

House is Broken from its Foundation!

(On the Split in the Worker-communist Party of Iran)

Once again, the "Hekmatite movement" has split into two pieces. No more than two years from the death of its founder Hekmat, the mud and straw bricks of this movement have broken up and have sunk its members and leaders. The internal documents with signatures of different shades are decorating the internet sites of different factions.

One faction under the leadership of the former "leader" and the head of Political Bureau of WCPI, Koorosh Modaressi, accuses the other faction headed by the new "leader" Hamid Taghvai of violation of organisational norms, conspiracy, and return to "traditional left". Taghvai's faction is analysed to be a faction without political horizon and is labeled with passivity, tail-ending, and being a politically dead end. Taghvai's faction, through internet Paltalk speeches and variety of

colorful articles, accuses Modaressi's faction of "refutation of socialism and revolution", jumping to reformism and parliamentarism, seeking referendum and an alliance with Islamic Republic's reformist leader Hajarian, lack of organisational discipline, cowardice, and escape from the extra-ordinary 5th Congress of WCPI.

Amidst of this noise, the tired and exhausted faithful comrades of the "leaders" make move in confronting each other and insist on the correctness of the leader's path. The leaders of each of the factions, through grandiloquent speeches in Paltalk and expensive trips to this or that country, try to prove that they are faithful to "grand leader" Hekmat more than the other faction with the purpose of collecting more supporters. Putting all these noises and radio-television interviews

Continued on page 4

Split in WCPI

aside, what we cannot find is adherence to any principles of Marxism-Leninism. Even any individual who is freshly involved with progressive politics can see by a simple glance that the quarrel is about personal power, self-promotion, and egotism stemming from liberalism and anti-party attitude and not about defending the communist principles. One who is interested in seeing the true nature and reasons behind the split must look into the words and deeds of "Marx of the time" of both factions, Mansour Hekmat, and dissect his thought to separate weed from the chaffs. We must refer to the main roots of this sect and its founder who reflects the identity of each of the factions and evaluate and expose his line on different questions.

Those who have any sympathy for the emancipation of the working class and do not like to sink into self-deceit must study the classics of Marxism-Leninism and use the experience of 150 years of world communist and worker-movement to analyse the views and practices of the line given by Hekmat in order to seek the root of the current and future splits in WCPI. It is only through adherence to the principle of Marxism-Leninism that one can expose and reject groups that have no achievements except throwing stone on and creating obstruction to the path of emancipation of the working class. One must refute all anti-Marxist views that have penetrated like a virus the soul and practice of all factions of WCPI in order to play a positive role in the communist and revolutionary movement.

The disintegration of "Hekmatism" began with Hekmat's refutation of Leninism. One cannot find any anti-Marxist individual who has not first set the account against Lenin and Leninism. One cannot find any anti-Marxist individual who has not first refuted the teachings of Lenin. One cannot find any anti-Marxist individual who has not negated the Great October Socialist Revolution, negated the construction of socialism in the USSR, and negated the valuable experience of the proletariat of the USSR and of 150 years of the world communist movement.

Deceased Hekmat was one of those who took this task, and misusing the weakness of the communist movement due to the Islamic Republic of Iran's bloody suppression of innumerable experienced and tempered Marxist-Leninists, he step by step began the refutation of Leninism. He propagated liberalism in the frame-work of "modern left" and contaminated the minds of those who were suffering from the poverty of knowledge and of the Marxist theory. Hekmat, under the pretext of analysing the restoration of

capitalism in the USSR, deviated from Leninism and then refuted it in its totality. In his incoherent theoretical writings that were published under the title of "Marxism and the question of the Soviet Union" there is no sign of him standing on the Marxist principles. In his theses that are amalgamations of Trotskyism, Kautskyism, anarchism, and liberalism, Hekmat eventually slips into Economism in criticism of socialism in the USSR and he accuses Lenin and the Bolsheviks of lack of horizon and of incorrect understanding of socialist economy. He stated that

"Socialism was never economically established in the USSR, so one cannot talk about restoration of capitalism there. What Lenin had in mind was state capitalism, and Stalin too had nothing else in mind and he practically implemented it".

In other words, Lenin and his Bolshevik comrades' desire was nothing except the industrialisation of the USSR which was the desire of the Russian nationalism.

Mr. Hekmat who had no skills except to copy the writings of anti-communist liberals and to formulate the broken pieces of these writings eventually gives a definition of socialism that has nothing in common with scientific socialism, but it is liberalism and Western capitalism wrapped in non-class words and expressions. Hekmat's socialism is socialism in name not in content and is inconsistent with reality and has mechanisms that flow bourgeois liberalism.

Hekmat sunk into opportunism with his refutation of Leninism. He analysed Leninism as a Stalin-made theory and mocked at it. He opposed even the most fundamental principles of communism. The disintegration of "Hekmatism" started from here. From the beginning of his activities, Hekmat labeled himself as a Marxist and not as a Leninist. He tried to return to the era of "young Marx" and to use Marxism of the era of free capitalist competition and of European industrial revolutions to analyse the complex situation of the era of monopolies and globalisation of capital and imperialism. With his nihilist and petty-bourgeois horizon, Hekmat refuted Lenin's theory of imperialism, attributed progressive role to imperialism in contrast with the third world capitalism, and eventually ended up with the theories such as "Modernism", "Political Islam" as one of the pillars of today's world contradiction, and a "Black and White Scenario". He bowed to imperialism and "secular and modern" liberal bourgeoisie. It was through these theories that he defended the US Invasion of Afghanistan and the "modern" and "democratic" Israel in confronting the barbarism of Palestinians and the Islamists.

