

POLICY AND TACTICS ARE THE LIFEBLOOD OF THE PARTY

Nov 2009

Due to the dispersal of communists in different organizations within Iran's communist movement, and to the prevalence of somewhat different or even contradictory views regarding the problems of the current class struggles, the correct communist viewpoint has not emerged from among the variety of one-sided Left or Right viewpoints. Consequently, the correct communist viewpoint has not become a material force in the hands of the masses of workers and laborers for changing the horribly unjust world of capitalism. The principal characteristic of the workers and communist movement today is theoretical and organizational diffuseness. That means that applying truly the scientific communism to the specific class struggles and arriving at the correct policies and tactics, become an important problem of the communist and workers movements in Iran. Below, we proceed to explain some of the existing inadequacies.

“Trying to move a mountain is a sign of missing the point.”

There are numerous organizations and individuals that, without adequate consideration of specific conditions and of class arrayal and of preparedness of the exploited and oppressed classes, have become captives of unsupported Left rhetoric. They think that the density of left wing words can substitute for the policy and tactics of the struggling working class.

Communism is the most advanced forerunner of humanitarian society, and its propagation is absolutely necessary. But if there are individuals who claim that at this time it is possible to establish and maintain communist relations in the world, they are talking nonsense. Why? Because without preparing the material and mental conditions for the transition to communism, such a claim simply cannot be realized. It is only some abstract words.

If some individuals claim that it is possible to establish socialism (as the first phase of communism) today in Iran, again these are only nonsensical words. The settlement of socialism in Iran demands certain necessary conditions without which the realization of socialism can only be a strategic concept in our minds. The essential necessary condition in its most basic form is the mobilization of the working class in its vanguard political party- the communist party- and its mobilization within mass organizations.

If some Leftists today raise the banner of “eliminating wage labor” now and claim that the working class vanguards must not create the single leading vanguard working class party, and instead intend to have workers organize themselves in workers council and take their everyday matters in their own hands – these would be only wishful desires which are entirely impractical. In essence they have turned their backs on the specific working class policy and tactics which aim to take political power.

If some individuals or organizations put forward the idea of the creation of “Red Councils” and the necessity of action plans for them (Azar Majedi- A Better World- #113), that is a caricature of workers councils which are the product of years of growth of the workers movement – growth which demands the existence of the leadership of an authoritative communist party. In their lumping together of “communists, Leftists and freedom loving people” they push this caricature

in the worker's councils, or the politburo of the Workers Communist Unity Party through the slogan "Long live the councils!" they propose "establishing the organs of the will of the masses everywhere!" In this manner, they hope to hit two targets with a single bullet – which is not possible. For background, it is important to note that the creation of such councils after the defeat of the workers and employees councils which were established at the beginning of the 1979 Revolution. This goes back more than quarter of a century, and the idea came from the Quasi-Trotskyites in Iran following the dispersion of the "Communist Party of Iran" into separate organizations. All of them put forward the slogan of forming the councils as "the organs of the will of the masses" as their central daily issue for organizing workers. To this day, this slogan has not been able to achieve any functional success. But they still insist on this issue. In fact, presently, one of these organizations is more inclined to than ever to establish coalitions among communists, freedom lovers and Leftists to which they give the name, "The Red Councils". But this does not take us very far. Why not? Because they are not structured on the basis of the mental and material conditions necessary for preparing the working class for the creation of the councils. These will be a type of coalition similar to those that had been created among the Left political forces in Iran and abroad. These "Red Councils" have not even been able to "enforce the will of elites". These organizations are a kind of union of political action among a number of Left organizations of which we have witnessed many births and deaths! – Why? Because communists do not form coalitions with each other. Communists unite with each other and gather in a single communist party as the vanguard leadership of the proletariat. They have responsibilities far more important than those of the workers councils. That is not intended as a slight to Azar Majedi and her comrades. In addition, in the current struggles, communists along with other non-communist forces may act in coalition and cooperate to achieve certain goals. At a given point in time, these kinds of unity in action have a tactical aspect that can be effective – but these coalitions do not correspond to workers councils which are the twofold power and forming a countervailing power against the counter-revolutionary forces.

