# Leftism in the Role Of Metamorphosed Councilism

# councilism EFTISM

Internationalist Voice

**Addresses of the Internationalist Voice** 

Homepage:

www.internationalistvoice.org

**Email:** 

contact@internationalistvoice.org

X (Twitter): https://twitter.com/int\_voice

## **Communist Revolution**

#### or

### the Destruction of Humanity!

#### **Support Internationalist Voice!**

A fundamental pillar of revolutionary work is to systematically intervene and provide a perspective for the development of the struggle of the working class. The existence of a revolutionary tendency, though very weak, is a manifestation of the antagonism between the social classes and is a barometer of the class struggle.

A revolutionary tendency is only supported against the enormous resources of the bourgeoisie propaganda machine by those who are against the capitalist society, exploitation, wage slavery etc. Internationalist Voice is truly internationalist without any illusions about nationalism, democracy, and the left of capital, and defends the Communist Left tradition. Internationalist Voice is fighting for the Communist Revolution and needs your support in its struggle, in its defence of proletarian values and principles. Support Internationalist Voice.

#### **Explanation to the readers:**

We have translated all the quotations related to the movement for the abolition of wage labour. All our efforts have been made with the intention of being faithful to the original text and to present a highquality translation. Despite this, if some quotes are not easily understandable, this is because of the original text. Apart from the political content, the writing style of the original texts by this movement is not of good quality. This explanation is valid for all quotes from this faction.

#### Table of Contents

Introduction
Marxian or Marxism?
Failure to Adhere to the Basic Principles
Anti-Capitalist or Leftist?
The Rise of the Proletariat as a Social Class
The Concept of the Decline of Capitalism
The Marxist Concept of Anti-Imperialist Struggle
Bourgeois Revolution or Proletarian Revolution?
The Principles of Marxists
Distortion of Engels or Distortion of Marxism?
The 1840s Was the Decade of the Emergence of the Working Class
The Experience of 1848 and the Horizon of the Proletarian Revolution 89
Marxism Against Schapperism
Marx and Universal Suffrage 104
Marx and the Paris Commune
The Evolution of Capitalism and Labour Unions
Entryism in the Movement for the Abolition of Wage Labour 144
A Well-Known Labour Figure or the Translator of Leader Capital 147
The Anti-Capitalist Organization
Labour Councils or Caricatures Called Councils 190
Marx's Irresponsibility?

Faking Class Battles in the Style of Stalinism	206
History Writing in the Style of Stalinism	220
Social Democracy, the Murderer of the German Revolution	226
Rosa Luxemburg and Misleading Workers	240
The Nationalism of the Movement for the Abolition of Wage Labour	249
The Marxist Concept of Exploitation	263
The Communist Left, the Only Horizon	273
Basic Positions:	281

"It is not a question of what this or that proletarian, or even the whole proletariat, at the moment **regards** as its aim. It is a question of **what the proletariat is**, and what, in accordance with this **being**, it will historically be compelled to do."<sup>1</sup>

#### Introduction

The movement for the abolition of wage labour is a leftist undertaking that wants to pretend that it presents a new initiative. It claims to derive its ideas directly from Marx. It does not believe in Marxism and views it as Engels' invention, and it deems its narrative to be pure Marxian. Although it does not consider itself to belong to councilism, in reality it is a type of leftism that has appeared in the role of metamorphosed councilism. We will examine these issues in the text of this book.

The main force behind this movement, Nasser Paydar, believes that it is not only the difficulty of the book *Capital* that has caused the workers to show no desire to read it, because they understand and experience its concept daily with every bone in their bodies, but that the incomprehensible translation of *Capital* has made it harder for them to comprehend. He believes that:

"Mastering German and English is not enough to translate works like Capital and Grundrisse. It should be a real, global movement

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The Holy Family - Marx

and class, the rebellious and radical partner in all the pain that a person like Marx, as a person from the working class, has endured and revolted against."<sup>2</sup>

With this argument, the first question that arises is: have all German workers read the three-volume book *Capital*? In addition, although it was written in German, Marx himself oversaw the translation of the first volume of *Capital* into French and English, so at least reading the first volume in these languages should be possible. In order to make Marx's work *Capital* more understandable and convenient for Farsi-speaking workers, Paydar offers a rereading, for which he has also written a preface. However, this preface is not only a distortion of Engels' statements, but an inversion of the communist movement that smears labour and communist battles with the name of Marx. He has taken separate pieces from his theme, as well as from Engels' introduction to the book *The Class Struggles in France*, and then put them together and falsified the facts. First, let's read one of his comments. He states:

"...But history also proved us in the wrong, and revealed our opinion of that day as an illusion. History went even farther; not only did it destroy our former error, but also it transformed completely the conditions wider which the proletariat will have to battle. The fighting methods of 1848 are today obsolete in every respect, and that is a point which right here deserves closer investigation...' Engels continues his speech and writes that the defeat of the Paris Commune shifted the focus of the European labour movement from France to Germany. It is industrialized

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Rereading Marx's Capital, Nasser Paydar.

in Germany and as the hothouse development centre of capitalist production 'the Social Democracy grew still more rapidly and effectively. Thanks to the discernment with which the workers utilized the general franchise, introduced in 1866, the astonishing growth of the party lies in incontestable figures open before all the world."<sup>3</sup>

It should be emphasized that Marxism is not an ideology, religion or dogma, but rather fluid, and criticism is one of Marxism's important and fundamental pillars. This applies to Engels, Rosa Luxemburg, Lenin and others, as well as Marx himself. No one criticizes Luxemburg for her critique of Marx regarding capital accumulation. But a Chinese wall separates criticism from mudslinging and distortion. The fact that Paydar has resorted to the most unprincipled and immoral act to smear Engels is, on the one hand, a reflection of the decadent culture of leftism, which has metamorphosed into a deformed councilism, and on the other, a result of the alienation of this movement from Marxism. We will return to all these inversions later in the book. In one case, we agree with Paydar when he writes:

"The most misleading theories have a right to be expressed, but it is also the right of human beings to criticize them at the roots."<sup>4</sup>

Such movements must have the chance to express their incongruous and non-Marxist narratives, to show where they stand in this upside-down world of capitalism. On the other hand, Marxists should also have the opportunity, in defence of Marxism, to expose the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> As source 2.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> As source 2.

anti-communist nature of such ideas and factions. Perhaps the following question can be raised: does a leftist movement that has appeared in the role of a metamorphosed councilism need to be investigated? Such movements appear in most parts of this earth, with different languages and titles, and under the name of opposition to Leninist organizing, they start causing intellectual turmoil and confusion in the political environment. They create ambiguity in relation to Marxism and the history of the labour movement. In defence of Marxism, examining one of these means exposing to the public the nature and functioning of such leftist movements with different and apparently deceptive versions and names with varying meanings.

In this book, we have to refer to several quotes to show the inversions that this movement makes, as well as the truth of Marxism. We hope that this issue will not be boring for truth-seeking readers.

This study and review would not have been possible without relying on the historical experiences and achievements of the communist left. The communist left, especially during the dark era of counter-revolutionary domination, although in absolute isolation and in the most difficult conditions, was loyal to proletarian positions in all events, stood up against being dragged into the mud of communism and rose up defend Marxism. This political tradition, which in defence of Marxism has struggled not only against the right and left movements of capitalism but even against the intermediate ones, continues to fight.

## The Process of Formation of the Movement for the Abolition of Wage Labour

As stated in the introduction, this movement does not consider itself to belong to the tradition of councilism, but believes it presents a Marxian account of Marx. In other words, it pretends to follow a new thinking and creed which is directly related to Marx. This movement writes:

"The founders and defenders of Soviet Communism, with their explanations, guidelines and theorizing, not only do not help the formation and ossification, consistency and growth of this movement, but make its problems more complicated. The current followers of this approach should upgrade their rightful criticism of unionist right reformism and the party structure above the workers to socialist criticism and anti-wage work. Only then will their council communism be homogenized with the communism of the abolition of the wage labour of the proletariat."<sup>5</sup>

Previously, worker-communism also falsely claimed that its roots were directly derived from Marx. Therefore, we were forced to expose its formation from a simple Stalinist circle, then its growth in the Maoist environment and finally its disintegration into different factions. The question that comes to every person's mind is, what was

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Council Communism and the Abolition of Wage Labour Communism, Nasser Paydar.

the formation process of the association for the abolition of wage labour? To investigate this issue, the examination of the political evolution of the main character of this movement shows how it was developed and also how correct it is to relate it to Marx.

Paydar joined the National Front in his early youth. Over time, he developed the idea that the ideology of Islam could become the container of the struggle of the labouring masses against exploitation, dictatorship, capitalism and those in power. Therefore, years later, at the beginning of 1971, he joined the People's Mojahedin Organization and began to learn "the way of the prophets, the way of humanity."

With the intensifying of Stalinist-Maoist movements and also national liberation movements which often were combined with the ideology of Stalinism, in the People's Mojahedin Organization Stalinism dominated Islam, which is known as a process of ideological change. During the process of ideological change in the People's Mojahedin in the years 1973-1975 the vast majority of the members of the organization were converted from Islamic ideology to Marxism-Leninism (Stalinism). Tagi Shahram, one of the members of the central committee of Mojahedin, played a major role in this process. The conversion of Mojahedin to Stalinism was also performed with the same Stalinist tradition and style, and took place as a bloody coup.

Paydar explains how he learned about the murder of his comrades when the ideology of the organization, which had been Islamic, became Stalinist, as follows:

"The vast majority of the comrades of the organization read the news of the assassination of Sharif Waqfi and Samadiyeh in the newspapers after days had passed. They learned about the killing of several other organization members, much further away, during a new wave of internal developments in the organization, around the critique of the guerrilla policy and related issues."<sup>6</sup>

During the Stalinization of the organization, Taghi Shahram, who was a member of the Central Committee, appeared in the role of the organization's leader. Paydar describes the atmosphere and internal relations at that point:

"With a camp method, Shahram turned the organization into a copy of the capitalist society, in which self-censorship, opportunism, and the destruction of comradely values rained from its doors and walls."<sup>7</sup>

In describing the internal factions of the organization, Paydar believes that the organization was not one-handed at that point and there were three different and opposing approaches in the organization. According to Paydar, these three trends were not at the same level and did not have the same social base in the organization, but despite that, all of them existed and were represented. Paydar defines them as follows:

"There was the kernel of existence of three different and opposite approaches in our organization at that time. These seeds did not have the same social atmosphere and facilities to grow and express their conscious identity, but they all existed. The approaches were:

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup>From Militant Religious Populism to Militant Populist Communism, Nasser Paydar – page 210.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> As source 6 - page 207.

- 1. Militant religious populism
- 2. Militant populist communism
- 3. Marxian and anti-capitalist communism."8

Paydar believes that within the Mojahedin organization from 1973 onwards, the Stalinist movement, or in his words, militant populist communism, arose in an antagonistic struggle with the religious one, and it strongly hindered the growth of Marxian and anticapitalist communism and limited the third trend, which Paydar induces that he and his friends represented. Paydar explains as follows:

"What actually happened in the Mojahedin organization from 1973 onwards was the rise of the second tendency, its antagonistic militancy with the first tendency and the closing of all the ways to the growth, self-expression and expansion of the third approach."<sup>9</sup>

However, according to Paydar, the advancement of the third approach forward was stopped and he believes that the organization at that point in time had become a replica of the capitalist society; nevertheless, he argues that representatives of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie were involved in the organization. At first glance, it may be perceived that Paydar has a sociological view of the People's Mojahedin Organization because as the proletariat and the bourgeoisie are present in a society, so they will also exist in its replica, that is, the Mojahedin Organization. But the class dimension of the issue is that he

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> As source 6 - page 156.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> As source 6 - page 159.

emphasizes that the proletariat was represented in the organization. He explains this issue as follows:

"I have stated many times in this text that the representatives of both the bourgeoisie and the proletariat were present in the organization on the basis of an unwritten agreement of socialpeople beliefs and bourgeois anti-imperialism."<sup>10</sup>

In the autumn of 1978, the internal disputes of the Stalinist Mojahedin escalated, and the performance of the leadership was questioned. The organization's officials responded to these controversies with changes in leadership and policies and blamed the problems on the former leaders. A statement was also issued that determined the organization's future line. Paydar outlines the conditions of that stage within the organization, the bourgeois understanding of socialism and **his submission and obedience to the rightist and compromising positions:** 

"The whole approach to the extreme right of the statement and its authors did not face our clear and explicit criticism. We, the critics of the organization's current situation, did not show any particular sensitivity. Of course, we had criticisms in parts, but like the entire left of Iran at that time, we were swimming in the sea of popular and social-bourgeois illusions. What caused us confusion and discomfort after the preparation of this text was not the right and compromising positions but the practical policies and orientations that were being adopted and implemented."<sup>11</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> As source 6 - page 261.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> As source 6 - page 331.

The new statement of the Stalinist Mojahedin described the positions of a radical leftist current of peripheral capitalism, which was trying to prepare itself for the new conditions following the protests that had become acute in society. Paydar considers himself a participant in **making these inversions** and admits that his knowledge of basic principles such as capitalism, socialism, the labour movement, etc., was no different from others, and he says in relation to that period:

"In those days, we shared enough with others, in making all these misconceptions or inversions. We also thought like other comrades in understanding capitalism, socialism, the goals and expectations and perspectives of the labour movement and all issues of class struggle, including the dimensions of the existence of the working class, and we were no different from them."<sup>12</sup>

In the quote above, Paydar means the third trend or the Marxian and anti-capitalist communist movement. The quotation admits how much this trend of Marxian communism was based on Marx. In the late autumn of 1978, the Stalinist Mujahedin were split into two small groups and an organization:

- Alliance for struggle for Working Class Cause (Arman)
- Battle of the emancipation of the working class (Nabard)
- Organisation of Struggle on the Path to the Emancipation of the Working class (Peykar)

Paydar became one of the founders of the Group for the Combat for Emancipation of the Working Class (Nabard), and one of its main

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> As source 6 - page 328.

figures. In other words, he played a key role in determining the policies of the Nabard group. At this point, he can no longer blame others for the bourgeois policies of his group, as he himself was one of the main policy-makers. During and following the developments of 1979, the leftists played an important role in stabilizing the Islamic bourgeoisie under the name of anti-imperialist struggles. The Nabard group was also engaged in the anti-imperialist struggle, spoke of the "**antiimperialist and revolutionary movement of the homeland**" and was a partner in this stabilization. Recently, Paydar has written that the antiimperialist struggle is nothing but the settlement of accounts between the bourgeoisie and class rivals, and he states that:

"What has happened in the world has been nothing but the 'antiimperialist struggle' under the name of a part of the bourgeoisie to settle scores with the dominant class rivals."<sup>13</sup>

Internationalists (Communist Left), in February 1979, contented with being attached to the proletarian camp and relying on communist positions and internationalist perspectives, began to analyse the situation. This contrasts with the political delirium of the left of capital and the support for reactionaries like Khomeini, claiming the imam defended the oppressed and made the clergy anti-imperialist. Yes, in February 1979, internationalists declared that Khomeini was no more progressive than the Queen of England or Emperor Bokassa I. Yes, internationalists in that same February, announced that the proletariat must maintain its class independence and should not dissolve itself in the people's movements. Yes, in the same February, internationalists

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> As source 6 - page 364.

announced that the only revolution on the agenda, both in peripheral countries including Iran and metropolitan countries, was communist revolution.<sup>14</sup>

At that time, the Nabard group was a radical phrase Stalinist group, defending the "proletarian position of the Albanian Labor Party"<sup>15</sup> and evaluating the Soviet Union as a socialist country until Stalin's death. The Nabard group wanted to fight and clear the ranks of the global communist and labour movement from Khrushchev's revisionism, and in criticizing revisionism, it argues:

"After the transformation of the world's first socialist country into a revisionist and social-imperialist country and the rule of the Khrushchev-Brezhnev gang over the Soviet Union, global revisionism has become a stout tree, fighting against which, and cleaning the ranks of the world communist and labour movement from its pollution, has a special priority."<sup>16</sup>

Contrary to Paydar's demagoguery at that time, the criticism of the left, although very simple and visionless, had started, but Paydar and his Nabard group were still busy obeying the left of capital. One of the factions engaged in criticism was the Red Star group, which branched off from the Organization of Struggle for the Emancipation

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup> For more information, refer to the article "February 1979: when internationalists announced that Khomeini was no more progressive than the Queen of England or Emperor Bokassa I".

