound relationship between dictatorship and imperialism, and the historical weakness of the national bourgeoisie and the petit-bourgeoisie's leadership in resolving the contradiction between the masses and imperialism and the comprador bourgeoisie, all contribute and prevent the non-proletarian forces of the society from completely defeating imperialism and ensuring the achievement of political freedoms in the style of Europe, despite their truly democratic nature.

Because of this, the subjective factors become even more essential for dissolving the contradictions of the masses with imperialism and the dictatorship (i.e. the mass democratic revolution), and the more we will discover that in the democratic struggle there exists the necessity and the importance of building an autonomous working class organization and fulfilling socialist tasks in order to ensure the necessary conditions for exercising the leadership of the revolutionary working class vanguard in the struggle of the masses against the dictatorship and imperialism.

If we believe that resolving the contradiction between the masses and imperialism and the establishment of the mass democratic republic is not achieved through resolving the contradictions between labor and capital, and if we don't believe that the contradiction between the masses and imperialism is overshadowed by the contradiction between labor and capital, then, in the domain of revolutionary practice, the necessity of participation in the process of resolving the contradiction between labor and capital, in this situation, should directly and exclusively arise from the necessity to ensure the hegemony of the proletariat in the people's movement for the total resolution of the contradiction between the masses and imperialism and nothing more.

The most erroneous assumption would be to consider that the democratic tasks are something quite irrelevant to the socialist

tasks. We can see that our perception of the necessity for engaging in socialist tasks under these circumstances is related to the importance and priority we give to the success of the mass democratic movement, and is thus both understandable and justified. Under these circumstances, our strategic and tactical program with regard to our participation in the working class movement recognizes that while it should be able to equip the working class with its proper revolutionary vanguard, it should also be able to consolidate and strengthen, with every specific step of revolutionary practice, the objective and subjective grounds for solidarity with the forces affiliated with other strata of the masses. This process should lead to ever-increasing trust of these strata for the unity with the working class, its vanguard and the leadership of the proletariat.

To place on the daily agenda, either practically or theoretically, the resolution of the contradiction between labor and capital, to ignore the contradiction between the masses and imperialism, or to see it as insignificant, and to subscribe to the position that the dissolution of the contradiction with imperialism (i.e. the democratic revolution) is overshadowed by the contradiction between labor and capital (i.e. the socialist revolution) is contrary to and incompatible with these orientations.

Taking this position, which could be the result of not understanding the nature of a dependent capitalist society, its system of production and the structure of its classes, may lead to reversing the necessary stages in the process (playing the horn from the wrong end). This could make us attempt to end the annihilation of dependency by annihilating capitalism, rather than vice versa. If we take this position, then we must believe that it is unnecessary to consider the problem of dependency, and that we can progress directly towards dissolving the contradiction between labor and capital.

To continue to have these tendencies in the process of growth and the development of theory will inevitably lead to the following results:

1. The masses will be considered only in terms of the working

class, and all other progressive forces will be ignored.

2. The socialist revolution will be placed on the daily agenda, and it will be pointed towards an anti-capitalist, rather than an anti-imperialist direction.

3. There will be a rejection of the actions of the other anti-imperialist forces fighting against the regime. They will be charged with being reactionary and harmful to the working class, and there will be an attempt to destroy their actions.

4. The democratic tasks will be ignored and the attention will be directed solely at fulfilling the socialist tasks.

The incorrectness of these results is so obvious that no one is willing to openly accept its burden. Concerning this tendency, Lenin stated: "Whoever wants to reach socialism by a different road other than that of political democracy will inevitably arrive at conclusions that are absurd and reactionary, both in the economic and the political sense."^{*}

Perhaps it is possible to reject everything from its foundation and its base, but it is only the practical struggle of those who reject it which will be capable of then clarifying the truth to everyone. When confronting practical objectives, mere claims hold little weight.

We mentioned that the hegemony of the working class in the mass movement, which is absolutely dependent on equipping the working class with a nation-wide revolutionary organization peculiar to themselves, will not be achieved by repeating the slogan, "Towards the Leadership of the Working Class", or by propagating and insisting that the leadership of the Marxist-Leninist forces be accepted. Neither the hegemony of the working class, nor the hegemony of any of the various strata and classes in the mass movement will be achieved by inviting them to accept this leadership.

History has proven that any class current that undertakes a major share of the responsibility for dissolving the main contradiction will ultimately achieve hegemony in the frontline of the participating forces during the process of dissolving the contradiction. Thus, guaranteeing the hegemony of the working

^{*} Lenin - Two Tactics of Social Democracy in the Democratic Revolution

class over the mass democratic movement is precisely dependent upon the extent to which the revolutionary organization of the working class takes part in the process of destroying the anti-people apparatus.