These and many other instances show that these so called or pretender "communists" are not able to correctly analyze situations and set forth the political and organizational problem in the right moment and place, instead project their own political and organizational problems that have non immediate practical solution onto the workers' reality. Is it really hard to understand that under Iran's Islamic Republic dictatorship, when even the formation of trade unions is brutally suppressed, the demands for active mass/worker organizations such as workers councils will encounter an even more severe crackdown? Isn't it true that this policy itself becomes an impediment to the workers who intend to create their unions to defend their trampled rights? Consider the fact that a workers council is a far more progressive or vanguard organization than a trade union, and as a result may workers become confused in organizational struggle.

These Left organizations apparently are willing that workers should create "the enforcing organs of the will of the masses" by themselves, do not pay attention to specific practices of workers seeking to establish their own independent trade unions. Sometimes they have even turned against these union-organizing efforts, and it was only the insistence of the workers to form trade – union that caused these Left political forces to shamefacedly accept their existence?! They harbored other delusions regarding the Left political forces. Because on one hand they claim to be "diehard communists" and they created their "communist party" without any genuine sense of unity in a single party in their agenda. But on the other hand, because of the practical difficulties they encounter, and as a result the logic of "my ideology is the best", petty-bourgeois sectarianism enters in their actions. They speak of the creation of unity in action and of the united front activities of communists – which are entirely impractical in their circumstances!

On the question of the current political issues and communist tactics, scientific communism has a deep-rooted teaching which show us that communists must participate in the class struggles with unity of will and action and be prepared to make changes in their tactics:

“The Communists must exert every effort to direct the working-class movement and social development in general along the straightest and shortest road to the victory of Soviet power and the dictatorship of the proletariat. That is an incontestable truth. But it is enough to take one little step farther—a step that might seem to be in the same direction—and truth turns into error. We have only to say, as the German and British Left Communists say, that we recognize only one strait road, and that we will not permit tacking, maneuvering or compromising and it will be a mistake which may cause, and in part has already caused, and is causing, very serious harm to Communism. Right doctrinairism persisted in recognizing only the old forms, and became utterly bankrupt, for it did not perceive the new content. Left doctrinairism persists in the unconditional repudiation of certain old forms, failing to see that the new content is forcing its way through all and sundry forms, that it is our duty as Communists to master all forms, to learn how, with the maximum rapidity, to supplement one form with another, to substitute one for another, and to adapt our tactics to every such change called forth neither by our class, nor by our efforts.” (Lenin- [Left-Wing Communism: An Infantile Disorder](#), April 27, 1920, Collected Works, Internet Archives).

The Exploitation of Contradictions Even if Temporary or Conditional

The art of a genuinely communist organization is found in its ability to accurately analyze contradictions, to distinguish fundamental contradictions from non-fundamental ones, and to adopt specific tactics which advance the workers/mass movement toward higher consciousness, organizing and mobilization for the seizure of power. In this regard, some examples can also be pointed out which expose the incorrect perceptions and analysis of some of the authors on this problem.

Selahe Mazooji while being interviewed by the publication [Arash](#) in regard to the communist position vis-à-vis the election in Iran said: “If any organization or party boycotts the election, it thereby obviously implies to the Islamic Republic the preconditions that if the Islamic Republic satisfies those conditions, perhaps that organization or party would rescind its boycott of the elections. Whereas, for us, the precondition for free and fair elections is the overthrow of the Islamic Republic...in spite of all that, we did not disagree with this ‘election as a boycotting’ position since we know some of the Left forces who boycotted the election, and they have no illusions regarding the nature of this regime”([Today’s World](#) – #232).

In fact, we advise our comrade Mazooji that he should indeed “disagree with this position” and put aside the policy of “not roasting the skewer along with the meat” [for kebabs] and avoid jumping from one tree branch to another. Boycotting or not boycotting the election has nothing to do with “free and fair elections”! In the current class struggles, there is no place for such refinement of speech. It must be explicitly stated : Do you agree with participation in the bourgeois parliamentary process and putting forth candidates representing workers, laborers and communists [even while acknowledging that elections might not be “free and fair”]- or not?