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>15</sup> A Review of Tudeh Party's Positions and Functions from Battle Group Publications – page 7.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>16</sup> As source 15 – page 5.

of the Working Class (Peykar) in the late summer of 1980.<sup>17</sup> Despite its fundamental criticism of the left of capital and its reactionary positions, Red Star maintained its Stalinist framework. Radical criticism is the first step in liberation from the nightmare of the bourgeois left. **Although it is a required and necessary condition, it is not sufficient to reach a communist position.** Unfortunately, the brutal suppression of the Islamic bourgeoisie did not allow Red Star to leave behind the left of capital in its criticisms and reach internationalist positions. Despite this, the Red Star leaders, at the time of being beaten to bloodshed, were critics of the anti-revolutionary left.

Shortly after its rise, the disgraceful and dirty Islamic bourgeoisie began a violent suppression. The left of capital, which itself had played an important role in stabilizing the Islamic bourgeoisie, was among the first victims. Language cannot describe the crimes of Islamic criminals and it is very difficult to present a true

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>17</sup> Akbar Aghbashlu represented a weak but radical trend within the Peykar organization from the first congress. Akbar and the movement he represented did not accept the reactionary positions of Peykar about the "petty bourgeoisie" and so on. When Ayatollah Taleghani died, they were against Peykar's views. At that time, Akbar was the secretary of the Azerbaijan committee and prevented the militants from mourning Taleghani, at least in the Azerbaijan province. Finally, Akbar was practically removed from membership due to his criticisms and was not allowed to participate in the second Peykar congress. After Peykar took away the possibility of any internal discussion from them, after the second congress, which was held in the summer of 1980, they branched off from Peykar and founded the "Red Star" group. On 28 June 1981, the house of the leaders of the Red Star was attacked by the criminals of the Islamic bourgeoisie. The security officials did not provide any information about those arrested; only the shameful publication known as the Islamic Republic newspaper wrote in early September 1981 that the leaders of the Red Star anti-revolutionary group had been executed. Their bodies were buried anonymously in the Khavaran cemetery.

picture of those misdeeds. After the terrible suppression of the Nabard group, it also disintegrated. Fortunately, Paydar survived and made it to Europe, where he communicated with his former comrades, and this connection led him to establish a close relationship with Gholam Keshavarz, a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Iran<sup>18</sup> at that time, even though Paydar claims that he did not have a positive opinion about the Communist Party. Paydar explains this issue as follows:

"After arriving in Europe, I started talking with my former comrades... A few days after my arrival, Gholam Keshavarz called... After friendly talks, he suggested that we talk to each other at a suitable time and it was during these appointments and meetings that a long conversation between us began and continued... In the following meetings, Gholam asked my opinion about the Communist Party of Iran and the discussions within the Sahand circle, and my answer was that I have no positive view of them."<sup>19</sup>

Although Paydar had the opportunity to read Marx's basic topics such as *Capital*, *Grundrisse*, etc., he nevertheless admits that he did not have a correct understanding of Marx's communism at that time. The undeniable fact is that you cannot comprehend Marx by reading his works, but you can understand him and his teachings during and

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>18</sup> For more information about how the Communist Party of Iran was formed and its positions and policies, refer to the book *Worker-Communism, Radical Conscience of the Left of Capital* published by Internationalist Voice.
<sup>19</sup> As source 6 – page 366.

through the class struggle. Otherwise, academic Marxism would teach Marxism in a better way. Paydar explains his leftist attitude as follows:

"I must emphasize that at that time, not only compared to today but even compared to five years after that date, I was still halfway in terms of completing the knowledge of various issues related to Marxian communism and the abolition of wage labour. On that day, despite criticizing Lenin's narrative of imperialism, I still considered Lenin's theories, analyses and strategies to be the continuation of the Marxian and communist praxis of the proletariat's class struggle."<sup>20</sup>

At that time, under the influence of the communist left, militants in the Persian-speaking political milieu began to criticize the left of the capital and publish many pamphlets and materials. The fact that these movements could not become a communist alternative does not reduce the value of their critiques. Criticism of the left capital also includes the Communist Party of Iran, and as a result, the organization of supporters of the Communist Party of Iran in Italy fell apart.<sup>21</sup> In order to prevent the spread of the crisis to other countries, Hamid Taqvai began to distort and invert the communist left under the name of criticizing the programme of the Internationalist Communist Party. Although very it was late, Taqvai received a strong and hard response from us.<sup>22</sup>

 $<sup>^{20}</sup>$  As source 6 – page 367.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>21</sup> Critics have published many texts and articles, some of which have been included in a booklet entitled *Regarding Organizational Changes and Developments of the Organization of Iranian Communist Party Supporters Abroad.* 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>22</sup> Refer to the book *Worker-Communism, Radical Conscience of the Left of Capital.* 

The basic question is, at that time, where did Paydar stand in this upside-down world of capitalism? He had a history of working in several political groups and organizations. In other words, he was also "experienced" and did not have a positive view of the Communist Party. Shouldn't he have been at the forefront of the critics? Contrary to expectations, Paydar was preparing to enter the Stalinist party.

We have already observed that Paydar himself stated that he did not have a positive view of the Communist Party of Iran at that time. Trotskyists have a policy called entryism or influence in which, by infiltrating unions or other parties, they try to influence unions or parties from within. We will return to this issue in the following pages, and we will show that, contrary to the baseless claims of Paydar, his entry into the Communist Party of Iran was not a temporary mistake, but a part of the opportunistic politics and disbelief in the basic principles and leftist attitude of this movement. In 1987, Paydar joined the Communist Party of Iran and began to perform party duties. Paydar explains his joining the Stalinist party as follows:

"[Gholam] suggested in a friendly way that I think about entering the party and raising the desired issues within the party. He insisted that within the organization, there is a possibility to influence the analysis and the whole approach of the party, and this opportunity should not be ignored. My answer to Gholam's proposal was negative for a long time... I told Gholam that I would join the party on the condition that together, we would actively try to change the views and orientations of the party!! A statement that spoke of my falsity, naivety and crude thinking in the real world, and later, whenever I remembered it, I had some sort of disgust... In any case, it was in 1987 that I started some cooperation with the organization by mistake and with completely incorrect and baseless calculations. I took responsibility for the publication of the party's foreign magazine, which was published every two weeks."<sup>23</sup>

Internationalists have declared that the culture, behaviour, actions, ethics and principles of the left of capital reflect the values of the capitalist system. We will return to this discussion again in future chapters and show that the values of the left of capital are institutionalized in Paydar. He presents a very sad but true picture of the inside of the Stalinist party and portrays the bitter truths:

"Until that day, I did not imagine that there was something under the name of communism, worker, critic of the camp and Maoism and populism and the whole left of the day, to which people, to this extent, from any active anti-capitalist intervention, from any form of influence and while playing a real anti-capitalist role, could fall. What I saw was just a humble replica of the structure of order, politics, culture, values and ethics of the dominant capitalism."<sup>24</sup>

A political current or trend becomes a cult when the ongoing debates have lost their meaning. The leader produces an idea, and the disciples chew and digest it. Criticism is one of the major sins and is considered a type of sacrilege, despite the fact that it is one of the basic features of Marxism. Continuing his description of the inner

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>23</sup> As source 6 – pages 369-370.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>24</sup> As source 6 - page 372.

atmosphere of the Stalinist party, Paydar describes the crime of criticism as follows:

"Criticism here was a very serious crime and had very severe consequences."<sup>25</sup>

Paydar tried to stay inside the Stalinist party as much as he could, although he thought that influencing the party was nothing more than a fantasy. The question is, why? At this point, Paydar was not an inexperienced young man; he had participated in the activities of at least four political groups. Paydar describes his experiences in the process of influencing the Communist Party of Iran:

"Despite the reality that after observing these facts, I saw the hope of any kind of influence in the party as pure fantasy, I thought that before coming out, I should discuss some issues with elements of the organization's mass. There was no opportunity to bring up basic issues. No article criticizing the opinions and strategies of Hekmat and his associates could be included in any party media... Accordingly, the idea of influencing through organizing criticisms and opinions and including them in party publications seemed futile. I followed it in several cases, and it was faced with a powerful censorship barrier everywhere."<sup>26</sup>

Finally, after a long period of activity in a Stalinist party that was heavily influenced and nourished by Maoism, Paydar left the

 $<sup>^{25}</sup>$  As source 6 – page 372.

 $<sup>^{26}</sup>$  As source 6 – pages 373-374.

organization. He claimed that at the time of separation from the Communist Party of Iran, the future actions that should be taken regarding the labour movement and communism were somewhat obvious to him. Below, we will see that this claim of Paydar is baseless and bombastic. He himself explains as follows:

"When I left the party, the outlines of what should be done in relation to the labour movement and the communism of this class were, to a large extent, clear to me."<sup>27</sup>

In the early 1990s, those who survived the bourgeois Islamic Auschwitz were forced to leave the country and spread to all parts of the globe. Some of them were critics of the left of capital, although most of their criticisms were in the same range and unfortunately did not make it possible for them to be able to reach communist positions. Paydar explains this phase of his political life as follows:

"In 1995, I gradually got to know those who were all the young generation of political prisoners after June 1981 and who survived the mass slaughter of the bourgeois Islamic State in 1988... These acquaintances quickly led to the forming of a group of four people. In the first meetings of this group, the suggestion to publish a magazine was proposed, and since there were many unpublished materials in hand until that day, its first issue was published in a small number under the name of *Simay Socialism* (The Face of Socialism) and distributed among some people. The publication, although not wide, to some extent

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>27</sup> As source 6 - page 389.

received attention. Observers were usually critics of the existing left and were looking for an effective way to fight against capitalism. The publication of *Simay Socialism* led to the joining of some other comrades."<sup>28</sup>

Paydar's narrative shows the inversion institutionalized in his culture and attitude and is not real. We will return to these inversions repeatedly in the book's text. Before continuing the discussion, let's correct his story. On 14 April 1997, Paydar wanted to establish the group of the Union of Communist Workers (UCW) and published the **Statement and Programme of the Union of Communist Workers**. This was, in fact, the **Stalinist minimum programme** in a peripheral country with radical terms. Some of the demands raised in it had already been realized in Western Europe. We will return to the theme of this programme in later chapters.

After some time, Paydar started the "Today's Communist" movement instead of the Union of Communist Workers and did not give any explanation as to why he started this group instead. He published the same statement and programme with minor changes in *Simay Socialism* No. 1, which was actually the same as the Today's Communist publication. Unfortunately, the first issue of *Simay Socialism* has no date, and it is impossible to determine exactly when it was released. The explanation in *Simay Socialism* No. 1 about the above issues is as follows:

"Before this, fragmentary parts of this text under the title of a draft statement and programme were available to a very few of the closest comrades."

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>28</sup> As source 6 – pages 389-390.

Paydar himself admits that he had not yet criticized Stalinism in the late 1990s, despite the fact that sometime before that, after leaving the Stalinist party, he had announced that the goals of the labour and communist movement had become clear to him. Only a genius like Paydar can understand this contradiction and confusion. The articles in *Simay Socialism* began to be published in the late 1990s; they were a mixed bag, and later Paydar and his faction did not accept them either. Why don't they put these publications on their website?<sup>29</sup> Because they were a kind of radical Stalinism, and the seasoning and spice of councilism had not been added to them as much as necessary. Paydar states the following regarding the publication of *Simay Socialism*:

"At that time, we had not yet criticized Lenin's narrative of the party and the partisanization of communist workers."<sup>30</sup>

Shortly after the publication of *Simay Socialism*, the "Today's Communist" movement suffered a crisis, following which some of the members left it, and its orientations shifted towards a kind of leftism that was somewhat influenced by councilism, in other words, leftism which appeared in the role of metamorphosed councilism. At some point after that, it began to call itself not "Today's Communist," but the movement for abolishing wage labour.

If we state that the anti-party-organizing attitude of the workers, due to Paydar and his movement, was not based on a theoretical basis, but a reflection of his personal experience of the right and left of capitalism, which he himself spent a lifetime in, and had bitter and

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>29</sup> Approximately 12 issues were published and later its publication was stopped.

 $<sup>^{30}</sup>$  As source 6 – page 390.

painful experiences which affected his own flesh and skin, we have not said anything in vain. Several of Paydar's comrades have been killed by his organizational comrades in the People's Mojahedin for false reasons, which is very painful. Paydar only addresses these upsetting, bitter and agonizing memories and experiences with a political attitude in a rough and coarse way.

With these explanations, leaving communist values and principles aside, how ethical is it that Paydar refers himself or his movement directly to Marx? We will come back to this issue again; it is only necessary to mention that the ethics of leftism permit a great deal and as a result, Paydar has allowed many things for himself.

#### Marxian or Marxism?

Paydar and his friends do not consider themselves Marxists and claim that Engels founded the ideology of Marxism, so they use the term "Marxian." They claim that Engels was acting in line with strengthening the ideology of Marxism when he helped to form the Second International. According to them, there is a huge difference between the views of Marx and Engels. Of course, they are not the inventors of these opinions, but they have obtained these ideas from the original source without referring to it. Paydar explains why he is not a Marxist as follows:

"Marx's '*Capital*' or his other learnings and findings is not 'Marxism'!! Not 'Scientific Socialism'!! Not 'Revolutionary Theory', which is an analytical, radical, revolutionary criticism and praxis of the proletariat on capitalism."<sup>31</sup>

Unlike Paydar and his movement, we proudly and with a raised head declare that we are Marxists. We believe that Marxism is the theoretical weapon of the working class to overthrow capitalism, or in other words, it is the theory of the liberation of the proletariat, and the communist left is the historical and true continuation of Marxism. Contrary to Paydar's and his friends' inversions, Marxism is not an ideology, but a proletarian class consciousness.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>31</sup> As source 2.