Whoever mobilizes the greatest force in the struggle and sends it to the battlefield to overthrow the ruling system is precisely the force that will gain hegemony in today's mass movement. For example, today we are witnessing the phenomena of how the representatives of the national bourgeoisie and the factions relating to the conservative petit-bourgeois forces are forced to accept the leadership of the radical faction because of the objective fact that it is this sector of the petit-bourgeoisie that has more of a share in the liberation movement. We understand that it is the fundamental task of the communist movement to struggle for the unification of the communist movement and the workers' movement and for the resolution of the contradictions within the communist movement by propagating socialist and democratic awareness within the working class in order to establish a political-organizational relationship with that class. We also realize that any movement contributing to the foundation of a revolutionary proletariat organization that is not equipped with the ideology of the working class is merely performing insignificant tasks, and by avoiding the step-by-step, fundamental tasks, is condemned for keeping the working class in a position of following the other forces. This is an obvious deviation from Marxism-Leninism. We believe that we can fulfill our democratic tasks by active participation, by providing the correct and principled direction, and the correct and principled assumption of the front-line position within the liberation movement of the masses — meaning exposing and combatting the imperialist domination and dictatorship — by involving ourselves in every aspect of the struggle to overthrow the imperialist-dependent regime of the Shah, by fulfilling our role in striving to achieve and fulfill the goals of this stage in the growth of the mass movement, by introducing, mobilizing and stimulating the people, especially the proletariat, against the existing order and to destroy the dictatorial and imperialist-dependent regime which

presents the main obstacle for achieving freedom for the people of our homeland, by gaining the active support of the other forces in the movement who continuously struggle for these same goals, and by exposing the conservatives, compromisers and reformists and expelling them from the ranks of the masses regardless of whether they are connected with the working class or the masses in general.

At the same time, there are certain elements who consider themselves Marxists who are clearly afraid of isolation and of taking a stand against positions of the leadership of the enormous wave of the forces related to the radical petit-bourgeoisie; they propagate against taking a front-line position against this leadership. The propagation of the tendencies to dissolve, the surrender in the face of the powerful wave of the political-ideological aggressions of the forces associated with the radical petit-bourgeoisie, and the refusal to take a front-line position against the irreconcilable and stubborn attack of the leadership of these forces, ignoring the concept of class and sticking to the one-sided conception of the masses, and promoting the idea of organizing the masses without understanding their relation to the class formations, obviously is not the means by which the Marxist-Leninists respond to the democratic tasks. It must be frankly stated that the essence of this tendency does not differ even slightly from the class and ideological position of the vanguard elements of the petit-bourgeois forces. Although these gentlemen have apparently separated themselves from the political-religious forces of the petit-bourgeoisie, we nevertheless place them again completely among the petit-bourgeoisie because of their method of dealing with the socialist and democratic tasks.

These elements do not understand that they cannot prevent the development of the non-antagonistic contradictions within the masses into antagonistic contradictions by ignoring the independent workers' identity and disarming the workers against other strata and resolving the concept of "class" in the concept of the "masses".

In this connection, in 1897, Comrade Lenin pointed out in the

article, "The Tasks of the Russian Social-Democrats":

"While pointing to the solidarity of one or the other of the various opposition groups with the workers, the Social-Democrats will always single out the workers from the rest, they will always point out that this solidarity is temporary and conditional, they will always emphasise the independent class identity of the proletariat, who tomorrow may find themselves in opposition to their allies of today. We shall be told that "such action will weaken all the fighters for political liberty at the present time." We shall reply that such action will strengthen all the fighters for political liberty. Only those fighters are strong who rely on the consciously recognised real interests of certain classes, and any attempt to obscure these class interests, which already play a predominant role in contemporary society will only weaken the fighters."^{*}

Some of these elements have relied on the expansion and extension of the petit-bourgeoisie in Iran. They act as if every intelligent Marxist-Leninist has no other problem except dissolving the relation with the petit-bourgeoisie. Those elements, by this method of approach, throw themselves completely into the lap of the petit-bourgeoisie and from the rightist position, contribute to the disarmament of the working class, meaning its disorganization and continuous dispersal of the forces in the communist movement in Iran. We cannot detect any indication of Marxism-Leninism and a belief in the goals of the working class within this liberal and bourgeois means of dealing with the problem. Accepting the democratic tasks in no way means forgetting socialist tasks and is not following behind the movements of the other sectors of the masses. If this idea that any

* Lenin's later discussions have pointed out that in the grouping of these provisional allies, the liberal bourgeoisie enjoyed a genuine share in the democratic movement of Russia. However, in the present revolutionary movement in Iran, it can be clearly seen that the viability of the temporary alliance between the proletariat and its natural allies with the liberal bourgeoisie has automatically come to an end, given the present nature and ability of the liberal bourgeoisie and the direction it has taken in the revolutionary movement.

We can recognize the outstanding differences between the share and composition of the forces participating in the democratic movement in Iran with those of Russia.

effort in the direction of fulfilling the socialist tasks will necessarily damage the progress of the democratic goals does not come from association with the petit-bourgeoisie, then it is purely a naive and primitive interpretation. Only a non-principled approach to this can lead to the conclusion that these two struggles negate each other. Anyone who ignores the integration and unity between the socialist and democratic tasks of the Marxist-Leninist forces in fact does not yet know anything about Marxism-Leninism.

To be capable of confronting the problems of the democratic revolution with Marxist-Leninist commitment and honesty, and to be able to define the means of attaining the strategic and tactical goals of the revolution and to offer practical methods for their achievement are essential to guarantee the success of the masses.