Participation in bourgeois parliaments, and thereby providing opportunities for candidacy of Communists and the Left, is a necessary condition. This is because the parliament is the battleground which reactionary capital wants to control, in order to present its demands as “legal” via the approval of the parliament. Communists, contrary to the bourgeoisie which rubber

stamps the demands of capital, expose legislative matters to the people so that they can clearly see the abuses of power used against them in the parliament. The communists offer an alternative to the bourgeois agenda. This is necessary to inform the working class and impoverished masses, for the advancement of their knowledge, for the struggle to overthrow the parliamentary system, and for the transition to the system of workers councils and the rejection of the "legal state", embodied by this parliament! Therefore, the refusal to participate in the parliamentary struggle and to develop the necessary conditions for revolution is an infantile Left-wing disorder: brainless nonsense which has no relation to genuine communism. Mazooji asserts in this way that an organization or a party that wants to participate in the election may also retreat to the position of boycotting the election, somehow saying that boycott is the basic position for communists when faced with parliamentary type elections. Where in scientific communism is there such a teaching- that since bourgeois parliaments are reactionary institutions and free elections are not possible under the guidance of the capitalist system, then they have to be routinely boycotted and that the strategy of rejection of parliamentary elections transmitted to tactical one? Is there any contradiction between participation in parliamentary elections and rejection of the capitalist system? It is possible to participate in the parliament and compromise by the regime (like the opportunists and the reformists, but it is also possible to participate in the parliament while building a position of strength from which to rise up against the regime (like the Bolsheviks). Obviously, free elections under bourgeois rule are impossible. But why must we surrender this battleground to the bourgeoisie? Didn't Bolsheviks participate in the Czar's Duma? Did this indicate that Bolsheviks approved of Czarism? Here we are faced one more time with the colors of the class struggle being described as only black or white, due to this Left-wing disorder which ignores the diversity of colors! Just because the workers who are being exploited and who go on strike for their specific demands might not be able to fully restore their trampled rights, does that mean that they must refuse to go on strike and instead only struggle for the overthrowing of capitalist rule, ignoring their immediate, specific demands?

In the same issue of Today's World, Ata Khalghi, in an article under the title of " Karroubi's Letter: Reactions and the Deepening of the Ruling Class Crisis", writes: "With the disclosure of secrets by Karroubi regarding the crimes of the regime, the very first question that comes to mind for anyone who reads the letter is to ask 'But weren't you always one of the top officials of this regime? Did you not have something directly or indirectly to do with these crimes? Why were you silent all these years while you witnessed these crimes and did not talk?'" The author focused solely on exposing Karroubi!

Of course, it is absolutely true that Karroubi was among the top officials of this regime and therefore, was an accomplice in all of these crimes and that he and others alike must be exposed. On those points we do not have any differences with Ata Khalghi. We must ask: In confronting the regime's criminal behavior in this current situation, is finding fault with Karroubi the critical issue? Or is it rather exposing all recent crimes committed by the regime, including those disclosed by Karroubi? Karroubi is part of a faction within the regime that currently is in intense conflict with the ruling faction; in order to give legitimacy to his faction, he is exposing the regime. It is not enough to say simply that "Karroubi's faction is cut from the same cloth as the oppressors!"

It is better still to, the contrary, to insist that Karroubi expose more of what he has in his knapsack until the full extent of the Islamic regime's corruption becomes public. And also we must be very mindful of not allowing Karroubi and others of his ilk to be able to attract people's sympathy for their faction and to perpetuate the Islamic Republic in a new form. Crackdowns and repression have reached the point that even the corpses of martyrs are only given to their families on the condition that the families not hold funeral observances for their loved ones.

Even the victim's family has to come up with the cost of bullets that executed their loved one by the regime. The regime is trying to impose the silence of a cemetery over society so that its crimes remain undisclosed as much as possible. Commonsense and correct tactics tell us that communists and freedom loving people must exert more pressure on Karroubi's faction until they disclose whatever information they have about the crimes committed by this regime in recent months and during the past 30 years. The spearhead of the attack should not aimed at Karroubi, with statements such as "Don't try so hard to be a diehard supporter of the martyred, you are also one of the criminals". Finally, if Ata Khalghi is the defender of the martyred and their families- which I hope is the case- he must be able to recognize that in the present situation, and in this specific connection, who is the main enemy and how it is possible- even with the temporary help from Karroubi – to combat that enemy.