Perhaps this is the first time that Paydar will learn that even the young Marx was critical of the communist theories of his time and was pessimistic about their practical realization. The struggles of the working class in the early 1940s made it possible for Marx to understand the evolution of capitalism and the rise of the working class as a social class. These factors changed Marx's views, and Marx devoted his life to the struggle for communism. Unlike in his youth, when he wrote the *Manifesto* with Engels, Marx actually declared that communism had become both possible and necessary. The proletariat was able to turn Marx into a thinker for their communism. Marx did not invent communism for the working class based on his own genius.<sup>32</sup>

Marxism is not a handful of books by Marx or a few courses, or a wise theory or an ideology that can be learned in universities. Marxism is not a religion or ritual and creed that its followers believe in. In the apparently radical statements of Paydar under the description of Marxian, Marxism is actually emptied of its revolutionary meaning. Marxism is the accumulated experience and class consciousness of the proletariat, which has become the historical memory of the working class; in other words, it is the weapon of the working class's struggle in its revolutionary struggle against capitalism. Marxism is a revolutionary understanding for changing the world; "philosophers have only interpreted the world in various ways; the point is to change it." The leftists appearing in the form of metamorphosed councilism want to reduce this historical memory of the working class to a few books and teachings by Marx himself.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>32</sup> For more information, see the article "February 1848: The Proletariat Offers Its Own Manifesto as a Social Class for Its Own Emancipation!"

Another perversion and reversing of this type of movement is the Marxist labelling of anti-revolutionary currents such as Stalinists, Maoists, Trotskyists, etc., under the title of Leninist parties, which join the choir and ideologues of the bourgeois in this anti-communist campaign and throw dust in the eyes of the working class.

#### Failure to Adhere to the Basic Principles

The culture, behaviour and actions as well as the ethics and principles of the left of capital reflect the values of the capitalist system. Paydar had been active in the right and left movements of the capital for nearly 40 years when he started the "Today's Communist" group. He spent many years in the Mojahedin Organization (in both its religious and Stalinist phases) and describes its inner atmosphere as follows:

"With a camp method, Shahram turned the organization into a copy of the capitalist society, where self-censorship, opportunism, and the destruction of comradely values rained from its doors and walls."<sup>33</sup>

In his biography, he admits that "we also shared enough with others in all these misconceptions or inversions in those days." He repeatedly refers to his compliance with right and compromising positions. Following the formation of the Stalinist party, criticisms of it both inside Iran and abroad began to form. In this situation, even though he does not have a positive opinion of the Communist Party of Iran, he becomes an opportunistic and unprincipled activist, as he says about the atmosphere within the party:

"What I saw was just a humble replica of the structure of order, politics, culture, values and ethics of the dominant capitalism."<sup>34</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>33</sup> As source 6 – page 207.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>34</sup> As source 6 - page 372.

Paydar pretends that his activity in the Stalinist party was a mistake, but this is nothing more than demagoguery. Most of the same party activists separated from the Communist Party and founded the Worker-Communist Party. In January 1999, the activists of the Worker-Communist Party, who were actually his former comrades, started publishing a publication entitled *Negah* (*The Look*). Paydar has been one of its regular writers, although most of the writers later broke away from worker-communism. Apart from the leftists, the following people also published material in the magazine, which shows to what extent Paydar is an appeaser and a believer in basic principles:

- Dariush Homayoun minister of information of the imperial regime (No. 1)
- Farrokh Negahdar one of the leaders of the hated Majority organization. In 1981, while the soles of political prisoners were being shredded under torture, Farrokh Negahdar had an information meeting with the executioner and criminal Lajordi in the adjacent room. These were the same Majoritists who snitched and exposed the former friends of Paydar to the intelligence forces (No. 2)
- Fidel Castro the symbol of the leftists who bowed down in front of Islamic criminals (No. 8)
- Parisa Nasrabadi leftist activist of the resistance axis, i.e., the leftists, under the pretext of anti-imperialism, are actually defenders of the Islamic bourgeoisie (No. 26)

After the fall of the Berlin Wall, the leftists also became democrats and want to represent all trends in their publications. The democratization of the leftists prepared the ground for Paydar to put himself forward at any price. Paydar uses every opportunity to smear Lenin and Engels and turn Marxism upside down. Apart from *Negah* magazine, which was described above, other leftist works such as *Research of Iran's Social Movements*, *Praxis of the Social Revolution* and *Arash* magazine are just a few examples.

The descriptions above show that Paydar left the Stalinist party not because of its bourgeois nature, but because of the "powerful barrier of censorship." In other words, if they had not censored him in the Stalinist party, he would still be a party activist. It would be difficult for Paydar to call the Stalinist party bourgeois. Why did he join a bourgeois party?

All of this means that, contrary to Paydar's understanding of Marx, who was the epitome of principle, if anyone gives Paydar a publication he will use it to promote his anti-communist and anti-Marxist positions. Paydar's performance is sometimes not unprincipled but disgusting.

Regarding the Stalinist Mojahedin (Marxist-Leninist) activists, Paydar, not at that time, but today, uses terms such as "communist revolutionaries," "radical labour and communist orientation," "joined communism by breaking with religious beliefs," "in the process of internal developments was associated with communism," "hand in hand with the communist mujahedin" and so on. This discussion should not be considered personal, as it is not about individuals, but about concepts such as communists and revolutionaries, as well as communism, labour orientation, etc. Does Paydar disrespect such ideas any less than the cult of worker-communism?

This movement apparently does not consider trade unions suitable vessels for the struggle of the working class and talks about

34

"union right reformism," but it has tried to interfere in the formation of the Labour Foundation, coordination committee, etc. How can all this adherence to non-principles be explained?! Of course, these issues will be discussed in the following pages.

Culture, self-censorship, opportunism, inversion, obedience to the right positions, compromise and breaking comradely values, as well as bourgeois ethics, values, etc., in other words, the leftist values of capitalism have been normalized in Paydar. He has institutionalized all these in his movement and made them a part of the values, culture and tradition of his friends as well.

With respect to Paydar, when he writes or speaks, he imagines that he is on the pulpit like a priest and preaches to "God's sheep." Therefore, Christians should also accept the sermons of him and his friends as holy words and not allow themselves the slightest doubt. Most of the sermons (writings) of Paydar and his friends lack value and credibility. If a student presents one of his or his friends' writings as an essay to a teacher in a capitalist metropolis, it will definitely be returned, not because of its content but because it does not meet the basic standards of writing. It is likely that, according to the opinion of Paydar and his friends, those standards are bourgeois ones and Paydar and his friends are not required to comply with them.<sup>35</sup>

It doesn't matter that, everywhere in this capitalist world, workers are humiliated daily at work and in society, and that humiliation is part of the values of the dirty capitalist system. After

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>35</sup> In the book *The Anti-Capitalist Workers A Manifestation of the Non-Horizon of Councilism*, we have repeatedly pointed out incorrect facts, irresponsible statements and inversions, and we will also highlight some cases in this publication.

enduring the daily degradation of dirty capitalist relations, the workers should prepare themselves for that of Paydar and his friends with their low literature.<sup>36</sup>

Unprincipledness, inversion, fakeness, arrogance, submissiveness and humiliation have become part of the practice of this movement.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>36</sup> We have mentioned this in the book *The Anti-Capitalist Workers A Manifestation of the Non-Horizon of Councilism*, and we refrain from repeating it here.

# **Anti-Capitalist or Leftist?**

The movement for the abolition of wage labour masquerades as an anti-capitalist group and publishes pure Marxian ideas, appearing to strengthen the movement to abolish wage labour within the working class. It pretends to deal with the roots and that it is not looking for anti-regime noise, but tries to put the real Marx in front of the workers. Unfortunately, such claims are just demagoguery and pure lies.

We will refer to some of the opinions, articles and texts of this movement and show that contrary to its claims, its performance is aimed at creating confusion and throwing dust in the eyes of the working class to prevent them from being able to appear as a social class in the events of society.

The website of this movement is a mishmash and hotchpotch where you can find any kind of leftist text. Topics from the left wing of the Green Movement (the issue for the founders of the People's Mojahedin was that the policy of liberation was in the same tradition of the struggle of the oppressed) to the Trotskyists (David North, an American Trotskyist), from "Che Guevara and ethics in political struggle" to "Antonio Gramsci," from "Mumia Abu-Jamal" to "Reformist Syriza Party," from "Socialist Feminism" to "Communist Core – Frankfurt," etc., can be found on it.

His friends on the Telegram channel under the name of anticapitalism have become the infantry of the Human Rights Watch (the right wing of capitalism) and other leftists. As we said before, antidictatorship is a more suitable term for them.

37

#### The Rise of the Proletariat as a Social Class

The economic structure of the capitalist society emerged from that of the feudal society. Although the beginning of capitalist production dates back to the 15th century in certain cities of the Mediterranean, capitalist production actually began in the 16th century. Wherever it appeared, the bourgeoisie broke up feudal relations, freed the serfs and provided wage labour for the bourgeoisie. Nevertheless, the growth of capitalist production was very slow until the end of the 18th century, and as a result, wage workers also went through the infancy of the working class. It was from the end of the 18th century or the beginning of the 19th that capitalism as a social system and, accordingly, the working class as a social class in society ascended.

The capitalist mode of production was first developed in England and became a dominant production system, before gradually expanding to other European countries. With the expansion of capitalism, a large part of the peasantry were taken from their lands and turned into proletarians. The working conditions were more terrible than today and workers had to work from 60 to 72 hours per week in factories.

With the industrial revolution and the evolution of capitalism in England, advanced machines replaced simple tools in the industrial sector, especially the textile industry. The use of advanced machines led to mass unemployment. The workers saw the machines as being responsible for their misery, regarded them with anger and hatred, and objected to their existence. It was in this context that workers began to destroy machines in the period 1811-1812 as part of the Luddite Movement. For a short time, the Luddite Movement was so strong that the bourgeoisie was scared and the British state pushed for its bloody repression. At a collective trial in the English city of York in 1812, a large number of activists belonging to this movement were sentenced to death, exile or imprisonment. Subsequently, laws were adopted whereby any damage to machinery would result in heavy punishment and even execution.

Several rebellions occurred in the 1830s and 1840s. A social class was protesting at its exploitation, while a revolutionary spirit was pervading society. Although the radical elements in these movements called themselves "communists", their communism was a mixture of imaginative aspiration and heroic action. The passage of time and the experiences of the struggle have revealed the ineffectiveness of such thoughts and pursuits. The struggle to improve living conditions required a revolutionary perspective.

The manifesto represents the maturity and reflection of the emergence of a social class in the developments of society. Rather than riots or insurrections, it offered a political programme and a call for social revolution, as its historical mission, in order to end the capitalist system and establish a communist society.

Nevertheless, capitalism, which was developing from the beginning of the 16th century until the beginning of the 20th century, or to be more precise, until the First World War, was in its heyday, and until this point, the material ground for the communist revolution was not ready, although we witnessed dozens of glorious proletarian uprisings all over the world, especially in Europe, at that time. With the entry of capitalism into the age of its decline, which was marked by the First World War, the material ground was prepared for the communist revolution, which is the subject of the following pages.

### The Concept of the Decline of Capitalism

Capitalism is only a specific historical form of social production. Before capitalism, there were other types of production methods with different levels of development within the productive forces. The origin of this process goes back to the time when humans tried to constantly grow and develop productive forces in order for natural life to survive. No social system falls apart during its flourishing period, unless it is replaced by a higher social system during its decline. This issue is also true for the capitalist system. The history of capitalist production can be divided into two stages.

The first is the time when the bourgeoisie played a revolutionary role and relations of production allowed the growth of production forces. The second is the phase when capitalism has entered its period of decline. This stage of imperialism is the era of the rottenness of capitalism. In the age of imperialism, the bourgeois class is an antirevolutionary and reactionary one, and therefore capitalist relations create an obstacle in the way of the progress of productive forces.

The main characteristic of decadent capitalism, i.e., the imperialist era, is the cycle of crisis, war and reconstruction. World War I indicated that capitalism had entered the age of its decline and resorted to a world war as its last solution for the crisis it was involved in. In the stage of capitalist decline, capitalist relations of production are shackles on the hands and feet of the growth and development of productive forces. It is only at this stage that the material conditions are prepared for a social revolution in the current era of "communist revolution".

The important point is that the historical decline of capitalism does not mean the end of the growth of productive forces, but that in the era of capitalist decline it is much more destructive. The period of the decline of capitalism does not mean the cessation of the growth of productive forces, because capitalism cannot function without accumulation.

The era of the development of capitalism meant that the capitalist system was not yet the dominant mode of production all over the world and the bourgeoisie still played a revolutionary role in society, so the material conditions for the communist revolution were not yet on the agenda of the proletariat. Since the bourgeois government was not yet too large and the bourgeoisie played a revolutionary role in society, it was possible to impose lasting reforms and the working class could use trade unions as a tool to improve their conditions. At that point, the communists could employ the bourgeois parliament to advance their goals. Communists conditionally supported some liberation wars.

Capitalism's entry into the era of its decline meant that it became the dominant mode of production all over the world and the entire capitalist system entered the imperialist stage.<sup>37</sup> In other words, all countries are capitalist and the bourgeoisie has lost its progressive role. In this period, all countries, whether large or small, are imperialists. We will come back to this issue again later.

When capitalism entered the age of its decline or imperialism, which was characterized by the First World War, the trade unions were

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>37</sup> Here, our description of the decline of capitalism is very brief. For a deeper understanding, the communist left has published detailed books, pamphlets and articles, which are recommended. Here we also do not go into the crisis mechanisms involved in the capitalist decline.

integrated into the capitalist state and were no longer a tool for the struggle of the working class, but an institution for opposing the class struggle. Bourgeois parliaments lost their progressive role. National movements became infantry in imperialist tensions. The era of decadence also meant that the material conditions for the communist revolution had been prepared and the age of the communist revolution and imperialist war had begun. It was in such a context that the wave of the world revolution of 1917-1923 started.

Apparently, the movement for the abolition of wage labour also believes in the decline of capitalism and describes it as follows:

"The true meaning of the decline or the actuality of the death and decline of capitalism is that this system has entered a stage where it has no other way to survive except to attack the current living level of the working class in different parts of the world."<sup>38</sup>

Of course, if it can be called a review, it is dedicated to dismantling the welfare state that started in the 1980s. The concept of degeneration is not adapted from the **dialectical evolution of global capitalism** but from the performance of a part of metropolitan capitalism at a certain point. For them, the decline of capitalism probably started in the 1980s. Equating the dismantling of welfare states to the concept of capitalist decline shows that this movement has not understood the dialectical evolution of capitalism, and this is completely natural because it has never understood Marxism, because it never belonged to it.