Marxism-Leninism, with its excellent frankness, and with all the revolutionary experiences of all the masses throughout the world, emphasizes with undeniable decisiveness the necessity for exerting revolutionary force and violence in order to overthrow the existing social order. It identifies this as the only means of destroying the tools of imperialism and reactionary violence.

All the facts have proven time and again the correctness of this prevailing and undeniable Marxist-Leninist principle. If this principle is not adhered to, the political-organizational activities either within the class or in the participation in the mass movement will be buried in a whirlpool of drab revisionism, reformism and economism.

Abstract explanations of the socialist and democratic tasks, without defining the means of overthrowing the system, can in practice eliminate the lines and barriers existing between the revolutionary Marxist-Leninists and the economists, reformists and all opportunistic forces.

The true measure for distinguishing the boundaries which separate opportunism from Marxism-Leninism is the specific response given through practice to the question of the method and manner of acquiring political power and defeating the imperialists'

sovereignty.

It is the constant and permanent task of the Marxist-Leninists to raise the consciousness of the masses and in the initial stage, the working class. This will be our foremost task even after the victory of socialism until communism.

However, it is a mistake to attempt to avoid all of the tasks which history has presented to us in every stage and every period on the basis that we must address ourselves to these permanent tasks.

We cannot accept the claim of every Marxist imposter without judging the truth of their claims according to their acceptance of the necessity for armed struggle as the only path to the liberation of the masses. It is only in their daily practical activity that the objective conditions exist for determining the degree of their commitment to and belief in the Marxist-Leninist principle of using revolutionary force to overthrow the system.

Whatever is manifested in the strategy must necessarily be manifested in the tactics, that is, in the form of struggle and in the forms of organization. In general, to believe that revolutionary force is the necessary solution, but to not specify the tasks that these beliefs assign to us in today's situation, is merely a reflection of the petit-bourgeoisie's insincere nature.

We should not provide the opportunity, even for a moment, for this sort of petit-bourgeois method of disregarding the fundamental, step-by-step tasks, of disregarding objective and subjective conditions and all of the facts, of being careless about the necessities, and of altering the prevailing rules of Marxism-Leninism, and of lumping together the preparatory stage, the preliminary stage, the beginning and the end of the revolution, and completely justifying arms as the solution to all the problems.

But how can these tactics, these forms of struggle and organization be identified? Neither the general laws of Marxism-Leninism, nor the revolutionary experience of the masses from all over the world can provide automatic answers to our questions.

By relying on the sense, the planning and the knowledge of the leadership (the conscious elements), the general laws and the

utilization of those experiences should provide a concrete analysis for every concrete situation, and from this basis, should recognize and apply the proper form of struggle and organization.

The Leninist guideline, "Stubborn in strategy, maximum flexibility in tactic" should never be altered in practice to the non-dialectical slogan of "Stubborn in strategy, maximum stubbornness in tactic".

By observing realities, we learn that no tactic can ever be found which constantly and continuously, throughout the entire process of the growth of the movement until the victory of the mass democratic revolution, be considered as the only suitable and effective tactic. Again, we will have presented an improper picture, and improper knowledge from the tactic and its nature whenever, in this entire process we consider that there is one form of struggle, and one tactic under any conditions which is necessarily and positively the principal tactic, regardless of the possible changes that could take place.

With this action we will have really placed ourselves in a corner. We will have practically lost all of our ability to adapt to the facts and the upcoming events which continuously are imposing themselves on us.

Today, any current that does not understand that all the tactics, whether organizational or in the struggle, should be directed towards the preparation of the mass armed battle, any organization that cannot put this theory into practice, any current that cannot put the publicity and the promotion of the armed battle on their daily agenda, and today, any force which does not strive to form and develop the defense elements and the material support for the armed movement among all popular strata, with the main emphasis being on the working class, and does not progress the step-by-step task of arming the masses and forming the armed nuclei of the people's army in the process of the development of the subjective and objective situations, and in the revolutionary practice cannot elevate the understanding and knowledge of the masses themselves from the armed struggle, any current that does not in practice enhance within itself the necessary organizational

forms for the leadership of the war, has been only falsely claiming to accept the necessity of the use of violence in order to overthrow the social system as a whole.

Today, it is not only revolutionary theory that the belief of the necessity for the use of revolutionary violence is manifested. This belief should be manifested in everyday material actions. In the present situation in the process of development of the mass movement, this is the only means to distinguish the boundary between claims and true beliefs.

Forward to Fusion with the Working Class Movement!

Forward to Unity of all the Revolutionary Marxist-Leninist Forces!

**Ever Onward with the Expansion of Unity and Coordination
Between all the Revolutionary and Militant Forces of the
Masses!**

**Victory to the Armed Struggle, the Only Path to the Liberation
of the Masses!**

From the publication of:
**The Organization of the Iranian Peoples'
Fedaii Guerrillas**
Azar 1357 (November-December 1978)

Translation by:

Peoples Alliance For Revolutionary Struggle
of the Iranian Masses (PARSIM)

P.O. Box 952

Ansonia Station

New York, NY 10023