Here we see again that Left-wing dogma prevents some comrades from being able to cleverly exploit every weakness and fissure that is created in the ruling regimes, and to distinguish among the counterrevolutionary factions in order to benefit the revolution. Isn't it true that at the outbreak of the recent uprisings, the officials of the regime claimed that only 17 protesters were killed of whom 7 were the members of the Basijis -Mobilization Force- ? Wasn't it true that the revelations of the opposition caused the ruling faction to admit the existence of the death camp in Kahrizak, and even to order to closure this camp? Isn't it true that it was Karroubi who accompanied the assaulted and violated individuals to the parliamentary investigative committee and caused the ruling faction to admit that some of the assaults were indeed committed? And in order to cover themselves, the ruling faction blamed the assaults on agents of rival factions who had infiltrated local "law enforcement".

Here we observe that both rival factions among regime officials defend their interests better than Ata Khalghi does. They are not concerned about the purity or polish of tactics; based upon the situation, they try to gain the greatest advantage from each contradiction or social movement to their benefit. Communists and leftists however are not mainly thinking of adopting correct and multi-faceted tactics; many are mired in the old school of thought, advancing their strategic views in regard to the nature of the ruling factions in order to not involve to the slip! Meanwhile, they cannot correctly take advantage of the existing conditions for the benefit of the exploited and the oppressed peoples. Is it possible to advance the class war effectively with such viewpoints?

During the outbreak of the protest movement, on the occasion of Iran's latest round of presidential elections, we witnessed millions of people taking to the streets; and their voices of protest grew louder every day. During this time, whether inside Iran or abroad, confusion reigned among some individuals and some political organizations / committees in defense of the Iranian workers. Declaring that they were the true defenders of the working class, they refused to participate in the mass movement because its leadership was in the hands of the "reformers". They refused to participate in these protests and even some of these committees were disbanded. That position, especially prevalent abroad, resulted in the initiative in opposition to the ruling regime in Iran fell into the hands of bourgeois forces, generally the supporters of the "green movement" and monarchists which cooperate with the foreign bourgeois-liberal forces. And arrange demonstrations for the benefit of the defeated faction of the Islamic bourgeoisie!? These Left forces forgot that the working class of Iran, as the most consistent defender of persistent democracy, has a responsibility to oppose the ruling religious autarchy. These gentlemen and their organizations, in an infantile manner, stepped away from their responsibilities in the struggle for democracy.

Lenin- though here, in regard to international questions- offers a concise summary view which is also applicable on a smaller and more limited scale in regard to the handling of one country's internal contradictions between revolution and counterrevolution, and how we must correctly utilize them:

“To carry on a war for the overthrow of the international bourgeoisie, a war which is a hundred times more difficult, protracted and complicated than the most stubborn of ordinary wars between states, and to refuse beforehand to maneuver, to utilize the conflict of interests (even though temporary) among one's enemies, to refuse to temporize and compromise with possible (even though temporary, unstable, vacillating and conditional) allies — is not this ridiculous in the extreme? Is it not as though, when making a difficult ascent of an unexplored and heretofore inaccessible mountain, we were to refuse beforehand ever to move in zigzags, ever to retrace our steps, ever to abandon the course once selected and to try others?” (Also from Left-Wing Communism, An Infantile Disorder).

The Absence of Differentiation of the Contradictions:

The arrest of some notable figures of the “reformist” faction, their torture-induced confessions, and their judgment in the court for “aiding and connection with imperialists” once again provided an opportunity to mainstream imperialist media like the BBC to compare these court proceedings to the trials of the 1930's in the Soviet Union. In this manner they wage an anti communist propaganda campaign to damage the image of Soviet Russia by a cleverness analogy and to sway public opinion to support shouts of “Down with Russia” and “Down with China”, so that the current more or less friendly relations between Iran's ruling regime and Russia might be viewed as harmful. Thus, the “democratic” and “lovely” West that presently is preoccupied in destroying Afghanistan, Pakistan and Iraq might be spared attacks by Iranian revolutionary elements which claim that imperialists are busy fomenting a “velvet revolution” in Iran. But it is our strong wish that Left forces don't fall into this imperialist propaganda trap.