The damage and destruction resulting from the Second World War were much greater than that following the First World War, so

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>38</sup> The Face of Socialism – No. 1 – page 91.

from the early 1950s to the late 1960s, there was a period of reconstruction and a kind of "economic prosperity." During this time, we also see the formation of welfare states. Although these were formed by the surplus value resulting from the exploitation of the working class, at this point, especially in the welfare states, the attack on the living standards of the working class was less significant compared to other periods. But the same reconstruction period in most parts of the world coincided with many wars, the most important of which were the Korean and Vietnam wars. The important point is that in the era of capitalist decline, war is a part of life in the brutal capitalist system, and it is not possible to avoid it.<sup>39</sup>

Since the early 1970s, when the era of rebuilding the destruction caused by the Second World War ended, capitalism has shown that it is in crisis. In the face of this, welfare states began to collapse one after the other from the early 1980s, peaking in the late 1980s. The fall of the Berlin Wall and the Eastern Bloc not only gave a harsh and crude form to the dismantling of welfare states, but also organized an attack on the living standards of the working class around the world. This is what the above quote from this movement describes. In other words, for the movement for the abolition of wage labour in the 1950s and 1960s, the decline of capitalism had no meaning because the attack on the living standards of the working class was less significant compared to the years before and after, even though at the same time atrocities and capitalist barbarism were taking place in the Far East.

As previously mentioned, the concept of capitalist decline is derived from the dialectical evolution of global capitalism, and its result is a general transformation in the struggle of the working class.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>39</sup> For more information, refer to the *Discussion Bulletin by Groups of the Communist Left*.

In other words, the historical time has come for the proletariat to fulfil its historical task, the world communist revolution. On the one hand, the lack of a correct understanding of the decline of capitalism, which is one of the basic topics of Marxism, and on the other, the traditions and values of the left of capital are institutionalized in this movement, which causes it to apparently distort Engels and other prominent communists. In fact, this is due to the inversion of Marxism, which is the subject of the next chapters.

#### The Marxist Concept of Anti-Imperialist Struggle

One of the concepts that Paydar, at every opportunity like a priest, goes up to the pulpit and by referring to a few verses (quoted from Lenin's book), simply preaches without pausing, without specifying; after all, Peter was the "The Keys of Heaven" or "Satan", is the question of imperialism. In his book, he has sophisticated sections about imperialism and addresses marginal issues. So he covers everything without tacking the core of the discussion, that is, the definition of imperialism, at all. The reason for this is simple: it is because he does not have a correct understanding of imperialism, and he has had varying and confused descriptions of it at different points. At one time, through his group, the Group for the Combat for Emancipation of the Working Class (Nabard), under the banner of antiimperialist struggle, he evaluated a criminal like Khomeini as a revolutionary imam and also considered the actions of the Islamic Revolution Committee and the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps to be anti-imperialist. Recently, he used the same imperialism as an excuse to discredit Marxism. Paydar writes:

"In the early years of the 20th century, the world was filled with the fame of imperialism. The existence of capitalism went to the forgotten part of memories. Although the pain of being a seller of labour, under the pressure of capitalist exploitation, and the deadly pain of the shackles of the lawless and the everincreasing wage slavery were repeated more and more in the text of the manifestos and the literature of the '*Left*', the discussion of the fight against the real roots of these, the fight against the basis of capitalism, was completely closed. Instead of the discussion of the anti-wage labour campaign, 'the predatory discounter imperialism', 'usurer monopoly capital', 'Parasitic financial capital', 'a finalist tyrannical fist' and the like filled these. The Marxian analysis of capitalism retreated to the seven dark wardrobes of the archives and 'imperialism as the highest stage of the evolution of capitalism', or similar articles about imperialism, confirmed the role of the book of revelation of the day. All the talk revolved around the imperialization of capitalism, and any amount of discussion about the same capitalism that had become imperialist, became rare in the exchange market of the left currents!... Analysis and knowledge that Lenin played the role of its flag-bearer."<sup>40</sup>

Paydar knows that in broad daylight, he distorts Marxism and falsifies the facts by resorting to the institutionalized tradition of leftism. We will deal with the misrepresentations and distortions of Paydar in the next chapters. That is why he writes:

"These are not phrases that I have cut from the actual skeleton of statements and analyses from a social and class perspective with the aim of proving a claim and justifying a critique or criticism."<sup>41</sup>

Of course, the same movement in its first publication, a few years before Paydar's statements, had considered the same books to be

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>40</sup>The Communism of Wage Labour Abolition and Militant Leninist Reformism – pages 56-57.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>41</sup> As source 40 - page 59.

raising the flag of revolutionary Marxism over the struggles of the working class. Paydar and his faction belong to those who change their opinion daily. So far, it's still not too much of a problem, but a **serious** movement criticizes earlier views and offers new ones. However, this group and Paydar never critique earlier ideas, but just like worker-communism, they don't keep their old ones and only present new ones. In any case, the movement had already written statements such as:

"The texts of the state and revolution, the renegade Kautsky and imperialism, and more importantly, the worthy role of Bolshevism in the leadership of the Russian labour movement from 1902 onwards kept the banner of revolutionary Marxism flying above the struggles of the working class in this part of the world."<sup>42</sup>

Before examining the Marxist concept of imperialism, it is necessary to highlight one point, and that is that Paydar apparently understood at least one thing correctly. That is, as long as capitalism had not entered its decline, the age of imperialism, the communist revolution (proletarian revolution) could not be included in the agenda of the proletariat, as Paydar writes:

"The simple translation of the words is that it seems that capitalism was not pregnant with the occurrence of labour and socialist revolutions until that day, and it is only after the emergence of the monopoly period that the grounds for transitioning to a higher socioeconomic formation appear in it!!"<sup>43</sup>

 $<sup>^{42}</sup>$  As source 38 – page 11.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>43</sup> As source 40 - page 62.

We shall examine this question broadly in the light of the events of the 1840s and with the help of Marx in the coming pages, and we shall show, contrary to those unfamiliar with Marxism, that it was Marx's view that only when the proletarian revolution is on the agenda that these two factors, **the modern forces of production** and **the bourgeois forms of production**, come into opposition with each other.

Let's go back to the issue of imperialism. Either Paydar is not familiar with the debates that took place in the early 20th century regarding the concept of imperialism, or he is consciously falsifying the Marxist debates of that period. In 1915, Luxembourg wrote The Junius Pamphlet (also known as The Crisis of German Social Democracy) in prison. In this pamphlet, she portrays the basic concept and core of the Marxist attitude in relation to imperialism. Imperialism is a phase of capitalist life in which capitalism has become the dominant global mode of production. In other words, capitalism has passed its heyday and has entered its decline as a global production system, and accordingly, the duty of the proletariat is no longer to expand this mode of production, but to overthrow it. In the age of imperialism, the bourgeoisie has lost its progressive role; as a result, national movements are no longer progressive, and if they win, they will only lead to the formation of a weak imperialist state. Among other opinions expressed in relation to imperialism, we can mention Radek's Theses on Imperialism, which was published in Polish and German at that time. The authors believed that capitalism has entered the era of imperialism in the sense that the task of the proletariat is not to develop or expand

capitalism, but to overthrow it.<sup>44</sup> Marxism is not a religion or a dogma, and controversy has been part of its tradition. It was during these debates that Lenin wrote the book *Imperialism*, the Highest Stage of Capitalism. The events of the last hundred years showed that Lenin had doubts about the concept of imperialism and the national question, and Luxemburg's opinions were more correct. In other words, in the debate between Luxemburg and Lenin regarding imperialism and the national question, it can be said that Luxemburg was right. In relation to the imperialist war and revolutionary defeatism in 1915 against the pacifist Luxembourg, Lenin became the standard-bearer of internationalism. With minimal explanations regarding the history of the imperialism debate among Marxists, before continuing the discussion, let us first express our opinion regarding imperialism, then return to the performance of Paydar in this regard.

The left of capital defines imperialism as the manifestation of a major economic, military and repressive power such as the US, Japan and the UK. The consequence of this definition is to mobilize the working class behind the weakness of imperialism<sup>45</sup>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>44</sup> Recently, the comrades of the Internationalist Communist Tendency have translated these theses into English and published them with an introduction. Additional explanation in this regard is not necessary and reading the theses and the introduction is recommended, because these show what useful efforts have been made.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>45</sup> For more information about the positions of the internationalist voice in relation to the concept of imperialism, the national question, liberation movements, etc., refer to the pamphlet titled *Nationalism Is a Deadly Poison for Class Struggle*.

If imperialism is not a manifestation of a major economic, military and repressive power such as the US, then what is the Marxist definition of imperialism? The fact is that such a definition is based on an understanding of world capitalism's development into decadence. Imperialism became a way of life in the capitalist system during its decadent period. Imperialism is not a specific policy carried out by any particular state. It can only exist on an international scale.

A free capitalist state and nation cannot exist in the era of capitalist decline; all states are forced to integrate into the capitalist world system. The undeniable fact is that capital cannot accumulate in **absolute isolation** and no state can escape from it. This means that the new countries that arise from national movements, regardless of their size or economic power, will soon become imperialist countries. These are forced to integrate themselves into the capitalist mode of production and participate in the world market. World War I was the result of the entire capitalist system worldwide entering a period of decline and there could be no more progressive wars. The killings that take place under the name of "national liberation wars" with the words "socialist" are actually nothing but tension between various imperialists. In the age of imperialist decadence, it is the class struggle alone that is progressive, because it will challenge the bourgeois state in its evolutionary process through social revolution.

According to the above explanations for communists, the antiimperialist struggle means the anti-capitalist struggle in any country, whether it is metropolitan or peripheral capitalism. We mentioned earlier that the leftists played an important role in stabilizing the Islamic bourgeoisie under the title of anti-imperialism. We also noted that Paydar was one of the founders and main figures of the Nabard group, and he played a key role in determining its policies. At that time, the Nabard group and Paydar were making a revolutionary and progressive imam out of a criminal like Khomeini, and they assigned him the role of an anti-imperialist militant. In July 1979, the Nabard group conducted an interview with one of its members and published it in the form of a pamphlet. Due to Paydar's role in the Nabard group, this booklet could not have been published without his knowledge. In the pamphlet, we read:

"In our opinion, 'Imam Khomeini' has a dual role, he is the real representative of the traditional petty bourgeoisie, and his intellectual-ideological duality also comes from this, that is, from his social-class base. For a long time, before the bloody and epic uprising of February [1979], he represented the antiimperialist struggles of the traditional radical petty bourgeoisie, and for this reason, he had a revolutionary performance. In the entire mentioned period, he continues his struggle against the imperialist domination and royal dictatorship of the dependent bourgeoisie, and this is the reason why, in one period, in the second half of 1978 and in the months before the uprising, he can temporarily prevent the reformist and compromised liberal bourgeoisie from falling into the mire which prevents compromise with imperialism, and leads to petty bourgeois radicalism, and thus the Imam's role at this stage has been mainly progressive and revolutionary."46

In the summer of 1979, the Nabard group and as a result Paydar still had no doubts about "Imam Khomeini's revolutionary nature" and

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>46</sup> A Conversation with Amir Hossein Ahmadian – publication of the Nabard group – page 57.

continued to emphasize the anti-imperialist campaigns of their revolutionary imam, despite the fact that the criminal Khomeini started crushing the revolutionary protests of the workers from the very first day. The Nabard group were in delirium:

"Imam Khomeini has been insisting on his positions against imperialism and against its puppet royal dictatorship throughout the entire mentioned period and also during the heroic struggles of the people in the last 1.5 years, and in the months before the uprising, he is even forcing an important part of the opportunistic liberal bourgeoisie to reconsider his anti-social and compromising policies... So far, there is no doubt that Imam Khomeini is a revolutionary."<sup>47</sup>

Contrary to the delusions of the Nabard group that made a reactionary like Khomeini an anti-imperialist imam, but a revolutionary one in the summer of 1979, six months before that, in February 1979, internationalists declared that Khomeini was no more progressive than the queen of England or Emperor Bokassa I. Yes, in that same February internationalists announced that the proletariat must maintain its class independence and should not involve itself in the people's movements.<sup>48</sup>

For the Nabard group, in the same summer of 1979, Imam Khomeini imposed the revolutionary demands of the masses on the provisional government. The Nabard group and, as a result, Paydar

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>47</sup> As source 46.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>48</sup> For more information on this issue, please see the text, February 1979:
"When Internationalists Announced That Khomeini Was No More Progressive Than the Queen of England or Emperor Bokassa I."

threw dust in the eyes of the working class, and they emphasized the anti-imperialist positions of Imam Khomeini and the effective role of that imam in the continuation of the struggles of the masses. They supported a criminal like Khomeini without denying his revolutionary role:

"After the February [1979] Uprising, 'Imam' went beyond this level of conservatism, but at the same time, he did not give up his anti-imperialist stances, and by putting pressure on the provisional government, he tried to make the process of dependence and compromise of this bourgeoisie with imperialism slow down and maybe impose some popular demands on it, in a very conservative way, he also resisted the revolutionary uprisings of the masses... With this description, we still do not deny the anti-imperialist positions of the 'Imam' and his effective role in the continuation of the struggles of the masses, and we support it. We believe that the traditional petty bourgeoisie and the symbol of the power of this traditional petty bourgeoisie, that is, Khomeini, in the current situation, will play a role in the continuation of the anti-imperialist struggle at a slower pace than before (in the long run). Putting pressure on the government and trying to prevent it from becoming completely dependent, imposing some limited reform programmes, which are certainly not in the desire of the imperialists, and continuing the work of the Revolutionary Court up to a stage and executing some mercenaries and corrupt individuals of the former regime, etc. have been the obvious cases of the positive actions of 'Imam'."49

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>49</sup> As source 46 – page 61.

The Nabard group considered the crimes of the antirevolutionary Islamic courts to be the positive performance of their revolutionary imam, and according to that, Paydar went further in defence of the criminals in their downfall and criticized the actions of the security institutions of the Islamic bourgeoisie, i.e., the Islamic Revolution Committee and the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps. They also considered them anti-imperialist and only criticized why they sometimes threw water into the mill of the imperialists. The criminal security institutions started a bloodbath sometime later and began slaughtering individuals, including the activists of the Nabard group. The Nabard group considers the actions of criminals towards the working class to be anti-imperialist ones:

"For many of the Islamic Revolution Committee and the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, in addition to some anti-imperialist actions, their job is to spread division and throw water into the mill of the imperialists."<sup>50</sup>

After reading these lines, shouldn't the faces of Paydar and his friends in the movement for the abolition of wage labour sink in shame? In a letter to Ruge in March 1843, Marx wrote:

"You look at me with a smile and ask: What is gained by that? No revolution is made out of shame. I reply: Shame is already revolution of a kind."<sup>51</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>50</sup> As source 46 – pages 96-97.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>51</sup> Marx to Ruge.

Years after that, Paydar left the Communist Party of Iran, and as he said, he had an opportunity and had read some books on Marxism. In 1997, he wanted to create the Union of Communist Workers, in relation to the characteristics of imperialism. He says:

"The emergence of imperialist conditions of capitalist production was accompanied by the following important characteristics:

- 1. Monopolization of capitalism
- 2. Sovereignty of financial capital
- 3. Issuance of capital
- 4. Economic and territorial redistribution of the world."52

Wasn't it by resorting to these four characteristics that the Nabard group and, accordingly, Paydar considered the criminal Khomeini an "anti-imperialist imam" and "revolutionary," and the crimes of the criminal of the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps to be "anti-imperialist"? Please compare the above quote, which was also published in the magazine of the movement,<sup>53</sup> with the first quote in this section of Paydar's statements. Where have Paydar and his movement criticized their past? Who, under the banner of anti-imperialist struggle, had completely stopped the struggle against capitalism: Marxists or Paydar and his movement? Backing out of one's own words and denying one's past, which is not criticism, is a part of the decadent culture of the left of capital.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>52</sup>The Statement and Programme of the Union of Communist Workers- pages 3-6.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>53</sup> *The Face of Socialism* – No. 1 – pages 49-52.