Continued on page 5

Split in WCPI

Hekmat justified Zionism and joined the Israeli front to fight against the "political Islam" in the Middle East region. He invented "new" theories that their implementations bring nothing except the stink of colonialism and dependence. He was hostile with the Iranian people's culture, history, and nationality and labeled them as reactionary and fascist. Hekmat presented views that the experienced French, British, Belgian and other old colonialists theorised in order to establish their rules in Africa and other regions and that the US imperialists are presently theorising and implementing in the framework of Huntington's "Clash of Civilizations". Hekmat ridiculed the anti-imperialist struggle of the people of the world and put make up on the reactionary and plundering nature of imperialism. His contradictory stands on several vexed issues, his position on Afghanistan, and the reactionary position of the followers of his "school" on the US invasion and occupation of Iraq all stem from his refutation of Leninist theory of imperialism and its nature.

Hekmat opposed the Leninist norms in regard to organisational construction of the working class party also. He rejected the Leninist principles on the party building and considered the idea that the party of the working class is the decisive tool in the hands of the proletariat for seizure of political power obsolete, and he replaced it with the theory of "open" and bourgeois party. Hekmat laughed at the formulation "for an underground (illegal) organisation" and of combination of legal and illegal work, and he worked for an all open party. Theoretically and practically, he replaced the party of the working class by the "party of figures" with open congress and exposed photos of its activists. Hekmat put the congresses of his party on sale and invited the public, from left to right to monarchists, to participate. He was proud of the participation of Tudeh Party, Fadaian Majority, and the monarchists in the congresses of his party. He replaced the congress of a communist party as the highest political organ that must make decisions on acute political, class, and organisational issues by a congress of Hollywood shows. His party threw away a Leninist constitution, accepted large scale membership of untested individuals, made factionalism and the existence of trends with different views admissible, and made a caricature out of the subordination of minority to majority and of the implementation of decisions made by the party.

A party that has distanced itself from all of the principles of Leninism and still carries a communist label has no choice except to split,

to be faced with crisis, and to be ridiculed by the public.

One cannot be a communist but not a Leninist. One cannot be a Leninist but not respect the past history of the communist movement and of the Communist International 1, 2, and 3. One cannot be Leninist but not have a position on the big split that took place in regards to Khrushchevite revisionism and the 20th Congress of the Communist party of the USSR. One cannot be a Leninist but evaluate Stalin as the representative of state capitalism and irrelevant to workers and socialism. One cannot be a Leninist but stamp the nature of the Great October Revolution and Chinese Revolution with a bourgeois label and accuse the leaders of these revolutions with bourgeois nationalism. He who develops hostility towards the communist movement that changed the world's picture and refutes the development of Marxism to Leninism and negates the glorious history of the communist movement has no choice except to fall to the ground in disgrace. Hekmat was one of these individuals and his party could not have any other fate. Hekmat, due to his self glorification and boasting of himself as the "Marx of the time" had to take the position of disrespect and loathing for the great leaders of Marxism. We see now that Mr. Hekmat as the "Marx of the time" and as the "bigger than Marx" is ridiculed by the progressive political activists.

Figures such as Marx and Lenin are the byproduct of definite historical era and of grand social transitions. Marx made scientific analysis of the capitalist system from which he beautifully derived the theory and tactic of the proletariat. The Paris Commune and the revolutionary theses that were raised after its defeat, especially the thesis on the destruction of the capitalist machinery and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, introduced Marx to the world as the century's great thinker, a revolutionary communist, and the teacher of the proletariat. Marx turned into a great leader in the communist movement through his theories and revolutionary practices. Lenin became a great leader in the communist movement through his continuation of Marx's path, by developing the Marxist theories, by presenting the scientific theory on the development of capitalism to imperialism, and by leading the October Revolution to victory. Isn't it to put Hekmat on the same level as Marx while Hekmat lacked even the ability to lead a few hundred of his supporters ridiculous? Hekmat did not develop any theories of Marx or Lenin; instead he copied the theories of bourgeois figures of Britain. He tried to seek prestige through raising questions about abortion and

Continued on page 3

Split in WCPI

through such non-class slogan as "The basis of socialism is human beings". This type of figure-making is fake and irrelevant to the class struggle and is as superstitious as the appearance of Khomeini's picture on the moon. This kind of figure is a caricature of a revolutionary Marxist.

In short, the intensification of the class struggle exposes the class nature of different forces. The military expedition of the US imperialism to the Middle East, the occupation of Afghanistan and Iraq, the defeat of the US occupying forces in Iraq, the Islamic Republic's compromise with the US, the intensification of the Iranian regime's offence on the masses, and the bankruptcy of the WCPI's theory on the disintegration of the Islamic Republic in a short time are some of the ingredients that lead to the fragmentation of WCPI.

Hekmat's theory of "Black and White Scenario", low theoretical level, and shortsightedness resulted in the paralysation of WCPI in dealing with the complex situation in Iran and the Middle East. One can regard the theory of imperialism as obsolete and void and refute it and laugh at Lenin. But the reality of occupation of Iraq and Afghanistan and the intensification of the anti-imperialist struggle of the people of the Middle East and of the world are so resounding that one cannot help but to see and to hear them. It is in this concrete condition that Hakmat's anti-Leninist theories encounter crisis and contradiction and show their alienation with the realities of today's world.

Long Live Marxism-Leninism!

***** **