More than two decades ago, Quasi Trotskyites's ruling “Communist Party of Iran”, imposing some of their baseless liberal Marxist-Trotskyite views and incorporating bourgeois propaganda against the Soviet Communist Party and the structure of socialism in Russia claimed that since the October Revolution didn't eliminate wage labor in Russia, a bourgeois economic solution was implemented. They then erased more than half a century of struggle by communists in Russia and the world under the leadership of communist parties, and “the dawn of communism once again” in Iran was proclaimed by Mansour Hekmat. Presently, “The Communist Party of Iran”, in order to not fall behind the caravan during this time that the trials of some of the reformist officials are taking place, has put forward the conclusions of Mansour Hekmat and his accomplices. Once again, they display their connection to quasi Trotskyism and claim that the “communist worker” (Kommonist Kargari) has conquered the working class of Iran! (Refer to “Today's World” – # 232).

Instead of exposing the regime's abusive trials which are presently taking place in front of our eyes, they prefer to imitate BBC, by bringing up Soviet trials which took place 70 years ago. They work to negate socialism and to emphasize that in the Soviet Union under the leadership of Stalin, a capitalist economy was developed (in the same issue of “Today's World”).

Without a doubt, the accomplishments of the first victorious socialist revolution, in such a backward country as Russia, which still had feudal relations and where the majority of its

population remained in rural areas, couldn't possibly advance without formidable difficulties and obstacles. The Soviet Union was a small island in the stormy sea of the imperialist world. The powerful imperialists sought to destroy socialism; the Soviet Communist Party was striving to avoid drowning in this stormy ocean. A critique of the mistakes of the Soviet Communist Party emerged in the mid-1950 as modern revisionism became dominant, and this critique was shared by the communist parties of the world including at their helm, the Chinese Communist Party under the leadership of Mao Tse-tung. Indisputably, **a deeper critique** of the circumstances of socialist construction taking into consideration the experience of the defeat of socialism in China, is a responsibility that has been put on the shoulders of the communist parties of the world. This is because, in order to achieve a successful socialist revolution in one country or one region of the world, past mistakes must not be repeated. Here, our intention is not to fully discuss such an important topic. But it is important to mention a few points regarding the problems of socialism in Russia in order to clarify the communist position in this regard:

1- Even Trotsky, the sworn enemy of Stalin, in characterizing the Soviet government [after being expelled from Russia] called it a "decadent worker state". He did not permit himself to characterize it as a bourgeois government and he had enough knowledge of economic relations in Russia for instance to show that the ruling relations in Russia had become "capitalist". Do the Communist Party of Iran and other quasi Trotskyites – more Trotskyite than Trotsky himself – wish to make that claim?

2- Hitler, in his book, Mein Kampf, said the attack on the Soviet Union was part of an inevitable war between world views; and against Bolsheviks. "The Soviet Union in Hitler's thought, as a communist country, was the number one enemy." (Bahram Mohebbi- Deutsche Welle: "On the Occasion of the 70th Anniversary of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact").

This poses the question: Why didn't Hitler see his British, French and American rivals in the same way? Why did not he question the world views of these imperialists? Why was Bolshevism his number one enemy? If the Soviet leadership had promoted the "bourgeoisie solution", wouldn't "bourgeois" have been the adjective in Hitler's precise German language to use to describe the Soviet rulers? Why then not concentrate his war effort in the west, rather than on the east?

3- If indeed the Soviet Union during Stalin's lifetime implemented the "bourgeoisie solution", what was the necessity of the revisionist coup after the death of Stalin? Wasn't the bourgeoisie already in the leadership? Did they do anything else beside usurp power in all arenas from the proletariat? After the consolidation of power by the revisionists, they pursued the policy of "profit sharing in factories and other production facilities" as a top priority; they became social-imperialists; and they lastly paved the way for the final uprising of the bourgeoisie in the latter part of the 1980's, resulting in the seizure of complete power through Yeltsin's coup – the coup de grace.