### **Bourgeois Revolution or Proletarian Revolution?**

By identifying the working class as the only revolutionary class that can abolish capitalism, Marxism has developed the revolutionary theory and the class concept of revolution through the experiences of the struggles of the working class. Our review here includes social revolutions and does not include political ones, riots, or labour uprisings, because in their course new relations of production do not replace old ones. Social revolution is a process, during which production and, accordingly, new social relations take the place of the earlier ones.

The initial seeds of capitalist production relations were formed within the previous class system. During the formation and rise of the bourgeois class, this class, while being a revolutionary one, was also an exploitative one at the same time. In its process, the gradual growth of capitalist production relations within the feudal system created the incompatibility of the superstructure of the society, i.e., the political power with the substructure of the society, which provided the grounds for the formation of bourgeois revolutions.

Since the bourgeois class is a minority of the society, the bourgeois revolution was one of the minority and started from above. According to the bourgeois revolution, the bourgeois class became the new ruling class and the bourgeois state took over the institutions of the society. Even when the vast majority of the masses willingly or unwillingly participated in such revolutions, their participation was in the service of the same bourgeois minority, although it was pretended that all the people participated. As long as the capitalist system had not become the world's dominant system, the bourgeois revolution could take place in some parts of the world, and the material conditions for the communist revolution were not yet ready. At that point in time, capitalist production relations themselves allowed the growth of productive forces. But when capitalism conquered the entire globe and became a dominant global mode of production, in other words, capitalism entered its period of decline, production relations became an obstacle to the growth of productive forces, therefore, the material basis for the bourgeoisie revolution disappeared in the far corners of the earth. The First World War meant that the age of bourgeois revolutions all over the world had ended, and the era of imperialist wars or communist revolutions had begun.

Unlike previous systems, where their embryo of change was initially created within the previous class system, growing within the old system and eventually becoming the ruling system, in the capitalist system the alternative was the proletariat. In other words, the embryo of socialist relations of production cannot emerge within a capitalist system and continue to allow it to grow.

Again, unlike the exploited classes of the past-the class of slaves and the class of serfs (or even farmers)- for the first time in history, the mission of the exploited class was to be the ruling class and to create new relations of production, to be a class that cannot release itself unless it releases the whole of humanity from the yoke of the class society and then destroys itself as a class.

"In all revolutions up till now the mode of activity always remained unscathed and it was only a question of a different distribution of this activity, a new distribution of labour to other persons, whilst the communist revolution is directed against the preceding mode of activity, does away with labour, and abolishes the rule of all classes with the classes themselves, because it is carried through by the class which no longer counts as a class in society, is not recognised as a class, and is in itself the expression of the dissolution of all classes, nationalities, etc. within present society"

Although the material basis of the socialist relations of production within the capitalist system is important, socialist relations cannot arise within capitalism under any circumstances. The productive forces of capitalism and their growth also create significant conflict. On the one hand, productive forces are collective but, on the other hand, the relations of production are private or capitalist. In other words, under capitalism, the growth of the productive forces and the antagonism between labour and capital provide the background material conditions for a communist revolution. Thus, the objective conditions are provided for a communist revolution.

The communist or proletarian revolution is the revolution of the working class who make up the majority of society. In other words, unlike the bourgeois one, which is a minority revolution and from above, the communist revolution is a majority one, and it starts from below. The working class is not going to become a new exploiting class.

Throughout human history, only one social class has arisen that, according to its material conditions, has been capable of offering an

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>54</sup> The German Ideology- Karl Marx

alternative to the system that exploits it. This is the proletariat class and its alternative system of communism.

The communist revolution is the first revolution in the history of humanity that exploited the notion of class with its understanding of class-consciousness and, with relative knowledge of the future relations of production, this was a revolution that would eliminate the contradiction between the productive forces and the relations of production.

#### **The Principles of Marxists**

For Marxists, Marxism is not only a series of combative theories, but also a commitment to proletarian and communist values. Morals, principles and values in class society have been influenced by class societies, and decent human ethics are only possible in a society where the material basis of class contradictions, i.e., social classes, have disappeared, in other words, they are only feasible in a socialist society. Nevertheless, Marxism has shown that the history of human values was not only the history of the morals and values of the ruling class. Exploited classes have had their own moral values and principles throughout time. Incidentally, these moral values have played a progressive and revolutionary role.

Capitalism has created a class in the history of mankind whose class solidarity is not based on false identities such as national or religious ones, etc., but on class identity. Never in history has an exploited class been the origin of the highest human culture and morality to the extent of the working class. Proletarian culture and ethics are a reflection of the class struggle, which is why we witness the highest form of class solidarity during the intensification of class struggle and during class battles, while during its decline, we also witness the diminishing of class solidarity.

Previously, proletarian values were passed from one generation to the next; unfortunately, following the victory of the counterrevolution following the defeat of the world revolution wave of 1917-1923, there was a gap in the continuity of proletarian values. The victorious counter-revolution presented an inverted narrative of communism. Discrediting communism also led to slandering

61

proletarian values, and this issue led to the distrust of proletarian values by the following generations.

Although during the anti-revolutionary period, the communist left, in absolute isolation, defended the proletarian values, as a result of leaving the isolation of the communist left, the defence of the values and principles of the proletariat became more important. With the collapse of the Eastern Bloc, the ideologues of the democratic bourgeoisie, in line with their class interests, did their best to ascribe the crimes of Stalinism to the name of communism.

The mudslinging of Marxists and their defence of their proletarian values go back to very distant times. We will return to the alienation of the proletarian values by the activists of the movement to abolish wage labour and their leader, Paydar, repeatedly in this book. We will follow the discussion of how professors, journalists and bourgeois ideologues tried to discredit Marx by resorting to the dirtiest methods and how two Marxists, Engels and Eleanor Marx (Marx's daughter), not only defended the honour and righteousness of Marx but also rubbed their noses in the dirt. This tradition must continue. Engels wrote a detailed report in the preface to the fourth edition of *Capital* on 25 June 1890:

"Meanwhile a complete revision of the numerous quotations had been made necessary by the publication of the English edition. For this edition Marx's youngest daughter, Eleanor, undertook to compare all the quotations with their originals, so that those taken from English sources, which constitute the vast majority, are given there not as re-translations from the German but in the original English form...Here, however, I am obliged to revert to an old story. I know of only one case in which the accuracy of a quotation given by Marx has been called in question. But as the issue dragged beyond his lifetime I cannot well ignore it here. On March 7, 1872, there appeared in the Berlin Concordia, organ of the German Manufacturers' Association, an anonymous article entitled: 'How Karl Marx Quotes.' It was here asserted, with an effervescence of moral indignation and unparliamentary language, that the quotation from Gladstone's Budget Speech of April 16, 1863 (in the Inaugural Address of the International Workingmen's Association, 1864, and repeated in 'Capital,' Vol. I, p. 617, 4th edition; p. 671, 3rd edition) [present edition, p. 610], had been falsified; that not a single word of the sentence:

23 Preface to the Fourth German Edition (Engels 1890) 'this intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power ... is ... entirely confined to classes of property' was to be found in the (semiofficial) stenographic report in Hansard. 'But this sentence is nowhere to be found in Gladstone's speech. Exactly the opposite is stated there.' (In bold type): 'This sentence, both in form and substance, is a lie inserted by Marx.' Marx, to whom the number of Concordia was sent the following May, answered the anonymous author in the Volksstaat of June 1st...The anonymous writer gets angrier and angrier. In his answer in Concordia, July 4th, he sweeps aside second-hand sources and demurely suggests that it is the 'custom' to quote parliamentary speeches from the stenographic report; adding, however, that The Times report (which includes the 'falsified' sentence) and the Hansard report (which omits it) are 'substantially in complete agreement,' while The Times report likewise contains 'the exact opposite to that notorious passage in the Inaugural Address.' This fellow carefully conceals the fact that The Times report explicitly includes that self-same 'notorious passage,' alongside of its alleged 'opposite.'

Despite all this, however, the anonymous one feels that he is stuck fast and that only some new dodge can save him. Thus, whilst his article bristles, as we have just shown, with 'impudent mendacity' and is interlarded with such edifying terms of abuse as 'bad faith,' 'dishonesty,' 'lying allegation,' 'that spurious quotation,' 'impudent mendacity,' 'a quotation entirely falsified,' 'this falsification,' 'simply infamous,' etc., he finds it necessary to divert the issue to another domain and therefore promises 'to explain in a second article the meaning which we (the non-mendacious anonymous one) attribute to the content of Gladstone's words.' As if his particular opinion, of no decisive value as it is, had anything whatever to do with the matter. This second article was printed in Concordia on July 11th. Marx replied again in the Volksstaat of August 7th now giving also the reports of the passage in question from the Morning Star and the Morning Advertiser of April 17, 1863....

The latter also seems to have had enough, at any rate Marx received no further issues of Concordia. With this the matter appeared to be dead and buried. True, once or twice later on there reached us, from persons in touch with the University of Cambridge, mysterious rumours of an unspeakable literary crime which Marx was supposed to have committed in 'Capital,' but despite all investigation nothing more definite could be learned. Then, on November 29, 1883, eight months after Marx's death, there appeared in The Times a letter headed Trinity College, Cambridge, and signed Sedley Taylor, in which

this little man, who dabbles in the mildest sort of co-operative affairs, seizing upon some chance pretext or other, at last enlightened us, not only concerning those vague Cambridge rumours, but also the anonymous one in Concordia.

'What appears extremely singular,' says the little man from Trinity College, 'is that it was reserved for Professor Brentano (then of the University of Breslau, now of that of Strassburg) to expose... the bad faith which had manifestly dictated the citation made from Mr. Gladstone's speech in the [Inaugural] Address. Herr Karl Marx, who ... attempted to defend the citation, had the hardihood, in the deadly shifts to which Brentano's masterly conduct of the attack speedily reduced him, to assert that Mr. Gladstone had 'manipulated' the report of his speech in The Times of April 17, 1863, before it appeared in Hansard, in order to 'obliterate' a passage which 'was certainly compromising' for an English Chancellor of the Exchequer. On Brentano's showing, by a detailed comparison of texts, that the reports of The Times and of Hansard agreed in utterly excluding the meaning which craftily isolated quotation had put upon Mr. Gladstone's words, Marx withdrew from further controversy under the plea of 'want of time.''

So that was at the bottom of the whole business! And thus was the anonymous campaign of Herr Brentano in Concordia gloriously reflected in the productively co-operating imagination of Cambridge. Thus he stood, sword in hand, and thus he battled, in his 'masterly conduct of the attack,' this St. George of the German Manufacturers' Association, whilst the infernal dragon Marx, 'in deadly shifts', 'speedily' breathed his last at his feet. All this Ariostian battle scene, however, only serves to conceal the dodges of our St. George. Here there is no longer talk of 'lying insertion' or 'falsification,' but of 'craftily isolated quotation.' The whole issue was shifted, and St. George and his Cambridge squire very well knew why.

Eleanor Marx replied in the monthly journal To-day (February 1884), as The Times refused to publish her letter. She once more focussed the debate on the sole question at issue: had Marx 'lyingly inserted' that sentence or not?

...The most comic point here is that our little Cambridge man now insists upon quoting the speech not from Hansard, as, according to the anonymous Brentano, it is 'customary' to do, but from The Times report, which the same Brentano had characterised as 'necessarily bungling.' Naturally so, for in Hansard the vexatious sentence is missing. Eleanor Marx had no difficulty (in the same issue of To-day) in dissolving all this argumentation into thin air. Either Mr. Taylor had read the controversy of 1872, in which case he was now making not only 'lying insertions' but also 'lying' suppressions; or he had not read it and ought 25 Preface to the Fourth German Edition (Engels 1890) to remain silent.

In either case it was certain that he did not dare to maintain for a moment the accusation of his friend Brentano that Marx had made a 'lying' addition. On the contrary, Marx, it now seems, had not lyingly added but suppressed an important sentence. But this same sentence is quoted on page 5 of the Inaugural Address, a few lines before the alleged 'lying insertion.'

And as to the 'contrariety' in Gladstone's speech, is it not Marx himself, who in 'Capital,' p. 618 (3rd edition, p. 672), note 105 [present edition, p. 611, Note 1], refers to 'the continual crying

contradictions in Gladstone's Budget speeches of 1863 and 1864'? Only he does not presume à la Mr. Sedley Taylor to resolve them into complacent Liberal sentiments. Eleanor Marx, in concluding her reply, finally sums up as follows:

'Marx has not suppressed anything worth quoting, neither has he 'lyingly' added anything. But he has restored, rescued from oblivion, a particular sentence of one of Mr. Gladstone's speeches, a sentence which had indubitably been pronounced, but which somehow or other had found its way – out of Hansard.'

With that Mr. Sedley Taylor too had had enough, and the result of this whole professorial cobweb, spun out over two decades and two great countries, is that nobody has since dared to cast any other aspersion upon Marx's literary honesty; whilst Mr. Sedley Taylor, no doubt, will hereafter put as little confidence in the literary war bulletins of Herr Brentano as Herr Brentano will in the papal infallibility of Hansard."

## **Distortion of Engels or Distortion of Marxism?**

It has been emphasized before that criticism is one of the important and fundamental pillars of Marxism and criticism includes all Marxists, including Marx himself, but a Chinese wall separates criticism from smearing, distortion and falsification. A serious critique helps clarify the political milieu.

Throughout its history, Marxism has been distorted, falsified and perverted by various currents and institutions. The narrative of academic Marxism is actually the presentation of a sterile Marxism of the "liberation theory of the proletariat." These are discussions that involve class struggle outside of its context and mostly remain within the same scope of the university. But the cleverest misrepresentation of Marxism is that which is done in the name of Marx. What crimes have not been committed in the name of Marx and communism? Stalin killed the noblest, most respected communists, the creators of the October Revolution, in the name of communism.

We have already emphasized that culture, self-censorship, opportunism, inversion, obedience to right positions and compromise, as well as values, bourgeois ethics, destroying comradely values, etc., in other words, the values of the left of capital have been institutionalized in Paydar. They are embedded and normalized in such a tradition in which unprincipledness, inversion, misrepresentation, carelessness, humiliation, etc., became a part of the practice of Paydar and his movement.

It is with such an institutionalized tradition that Paydar, some years ago before slandering Engels, in his praise and extol of Marx and Engels, flatteringly stated that, with their deaths, the labour movement not only lost two worthy leaders, but would also lack such leadership:

"Marx didn't have the life of Noah. Engels didn't live more than a few years after Marx. With their deaths, the international labour movement didn't just lose two worthy horizon-building leaders, it's worse than that, and much worse, it lacked such leaders."<sup>55</sup>

Paydar takes a few pieces from a long text of Engels entitled "Introduction to Marx's Class Struggles in France" and goes up to the pulpit like a priest and preaches in the name of Jesus Christ to the "sheep of God." If they want to achieve salvation, they must stay away from the devil. By appealing to the established and institutionalized bourgeois tradition in him, Paydar falsifies Engels at the height of unprincipledness.

Paydar's fabrications also show his lack of familiarity with the essential basis of Marxism. He has a confused understanding of Marxism and at the same time offers a rereading of *Capital* that is more like the "Marxism" teaching of the teachers at the October party school in the Komala camp, who preached everything but Marxism. First, let's take a look at the lies of Paydar:

"Engels' criticism of the past of the labour movement, his new strategy for this movement, and his prescriptions for mastering the strategy of the class struggle of the workers in Europe and the world should be well pondered, [then] the task of many things is clear. The anti-capitalist campaigns of the working

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>55</sup> As source 53 – page 9.

class in the 1940s to 1970s, including the June Revolution, the First International and the Paris Commune have been dodging in the wilderness!! All those role plays, anti-capitalism and uprisings, which even by Engels' own admission, terrified the bourgeoisie, were backward actions, localist and blind militarism!! All of these should go to the archives of history, instead all of them should be called 'universal suffrage', parliamentarism, partisanship above the working masses, an international consisting of parties hanging on to 'scientific socialism'!! Or the miraculous power of the leaders of these parties, to the dominant labour unions in the shroud and burial of communism, the abolition of wage labour and the like. This is the extract of Engels' speech as a symbol of the radicalism of the Second International at the same stage of its foundation. He especially insists on instilling in the minds of the workers that if Marx was there, he would have said the same thing!! In this way, he observed the deficits and deficiencies of the labour movement from the 1940s to the 1970s!! His previous analyses, examinations and statements about the labour movement of those years, about the June Revolution, the Paris Commune, other events would throw them away!! He would once again call the Paris Commune a desperate rebellion again!! Finally, he would shout, I found it, I found it, and invite the world's workers to parliamentarism!! In this realm, Engels does not limit himself to saying the above points, on the contrary, he runs to the farthest horizons and leaves no stone unturned. 'The German workers had, moreover, rendered to their cause a second great service, besides the first of their mere existence as the strongest, the best disciplined and the most rapidly growing Socialist party; they had furnished their comrades in all countries with a new and one of the sharpest weapons, by showing them how to utilize the general franchise.<sup>356</sup>

In fact, Paydar's goal of falsifying Engels is to misrepresent Marxism by presenting a false image of the "liberation theory of the proletariat," apparently under the name of Marx and with radical words. Marx crushed Proudhon's petty bourgeois radicalism with his scathing critique and through the book *The Philosophy of Poverty*. But Paydar is not Proudhon, nor is the leftism that has appeared in the role of a metamorphosed councilism petty bourgeois. But one should be faithful to the tradition of Marx and expose the nature of movements, such as the one for the abolition of wage labour, to the public. Before continuing this discussion, let's see how Paydar reaches his favourite conclusion.

"The basic question is that with this direction, perspective and strategy, this movement would find the need for Capital or other texts of criticism of Marx's political economy, giving false hope to the suffrage of the twisted version of the bourgeoisie or, at best, the product of the careful and conscious retreat of the bourgeoisie in front of the working class, what fusion and homogeneity does it have with the communism of the abolition of wage labour, what kind of combination does it have with Marx's critique of political economy?"<sup>57</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>56</sup> As source 2

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>57</sup> As source 2.

Paydar is not the first to misrepresent Engels and he will not be the last. Shortly after the publication of Engels' 6 March 1895 introduction to *The Class Struggles in France*, Karl Liebknecht unfortunately published parts of the same introduction in the journal *Votwärts* in a distorted form, portraying Engels as a pacifist admirer of law. In a letter to Kautsky, while refusing to present a false image of him, Engels points out Liebknecht's unsavoury performance. Engels wrote to Kautsky as follows:

"Dear Baron,

Postcard received. To my astonishment I see in Votwärts! today an extract from my "Introduction," printed without my prior knowledge and trimmed in such a fashion that I appear as a peaceful worshipper of legality at any price. So much the better that the whole thing is to appear now in the Neue Zeit so that this disgraceful impression will be wiped out. I shall give Liebknecht a good piece of my mind on that score and also, no matter who they are, to those who gave him the opportunity to misrepresent my opinion without even telling me a word about it ... Engels London,

April 1, 1895"58

Marx himself witnessed the uprisings of 1848, and especially the heroism of the Paris proletariat during the June uprising, which he has carefully examined in his book *The Class Struggles in France*. Marx meticulously followed the social events of that period and after Louis Bonaparte's coup, he analysed the social events from the class perspective in his work entitled *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis* 

<sup>58</sup> Engels To Kautsky

*Bonaparte*. In the same publication, he explicitly mentions the need to break the state instead of controlling it and writes:

"All revolutions perfected this machine instead of breaking it."  $^{59}$ 

Nevertheless, in 1852, not Engels but Marx was mistakenly convinced that the workers in some countries, for example Britain, could come to power not through communist revolution but through universal suffrage. Marx wrote about the Chartists in 1852:

"But universal suffrage is the equivalent of political power for the working class of England, where the proletariat forms the large majority of the population, where, in a long though underground civil war, it has gained a clear consciousness of its position as a class and where even the rural districts know no longer any peasants, but only landlords, industrial capitalists (farmers) and hired labourers. The carrying of universal suffrage in England would, therefore be a far more socialistic measure than anything which has been honoured with that name on the continent. Its inevitable result, here is the *political supremacy of the working class.*"<sup>60</sup> (Emphasis in original)

Paydar extends his presence everywhere, goes to his pulpit and, like a priest, reads a few verses (quotations) out of context from John, Matthew, etc., and then preaches his purpose. It is expected that believers will be delighted by his words. Paydar is unable to digest

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>59</sup> The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte, Marx

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>60</sup> Marx, Engels and the vote

Marx's ambiguous opinion regarding the working class in England achieving power not through the communist revolution but through popular vote because, like believers, only that part of his brain used for memory is active and not the part needed for analysis.

This is characteristic of all leftist movements that are associated with an amalgam of anarchism and "radicalism" and introduce themselves as "anti-Leninist," whose only aim is to create intellectual confusion in the political milieu and especially to encourage suspicion and pessimism towards Marxist currents. These sprinkle dirt in the eyes of the working class with the flavour of "anarchist," "antiparliamentarism," "anti-fascism" and "anti-capitalism," leading to a performance in line with the interests of capitalism with the "Leninist" evaluation of Stalinists, Maoists and Trotskyists.

If we leave aside his unprincipled actions, Paydar's misrepresentations show the height of his intellectual confusion and his lack of familiarity with Marxist fundamentals. As mentioned earlier, Paydar has not only distorted Engels, but has also falsified the history of Marxism by appealing to his established and institutionalized bourgeois tradition. In defence of Marxism and with the Marxist tradition, we will examine many of his fabrications in the following pages.

## The 1840s Was the Decade of the Emergence of the Working Class

Marxism and communism are not religions that came down from the sky as a dogmatic idea, but they evolved with the growth of capitalism and the evolution of the working class as a social class. Marx's ambiguity regarding workers gaining power in Britain not through the communist revolution but through universal suffrage can only be understood in this way. We will return to universal suffrage according to Marx's view. Although England and France had gone through the bourgeois revolution by the 1840s, apart from England, throughout Europe, other European countries were still going through different stages of their historical development.

It was only in Britain that capitalism was fully developed, and the working class constituted the majority of the population. In other European countries, the development of capitalism and, as a result, the social and political conditions were extremely backward. Most European countries at that time were divided into small kingdoms and did not have a centralized national government, and independence and national unity were still the main issues in nations such as Italy, Switzerland, Poland, etc. In Europe, other than Britain, until the 1840s it was only in Paris that the working class was a significant force, and large-scale industrial production elsewhere was still in its infancy. The same development of industrial production that was expanding in Europe was surpassing the political superstructure of the society. This problem pitted the interests of the bourgeoisie, proletariat and peasants against the feudal remnants in society as well as state structures. Therefore, carrying out or completing the bourgeois revolution to destroy the remnants of feudalism, create national governments and establish political regimes with bourgeois democracy was on the agenda. As industrial capitalism existed outside of Britain in only a few European industrial centres and an industrial working class was emerging, *The Communist Manifesto* recommended that:

"They fight with the bourgeoisie whenever it acts in a revolutionary way, against the absolute monarchy, the feudal squirearchy, and the petty bourgeoisie."<sup>61</sup>

Although the bourgeois revolution was the order of the day at that time, the revolutionary developments of 1848 were not a response to the remnants of feudalism, but to the crisis of capitalism. Although capitalism was very young, the historical depression of 1847 greatly reduced the standard of living for the masses. Accordingly, the proletarians, semi-proletarians and other lower strata of the cities of Paris, Berlin, Vienna, etc., played an important role in the protests of 1848. Marx explains this issue as follows:

"The potato blight and the crop failures of 1845 and 1846 increased the general ferment among the people. The famine of 1847 called forth bloody conflicts in France as well as on the rest of the Continent. As against the shameless orgies of the finance aristocracy, the struggle of the people for the prime necessities of life! At Buzançais, hunger rioters executed6; in Paris, oversatiated escrocs [swindlers] snatched from the courts by the royal family!

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>61</sup> Manifesto of the Communist Party, Position of the Communists in Relation to the Various Existing Opposition Parties.

The second great economic event that hastened the outbreak of the revolution was a general commercial and industrial crisis in England. Already heralded in the autumn of 1845 by the wholesale reverses of the speculators in railway shares, staved off during 1846 by a number of incidents such as the impending abolition of the Corn Laws, the crisis finally burst in the autumn of 1847 with the bankruptcy of the London wholesale grocers, on the heels of which followed the insolvencies of the land banks and the closing of the factories in the English industrial districts."<sup>62</sup>

For a dialectical understanding of the social events of the late 1840s, we turn to Marx, who codified the social events of the period, to see what he teaches us. Marx divides the social events between 1848 and late 1851 into three periods in his analysis:

"Let us recapitulate in general outline the phases that the French Revolution went through from February 24, 1848, to December, 1851.Three main periods are unmistakable:

- the February period;
- the period of the constitution of the republic or the Constituent National Assembly - May 1848 to May 28 1849;
- and the period of the constitutional republic or the Legislative National Assembly – May 28 1849 to December 2 1851."<sup>63</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>62</sup> The Class Struggles in France, Marx – page 17

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>63</sup> The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte, Marx – page 7

Although Marx carefully examined all three periods, we will reassess these in the light of the experiences of the labour movement. Unlike the leftism that appeared in the form of metamorphosed councilism, whose different versions can be found in every language and country, and which is an amalgam of leftism, anarchism, antifascism and modernism with the seasoning of councilism and radical language, the conquest of capitalism by the proletariat cannot be on their agenda at any time. Such attitudes, apart from their different forms with radical language, only fuel a kind of confusion in the political milieu and hinder it so that the militants or movements that seek to get rid of the nightmare of the left of capital can achieve a revolutionary alternative, and in the end, they face political disillusionment. We will show later that such movements do not believe in proletarian (communist) revolution at all.

### The February Uprising

On 22 February 1848, in Paris, mass demonstrations took place in response to the ban on political meetings, which led to the formation of a provisional government on 24 February. Although the working class of Paris was the main force of this uprising, the bourgeoisie was also involved. Marx explains the reasons for this as follows:

"In Paris the industrial crisis had, moreover, the particular result of throwing a multitude of manufacturers and big traders, who under the existing circumstances could no longer do any business in the foreign market, onto the home market. They set up large establishments, the competition of which ruined the small épiciers [grocers] and boutiquiers [shopkeepers] en masse. Hence the innumerable bankruptcies among this section of the Paris bourgeoisie, and hence their revolutionary action in February."<sup>64</sup>

At the time of February 1848, the French working class was not in a condition to organize its independent proletarian uprising and move towards a proletarian revolution. It was still going through its period of growth and development, and Marx correctly considers the development of the industrial proletariat the material basis of the proletarian revolution:

"The French working class had not attained this level; it was still incapable of accomplishing its own revolution. The development of the industrial proletariat is, in general, conditioned by the development of the industrial bourgeoisie."<sup>65</sup>

In 1848 the proletariat had real influence and power only in Paris. In other regions of France, capitalism had not yet developed and peasants still constituted the majority of the population. At that time, Marx believed that the struggle of workers in France against capitalism was a secondary phenomenon and wrote:

"While, therefore, the French proletariat, at the moment of a revolution, possesses in Paris actual power and influence which spur it on to a drive beyond its means, in the rest of France it is crowded into separate, scattered industrial centers, almost lost in the superior number of peasants and petty bourgeois. The

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>64</sup> As source 62 - page 17

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>65</sup> As source 62 – page 19

struggle against capital in its developed, modern form – in its decisive aspect, the struggle of the industrial wage worker against the industrial bourgeois - is in France a partial phenomenon, which after the February days could so much the less supply the national content of the revolution, since the struggle against capital's secondary modes of exploitation, that of the peasant against usury and mortgages or of the petty bourgeois against the wholesale dealer. banker. and manufacturer – in a word, against bankruptcy – was still hidden in the general uprising against the finance aristocracy."66

Not only did Marx consider the notion of workers being freed alongside the bourgeoisie to be an illusion, but he also portrayed the basic core of the communist revolution, that is, the idea of the possibility of achieving a proletarian revolution within the national boundaries of a country, while in other bourgeois countries, the order of capitalism prevailed and had not been challenged by the proletariat:

"Just as the workers thought they would be able to emancipate themselves side by side with the bourgeoisie, so they thought they would be able to consummate a proletarian revolution within the national walls of France, side by side with the remaining bourgeois nations."<sup>67</sup>

Since the proletarian revolution could not be included in the agenda of the proletariat in February 1848, the demands of the workers were raised within the same framework of capitalism. Work for the

<sup>66</sup> As source 62 - pages 19-20

 $<sup>^{67}</sup>$  As source 62 – page 19

unemployed and postponing the Constituent Assembly elections were among the most important. But the subject of work is the foundation of bourgeois society:

"In common with the bourgeoisie the workers had made the February Revolution, and alongside the bourgeoisie they sought to secure the advancement of their interests, just as they had installed a worker in the Provisional Government itself alongside the bourgeois majority. Organize labour! But wage labour, that is the existing, the bourgeois organization of labour. Without it there is no capital, no bourgeoisie, no bourgeois society. A special Ministry of Labour!"<sup>68</sup>

Under the pressure of the protests, the interim government delayed the Constituent Assembly elections until 23 April and also allowed the creation of national workshops. These led to thousands of workers being sent to Paris in the hope of finding work. The workers thought that by moving to Paris and finding a job, their living conditions would improve, but it soon became clear to the proletariat that the bourgeoisie was unable to facilitate the living conditions of the working class. This led to the unfolding of the conflict between the proletariat and the democratic bourgeoisie, which provided the material background for the June uprising, the study of which is the examination of the second epoch described by Marx.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>68</sup> As source 62 – page 19

#### The June Uprising

The "right to work" through national workshops at least gave the workers peace of mind in the face of unbridled unemployment. However, although Marx believed that the "right to work" was a bourgeois right, in other words, it was possible to realize it within the framework of the capitalist system, he nevertheless thought that behind the "right to work" was the movement to abolish private property and eliminate wage labour. Marx writes:

"The first draft of the constitution, made before the June days, still contained the droit au travail, the right to work, the first clumsy formula wherein the revolutionary demands of the proletariat are summarized. It was transformed into the *droit* à *l'assistance*, the right to public relief, and what modern state does not feed its paupers in some form or other? The right to work is, in the bourgeois sense, an absurdity, a miserable, pious wish. But behind the right to work stands the power over capital; behind the power over capital, the appropriation of the means of production, their subjection to the associated working class, and therefore the abolition of wage labour, of capital, and of their mutual relations. Behind the 'right to work' stood the June insurrection. The Constituent Assembly, which in fact put the revolutionary proletariat hors la loi, outside the law, had on principle to throw the proletariat's formula out of the constitution, the law of laws; had to pronounce its anathema upon the 'right to work.'"69

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>69</sup> As source 62 – page 35

February and March 1848 were the months of revolutionary excitement, in which everyone was united. In May and June 1848, the interests of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat became separated. The reality was that the idea that workers could flock to Paris and consequently have a better standard of living was nothing more than a mirage. The bourgeoisie forced the Parisian proletariat to choose between dying of hunger and attacking in defence of the right to life. The proletariat of Paris chose to strike in defence of the right to life, and in response to the closure of the national workshops, the workers rose on 22 June. This uprising was the first large-scale battle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. Marx describes the beginning as follows:

"Finally, on June 21, a decree appeared in the *Moniteur* which ordered the forcible expulsion of all unmarried workers from the national ateliers or their enrollment in the army. The workers were left no choice; they had to starve or let fly. They answered on June 22 with the tremendous insurrection in which the first great battle was fought between the two classes that split modern society. It was a fight for the preservation or annihilation of the bourgeois order. The veil that shrouded the republic was torn asunder"<sup>70</sup>

As mentioned earlier, the bourgeoisie forced the proletariat to rise to defend its right to life, that is, to close the national workshops. In other words, the bourgeoisie was basically the motivation for the June 1848 uprising, and the communist demands were more implicit than explicit and purposeful. In June 1848, the material conditions to

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>70</sup> As source 62 – page 26

crush capitalism were not yet ready, and the proletariat did not have the ability to overthrow the bourgeoisie at that time. The bourgeoisie forced the proletariat of Paris to rise and the proletariat defended its right to life. Marx states this issue clearly:

"The Paris proletariat *was forced* into the June insurrection by the bourgeoisie. This sufficed to mark its doom. Its immediate, avowed needs did not drive it to engage in a fight for the forcible overthrow of the bourgeoisie, nor was it equal to this task. The *Moniteur* had to inform it officially that the time was past when the republic saw any occasion to bow and scrape to its illusions, and only its defeat convinced it of the truth that the slightest improvement in its position remains a *utopia* within the bourgeois republic, a utopia that becomes a crime as soon as it wants to become a reality."<sup>71</sup>

Although the proletariat had gone through rebellions and uprisings in its historical class battles before June 1848, the uprising of the proletariat in Paris was the first major proletarian uprising in the history of the proletariat on a large scale and as a social class. Therefore, the proletariat launched the uprising of June 1848 without historical experience, a common plan or leaders. Marx describes its characteristics as follows.

"It is well known how the workers, with unexampled bravery and ingenuity, without leaders, without a common plan, without means and, for the most part, lacking weapons, held in check for five days the army, the Mobile Guard, the Paris National Guard,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>71</sup> As source 62 – page 27

and the National Guard that streamed in from the provinces. It is well known how the bourgeoisie compensated itself for the mortal anguish it suffered by unheard–of brutality, massacring over 3000 prisoners."<sup>72</sup>

After four days of epic street battles, during which approximately 3,000 people were killed and thousands were injured, the June 1848 Paris uprising was defeated and the bourgeoisie was able to regain control. As a result, 15,000 people were sent into exile without trial.

The year 1848 was not only the date of the rebellion in France, but of uprisings throughout Europe, and the scope of these extended to Latin America, Brazil and Colombia. In total, the uprisings of 1848 involved more than 50 countries, some of which are mentioned very briefly. These include the March 1848 uprising in Germany, which was motivated by political freedom, democracy and nationalism. An uprising broke out in Vienna on 13 March 1848, leading to the resignation of Chancellor Klemens von Metternich. On 15 March 1848, an uprising with bourgeois-democratic goals took place in Budapest, which accepted the emperor, the constitution and the creation of a Hungarian national government. The Italian uprisings of 1848 began to end the Austrian rule over Italy, thus starting the First Italian War of Independence. Influenced by the other uprisings of 1848, in July 1848 there was also a rebellion by nationalist youth in Ireland, sometimes called the Famine Rebellion, which was suppressed. Although in Paris, Vienna or Berlin, the bourgeoisie took their seats in the provisional governments following the insurrections, it was the workers, industrialists, peasants, unemployed and soldiers who played

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>72</sup> As source 62 – page 26

the main role in the uprisings. As we observed in the analysis of the uprisings of 1848, unlike the idealists, anarchists, adventurers and leftists who appeared in the form of transformed councilism, the overthrow and conquest of capitalism through the proletarian revolution in 1848 could not be included in the agenda of the proletariat. Marx dialectically summarized the goals of this period as follows:

"The second period, from May 4, 1848, to the end of May, 1849, is the period of the constitution, the foundation, of the bourgeois republic."<sup>73</sup>

### **Return to the Reactionary Forces**

Although most of the uprisings of 1848 were suppressed and, in most cases, monarchies were restored, the uprisings of 1848, and especially the June uprising of 1848, cast the spectre of the proletariat and the fear of the bourgeoisie throughout Europe. Instead of enlisting the help of the proletariat to continue its struggle against feudal power and the remnants of feudalism, the European bourgeoisie tried to contain the threat from the proletariat. It was in order to do this that the bourgeoisie compromised with the most reactionary forces.

"June insurrection raised the self-assurance of the bourgeoisie all over the Continent, and caused it to league itself openly with the feudal monarchy against the people."<sup>74</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>73</sup> As source 63 - page 8

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>74</sup> As source 62 – page 27

Contrary to anarchist and adventurous ideas, the uprisings of 1848 not only could not lead to proletarian revolutions, but they were not even able to complete their bourgeois ones, and unfortunately, following their failure, they caused the rise of reactionary forces. Due to the material background of the Bonaparte coup in France, in other words, the decision between proletarian uprisings or tyranny, the bourgeoisie had no other choice than Bonaparte (tyranny) in order to contain the threat of the proletariat. Marx also criticizes the German bourgeoisie for their actions taken to "betray the people and to compromise with the crowned representatives of the old society" in an article entitled "The Bourgeoisie and the Counter-Revolution."<sup>75</sup> In other words, the bourgeoisie in Europe tried to resort to reactionary forces to curb the threat of the proletariat.

"Obviously the bourgeoisie now had no choice but to elect Bonaparte."<sup>76</sup>

The question that arises is, given that the bourgeoisie chose Bonaparte, which social class did Bonaparte represent? The answer to this question is well depicted by Marx and shows how the bourgeoisie appeals to the representative of the old order, of the past, to contain the threat of the proletariat:

"And yet the state power is not suspended in the air. Bonaparte represented a class, and the most numerous class of French society at that, the small-holding peasants.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>75</sup> The Bourgeoisie and the Counter-Revolution, Marx.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>76</sup> As source 63 - page 65

Just as the Bourbons were the dynasty of the big landed property and the Orleans the dynasty of money, so the Bonapartes are the dynasty of the peasants, that is, the French masses. The chosen of the peasantry is not the Bonaparte who submitted to the bourgeois parliament but the Bonaparte who dismissed the bourgeois parliament...But let us not misunderstand. The Bonaparte dynasty represents not the revolutionary, but the conservative peasant; not the peasant who strikes out beyond the condition of his social existence, the small holding, but rather one who wants to consolidate his holding; not the country folk who in alliance with the towns want to overthrow the old order through their own energies, but on the contrary those who, in solid seclusion within this old order, want to see themselves and their small holdings saved and favored by the ghost of the Empire. It represents not the enlightenment but the superstition of the peasant; not his judgment but his prejudice; not his future but his past; not his modern Cevennes but his modern Vendée."77

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>77</sup> As source 63 - pages 62-63

# The Experience of 1848 and the Horizon of the Proletarian Revolution

Marx believed that no class system falls apart during its flourishing period, but after all class systems pass a period of wear and tear, the material conditions for their transition to a higher production system are prepared. According to this attitude, in the 1840s, the bourgeois revolution was still on the agenda of many European countries, especially Germany. *The Communist Manifesto* states:

"The Communists turn their attention chiefly to Germany, because that country is on the eve of a bourgeois revolution that is bound to be carried out under more advanced conditions of European civilisation and with a much more developed proletariat than that of England was in the seventeenth, and France in the eighteenth century, and because the bourgeois revolution in Germany will be but the prelude to an immediately following proletarian revolution."<sup>78</sup>

Marx and the Communist League expected that the German bourgeoisie would gain power in 1848 and establish a bourgeois republic. They also hoped that this republic would lead to a proletarian revolution relatively quickly. However, the surrender of the German liberal bourgeoisie to the Prussian government made Marx reconsider this scenario. The address of the Central Committee to the Communist League (March 1850) was actually Marx and Engels' analysis of the

<sup>78</sup> As source 61

new conditions. The idea of permanent revolution was that the proletariat would perform both the bourgeois duties and its own tasks through a permanent or uninterrupted revolution. This permanent revolution was actually considered a dual power situation between the workers and petty bourgeoisie and a step towards proletarian dictatorship. The speech ends like this:

"Their battle-cry must always be: 'The Permanent Revolution.""

In fact, the concept of permanent revolution was itself an unsolvable problem. Based on the idea of permanent revolution according to Marx at that time, proletarian revolution was possible in some countries, while bourgeois revolution was still ahead in others. But as mentioned before, Marx reached the following conclusion during the summation of class struggles in France:

"Just as the workers thought they would be able to emancipate themselves side by side with the bourgeoisie, so they thought they would be able to consummate a proletarian revolution within the national walls of France, side by side with the remaining bourgeois nations."<sup>79</sup>

The historical evolution of capitalism showed the truth of Marx's next conclusion: capitalism provides the conditions for proletarian revolution only on a global scale. In other words, capitalism as a global system had entered its decline period. He did not mean that some parts of it had entered the decline period, while others were still flourishing. Only when capitalism was promoted to the world's

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>79</sup> As source 62 – page 19

dominant mode of production did the era of imperialist wars and communist revolutions begin, and its stage was the First World War.

Marxism is not a religion in which everything descends from the sky at once, but it evolves and is enriched with historical experience and in the shadow of the struggles of the working class. With dialectical insight, Marx analysed the capitalist economy with regard to the struggles of the working class in the late 1840s and before the year 1850 was over, as mentioned above, Marx and Engels abandoned the theory of permanent revolution in the shadow of new results. They found that any hope of a proletarian revolution following a bourgeois revolution was overly optimistic in 1850 because they concluded that European capitalism was still in its growth phase and that the material conditions for a proletarian revolution were not yet ready.

"Given this general prosperity, wherein the productive forces of bourgeois society are developing as luxuriantly as it is possible for them to do within bourgeois relationships, a real revolution is out of the question. Such a revolution is possible only in periods when *both* of these *factors* – the *modern forces* of production and the *bourgeois forms of production* – come *into opposition* with each other. The various bickerings in which representatives of the individual factions of the continental party of Order presently engage and compromise each other, far from providing an occasion for revolution, are, on the contrary, possible only because the bases of relationships are momentarily so secure and – what the reactionaries do not know – so *bourgeois*. On this all the reactionary attempts to hold back bourgeois development will rebound just as much as will all the ethical indignation and all the enraptured proclamations of the democrats. A new revolution is only a consequence of a new crisis. The one, however, is as sure to come as the other."<sup>80</sup>

All the discussions that we have explained so far, i.e., the proletarian revolution is only possible when the contradiction of the productive forces with the capitalist mode of production is unavoidable, the uprisings of the 1840s with the participation of the working class were in line with the bourgeois revolution or its completion, that as long as proletarian revolution was not on the agenda of the proletariat, the proletariat could use universal suffrage in line with its duties (of course, we will return to this issue) and that the idea of the "permanent revolution" of Marx and Engels was wrong, and they rejected it before the end of 1850, are summarized by Engels in another way in 1895 in the introduction to *The Class Struggles in France*:

"History has proved us wrong, and all who thought like us. It has made it clear that the state of economic development on the Continent at that time was not, by a long way, ripe for the elimination of capitalist production; it has proved this by the economic revolution which, since 1848, has seized the whole of the Continent, and has caused big industry to take real root in France, Austria, Hungary, Poland and, recently, in Russia, while it has made Germany positively an industrial country of the first rank — all on a capitalist basis, which in the year 1848, therefore, still had a great capacity for expansion. But it is precisely this industrial revolution which has everywhere produced clarity in class relations, has removed a number of intermediate forms handed down from the period of manufacture

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>80</sup> As source 62 – page 71

and in Eastern Europe even from guild handicraft, has created a genuine bourgeois and a genuine large-scale industrial proletariat and has pushed them into the foreground of social development. However, owing to this, the struggle between these two great classes, a struggle which, outside England, existed in 1848 only in Paris and, at the most, in a few big industrial centres, has spread over the whole of Europe and reached an intensity still inconceivable in 1848. At that time the many obscure gospels of the sects, with their panaceas; today the single generally recognised, crystal-clear theory of Marx, sharply formulating the ultimate aims of the struggle. At that time the masses, sundered and differing according to locality and nationality, linked only by the feeling of common suffering, undeveloped, helplessly tossed to and fro from enthusiasm to despair; today the *single* great international army of socialists, marching irresistibly on and growing daily in number, organisation, discipline, insight and certainty of victory. If even this mighty army of the proletariat has still not reached its goal, if, far from winning victory by *one* mighty stroke, it has slowly to press forward from position to position in a hard, tenacious struggle, this only proves, once and for all, how impossible it was in 1848 to win social transformation merely by a surprise attack."