4- During the 29 years that Stalin led both the Party and the government, was there even a single millionaire that the quasi-Trotskyites are able to name who became rich because of the "bourgeoisie solution"? Isn't it true that today, even elementary school children are able to point out Russian billionaires especially, after Yeltsin's rise to power? Russian billionaires emerged like mushrooms after a rain, and they are internationally competing with their fellow imperialists. Was there any indication at all of such personal wealth in Russia during the 1920's, 1930's, or 1940's?

5- If after the October Revolution, the government of Russia proceeded to implement the “bourgeoisie solution”, why is there still all this enmity from the imperialist governments, after the passage of 56 years since Stalin’s death, against him and against the Soviet worker state? Would the imperialists do the same against any bourgeois government or against a bourgeois leader? Actually, if this claim were true (that Russia became capitalist after the death of Lenin), the imperialists should have been thankful to Stalin for showing that he could so easily usurp power from the hands of proletariat and hand it to the bourgeoisie.

On the contrary, billions of workers, laborers, the colonized, and the oppressed peoples in the world know how the Soviet socialist government served the working class and the laborers of Russia and also how it aided the colonized nations of the world in their liberation struggles. They know how the military might of the racist Hitler was defeated- at the cost of 60 million deaths – by the Communist Party, the Red Army and the heroic people of the Soviet Union of that time, under Stalin’s leadership and they are thankful. These events cannot be forgotten or erased because of some mistakes by the government and by the Soviet Communist Party. Nor can it be justified to take a position in-line with mainstream imperialist propaganda to delete the great achievements of the socialist revolutions in Russia and in China from history, to describe them as “bourgeoisie and petty-bourgeoisie solutions” or to behave like the corrupt Eastern European governments that could not even tolerate the presence of unknown Red Army soldier’s statue. That same Red Army freed these countries from the yoke of Hitler’s military and liberated concentration camps, including Auschwitz in Poland, from the hands of Hitler’s SS.

Of course, these individuals, who in the name of communism summarily dismiss the practice of billions of people, who negate the achievements of socialism, and who offer empty and impractical promises, cannot be expected to responsibly study the problems of the world from a proletarian perspective. They belittle the achievements of socialism while at the same time they hugely magnify the errors in socialism’s construction in order to be applauded by the imperialist and bourgeois cliques; and like the BBC, they portray the Islamic Republic’s trials as comparable to trials in the Soviet Union – all this with the protective blessing of the imperialists and Zionists. And by imperialist support yet they wish to put on a revolutionary face when they present themselves among peoples!

The failure to make distinctions among the contradictions in each specific phenomenon and historical pattern, and the inability to draw accurate historical analogies cause these “communists” to be incapable of arriving at the truth .They consciously or unconsciously become pawns in the hands of the non-proletarian classes.

Lenin says: **“History generally, and the history of revolutions in particular, is always richer in content, more varied, more multiform, more lively and ‘subtle’ than even the best parties and the most class-conscious vanguards of the most advanced classes imagine”.** (Left-Wing Communism, An Infantile Disorder).

In conclusion in order to display the correct attitude of the revolutionary proletariat toward the adoption of correct policy and tactics, which are at the heart of the class struggle, and appropriate consideration of the more varied existing contradictions, we quote a small part of ” Circular About the Current Situation” (Mao Tse-Tung, 03/20/1948, Collected Works, Vol. 4, Pg. 219):

“1- In recent months the Central Committee has concentrated on solving, under the new conditions, problems concerning specific policies and tactics for land reform, for

industry and commerce, for the united front, for Party consolidation and for the work in the new Liberated Areas; it has also combated Right and 'Left' deviations within the Party, mainly 'Left' deviations. The history of our Party shows that Right deviations are likely to occur in periods when our Party has formed a united front with the Kuomintang and that 'Left' deviations are likely to occur in periods when our Party has broken with the Kuomintang....Policy and tactics are the lifeblood of the Party; leading comrades at all levels must give them full attention and must never, on any account, be negligent”.