Now let's go back to the misrepresentations of Paydar and his demonization of Engels. Like believers who only memorize the verses of the Bible without being able to understand them, he writes: "He [Engels] especially insists on instilling in the consciousness of the workers that, if Marx was also there, he would have said the same thing!! From this point of view, he observed the deficits and shortages of the labour movement from the 1940s to the 1970s!! He would ignore his previous analyses, studies and statements about the labour movement of those years, the June Revolution, the Paris Commune, and other events!! He once again calls the Paris Commune a desperate rebellion!!"<sup>81</sup>

We examined the events of the 1840s and especially the June Rebellion and showed that Marx analysed those events in a dialectical way, and in the shadow of the labour struggles and his research, he came to the conclusion that "Given this general prosperity, wherein the productive forces of bourgeois society are developing as luxuriantly as it is possible for them to do within bourgeois relationships, a real revolution is out of the question." We will return to the topic of the Paris Commune, and we will demonstrate, contrary to Paydar's ideas, what position Marx had towards the Paris Commune, whether before, during or after it. Yes, we emphasize, if Marx was alive in 1895, contrary to the intellectual disturbances of movements such as Paydar like Engels, he would have announced the following sentence loudly:

"History has proved us wrong, and all who thought like us. It has made it clear that the state of economic development on the Continent at that time was not, by a long way, ripe for the elimination of capitalist production; it has proved this by the economic revolution which, since 1848, has seized the whole of the Continent."<sup>82</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>81</sup> Rereading Marx's Capital, Paydar.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>82</sup> Introduction to Karl Marx's The Class Struggles in France 1848 to 1850

We have already examined the difference between bourgeois and proletarian revolutions. The important feature of proletarian revolutions is that they do not look for momentary victories, but constantly criticize themselves, interrupt themselves in their own course, return to apparently accomplished tasks and retreat repeatedly until the moment when there is no longer any possibility of any retreat. Marx describes this as follows:

"Bourgeois revolutions, like those of the eighteenth century, storm more swiftly from success to success, their dramatic effects outdo each other, men and things seem set in sparkling diamonds, ecstasy is the order of the day - but they are shortlived, soon they have reached their zenith, and a long Katzenjammer [cat's winge] takes hold of society before it learns to assimilate the results of its storm-and-stress period soberly. On the other hand, proletarian revolutions, like those of the nineteenth century, constantly criticize themselves, constantly interrupt themselves in their own course, return to the apparently accomplished, in order to begin anew; they deride with cruel thoroughness the half-measures, weaknesses, and paltriness of their first attempts, seem to throw down their opponents only so the latter may draw new strength from the earth and rise before them again more gigantic than ever, recoil constantly from the indefinite colossalness of their own goals until a situation is created which makes all turning back impossible, and the conditions themselves call out: Hic Rhodus, hic salta! [Here is the rose, here dance!]"83

<sup>83</sup> As source 63 - pages 6-7

### **Marxism Against Schapperism**

Since the Communist League was the first experience of the working class as a social class, it certainly could not be free from errors and mistakes. The discussion is not about those, but about whether the Communist League was able to fulfil the tasks that were set out in *The Communist Manifesto*.

The failure of the proletarian uprisings and the disappearance of the horizon of revolutionary conditions made it clear to Marx and those who were of his political opinion that the counter-revolution had won all over Europe and that there was no prospect of an imminent revolution. Unlike the adventurers and idealists, many of whom also spoke with radical language, Marx was against bringing the revolution back to Germany through the bayonet and essentially considered the revolution not a military issue, but a social and political one. It was not only the military-political victories of the reaction, but also Marx's tireless economic research during his exile that brought him new results, and he stated:

"A real revolution is out of the question. Such a revolution is possible only in periods when *both* of these *factors* – the *modern forces* of production and the *bourgeois forms of production* – come *into opposition* with each other."<sup>84</sup>

The new conditions presented other forms of organization to the Communist League. In other words, most importantly, understanding

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>84</sup> As source 62 – page 71

the historical conditions of the development of capitalism and accordingly preparing for the future communist revolution, not immediate preparation for the revolution, were the tasks ahead. This issue was not pleasant for those who were looking for instant victories. According to the new conditions within the Communist League, the views of Marx and his followers were strongly opposed by the movements of Karl Schapper and August Willich. Schapper's faction wanted to arrange new rebellions. Regarding his differences with Schapper's movement, Marx says:

"During our last debate in particular, on the question of 'The position of the German proletariat in the next revolution', views were expressed by members of the minority of the Central Committee which directly contradict our second-to-last circular and even the Manifesto. A national German approach has replaced the universal conception of the Manifesto, flattering the national sentiments of German artisans. The will, rather than the actual conditions, was stressed as the chief factor in the revolution. We tell the workers: If you want to change conditions and make yourselves capable of government, you will have to undergo fifteen, twenty or fifty years of civil war. Now they are told: We must come to power immediately or we might as well go to sleep. The word 'proletariat' has been reduced to a mere phrase, like the word 'people' was by the democrats."<sup>85</sup>

Contrary to Marx's dialectical attitude, Schapper's faction resorted to adventurism and voluntarism and even looked down on

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>85</sup> Minutes of the Central Committee of the Communist League (Meeting of 15 September 1850)

Marx and those who thought like him. Schapper's comments at the meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist League in September 1850 led to the split of the Communist League. Schapper claimed that the conflict was between those who were busy organizing the proletariat, i.e., themselves, and those who were simply lounging in armchairs and writing, that is, Marx and Marx's followers. The same accusations are repeated against communists by radical leftists and adventurers, whose versions of them can be found everywhere. The only difference is that Schapper was an adventurer within the labour movement, while the latter is part of the left wing of capital, although some of them are also accompanied by the flavour of councilism. Shaper stated in the meeting:

"Just as the proletariat cut itself off from the Montagne and the press in France, so here the people who speak for the party on matters of principle are cutting themselves off from those who organize within the proletariat. I am in favour of moving the Central Committee, and also of altering the statutes. I also believe that the new revolution will bring forth people who themselves will lead it, and do so better than all the people who had a name in 1848...But then two leagues ought to be set up one for those whose influence derives from their pens and the other for those who work in other ways."<sup>86</sup>

Although Marx's rightness was proven in the debate against Schapper's movement at the same time, those controversies have left us a great lesson. The revolution will only occur when the "modern forces of production" and the "bourgeois forms of production" come

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>86</sup> As source 85

into opposition with each other. This is the response to all those who did not consider the material conditions and reduced the communist revolution to a simple issue, i.e., only will, and claimed or continue to state that the proletarian revolution has been possible since the beginning of capitalism.

Schapper tried to position himself in the discussions as a person who made more sacrifices than Marx. Marx did not allow the personalization of differences and emphasized the material basis of political differences. Unlike Schapper, who considered the immediate goals of the proletariat, Marx thought about the long-term aims. In other words, what the proletariat is historically capable of doing was important to him. Marx says:

"As far as personal sacrifices are concerned, I have made as many as anyone else, but they have been for the class and not for individual people. As for enthusiasm, there is not much enthusiasm involved in belonging to a party which you believe will become the government. I have always resisted the momentary opinion of the proletariat. We are devoted to a party which would do best not to assume power just now. The proletariat, if it should come to power, would not be able to implement proletarian measures immediately, but would have to introduce petty-bourgeois ones. Our party can only become the government when conditions allow its views to be put into practice. Louis Blanc provides the best example of what happens when power is assumed prematurely."<sup>87</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>87</sup> As source 85

Throughout history, there have always been movements that have not been able to produce their own opinions and ideas due to their social conditions. Such movements have taken other people's ideas, modified them somewhat and then presented the same concoction as their own. The Schapper-Willich trend was a clear example of this during the Communist League:

"The Schapper-Willich party have never laid claim to the dignity of having their own ideas. Their own contribution is the peculiar misunderstanding of other people's ideas which they set up as dogmas and, reducing these to a phrase, they imagine to have made them their own. It would be no less incorrect to agree with the prosecution in describing the Willich-Schapper party as the 'party of action', unless by action one understands indolence concealed behind beer house bluster, simulated conspiracies and meaningless pseudo-alliances."<sup>88</sup>

The same issue is true in relation to the movement for the abolition of wage labour or other anti-parliamentary groups in Europe. The former took anti-parliamentarism and the negation of labour unions from the communist left without understanding its historical context, made a kind of dogma out of them and presented them in a confused form, when in actuality it does not have an opinion regarding these topics. We will see in the following pages that this movement is not able to explain Marx's position towards the participation of workers in the parliament or his recommendation to bring workers to trade unions. What resulted in the Schapper-Willich movement, whose

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>88</sup> Revelations Concerning the Communist Trial in Cologne by Karl Marx 1853

members considered themselves the heroes of the proletarian struggle, who were busy organizing the proletariat and accused Marx and his followers of boasting (pen struggle)? Are Paydar and his movement or those who accused Engels of being a "peaceful worshipper of legality at any price" doing better than Schapper's faction?

"The Branched League was the title that Marx and Engels gave to the sectarian Schapper-Willich faction, which followed an adventurous policy. This faction, which was formed after the split of the Communist League on 15 September 1850, with its conspiratorial activities, facilitated the work of the Prussian police in discovering the secret activities of the Communist League associations in Germany and led to the trial of communists in Cologne. The story was that in September 1851, the members of the Paris Association of the Communist League of the Schapper-Willich faction were arrested in Paris. The petty bourgeois and conspiratorial tactics chosen by this faction, which ignored the real situation and wanted to organize an immediate uprising, caused the French and Prussian police, with the help of Cherval, who was an agent of the Prussian envoy in Paris and a French spy, who managed one of the associations in Paris, to plot the story of the so-called German-French conspiracy. Those arrested were convicted in February 1852 of preparing a coup d'état. Means were put in place for the escape of the agent Cherval. The efforts of the Prussian government to attribute the so-called German-French conspiracy to the Communist League under the leadership of Marx and Engels were completely fruitless, and a member of the Communist League, Konrad Schramm, who was arrested in Paris in

September 1851, was soon acquitted for lack of evidence. Schärttner's fake testimony in the communists' court in Cologne about the participation of the Cologne defendants in the socalled German-French conspiracy by Marx was disgraced."<sup>89</sup>

The champions of Schapper's trend, who were determined to start proletarian riots and did not adhere to legality at all, were not among the accused, but in the position of "*witnesses for the Crown*" during the trials of the communists in Cologne.

"That the group made common cause with the Prussian police is apparent not only in their silence but also in their utterances: whenever they entered the trial it was not in the dock with the accused, but as '*witnesses for the Crown*'."<sup>90</sup>

Marx's proposal was to move the headquarters of the Communist League to Cologne and separate the two factions, which unfortunately did not happen. The Communist League continued to exist until the Cologne communist trials in 1852, after which it was dissolved. Marx spent his time gaining a deeper understanding of the organization and a better comprehension of the capitalist mode of production, and Schapper's followers, who had conspired to start a proletarian storm, disappeared from the political scene forever.

"With the Cologne trial the first period of the German communist workers' movement comes to an end. Immediately

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>89</sup> The Communist League – page 212.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>90</sup> Revelations Concerning the Communist Trial in Cologne by Karl Marx 1853

after the sentence we dissolved our League; a few months later the Willich-Schapper separate league was also laid to eternal rest."<sup>91</sup>

The lack of organizational continuity following the dissolution of the Communist League until the First International, and then between the First International and the Second International, has been a weakness of the proletariat, indicating the immaturity of the political movement of the working class, whose review is outside the topic of our discussion. But the weakness of the proletariat, i.e., the lack of organizational continuity, has been studied by the communist left movements and that is why the organizational continuity of the communist left was of vital importance even in the most difficult period of counter-revolution.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>91</sup> On The History of the Communist League - Frederick Engels

### Marx and Universal Suffrage

We have already discussed how the evolution of capitalism and its entry into the age of decadence brought about important changes in the struggle of the working class. In other words, it provided the material ground for social revolution. The task of the proletariat is no longer imposing reforms on capitalism. Instead, it is now to bring down capitalism. Due to the changes in the struggle of the working class, the parliament no longer plays a progressive role and has become a circus for the bourgeoisie.

Therefore, until the age of imperialism, Marxists tried to use the parliament as a tool for the struggle of the working class, because it had not yet lost its progressive role. For this reason, Marxists, including Engels, emphasized the use of the right to vote. First, let's see how Paydar presents an inverted narrative of the positions of Marxists by resorting to the established tradition of inversion in him:

"[Marx] would throw away the June Revolution, the Paris Commune, other events!! He would call the Paris Commune once again a desperate rebellion!! Finally he would shout, I found it, I found it, and invite the workers of the world to parliamentarism!! In this area, Engels does not stop at just saying the above points, on the contrary, he runs to the farthest horizons and pulls out all the stops."<sup>92</sup>

<sup>92</sup> Rereading Marx's Capital, Paydar.

We have already examined the events of 1848 and will examine the Paris Commune in the next chapter. We will briefly study Marx's opinion in this context to show that the leftists who appeared in the metamorphosed councilism are not able to understand social events from a Marxist perspective. Marx, who carefully followed the events in France, who codified the uprising of June 1848, not Engels, ironically wrote after those episodes that **the bourgeoisie had done away with the class struggle for the moment by abolishing universal suffrage**:

"Consequently, since France demanded tranquillity above all things, the party of Order dared not answer —warl after Bonaparte had talked —peacel in his message. The public, which had anticipated scenes of great scandal at the opening of the National Assembly, was cheated of its expectations. The opposition deputies, who demanded the submission of the Permanent Commission's minutes on the October events, were out-voted by the majority. On principle, all debates that might cause excitement were eschewed. The proceedings of the National Assembly during November and December, 1850, were without interest.

At last, toward the end of December, guerrilla warfare began over a number of prerogatives of parliament. The movement got bogged down in petty squabbles about the prerogatives of the two powers, since the bourgeoisie had done away with the class struggle for the moment by abolishing universal suffrage."<sup>93</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>93</sup> As source 63, page 40

Certainly, the class battles had not ended and Marx was referring to another dimension of the class struggle. Years after the Paris Commune in 1880, Jules Guesde, the leader of the French Workers' Party, came to Marx to establish the party's programme. This consisted of two parts, in the form of minimum and maximum demands (communist goals). Marx was personally involved in setting up the programme, and it was approved with amendments in November 1880 at the founding congress of the party.

During its preparation, there was at least one controversy between Marx and his French supporters over the programme. Marx insisted on the minimum programme, that is, the demands that could be achieved within the framework of capitalism. But the French supporters of Marx, especially Guesde and Lafargue, believed that such demands created illusions in the workers, and they claimed that by rejecting such reforms, they would free the workers from reformism. By accusing Guesde and Lafargue of revolutionary rhetoric, Marx denied the importance of their reformist struggles, and it was in connection to this topic that he made his famous statement that if their politics represented Marxism, "what is certain is that I myself am not a Marxist."

The introduction of the programme of the Workers' Party, written by Marx himself, not only emphasizes the use of universal suffrage as a tool for the proletariat, but also states that universal suffrage will be transformed from the instrument of deception that it has been until now into one of emancipation. In the introduction to the programme of the Workers' Party, we read: "Considering,

That this collective appropriation can arise only from the revolutionary action of the productive class – or proletariat - organized in a distinct political party;

That a such an organization must be pursued by all the means the proletariat has at its disposal including universal suffrage which will thus be transformed from the instrument of deception that it has been until now into an instrument of emancipation; The French socialist workers, in adopting as the aim of their efforts the political and economic expropriation of the capitalist class and the return to community of all the means of production, have decided, as a means of organization and struggle, to enter the elections <sup>394</sup>

It was Marx, not Engels, who encouraged the workers to exercise universal suffrage years after June 1848, years after the Paris Commune. The left wing of capital, by focusing on such quotes, defends "revolutionary parliamentarism" under the title of a revolutionary tool. In contrast, we emphasize that in the era of decadent capitalism, participation in election shows and the parliament circus only serves to strengthen the illusions of bourgeois democracy.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>94</sup> The Programme of the Workers Party

### Marx and the Paris Commune

During the world revolution, the October Revolution had become the light of hope for the workers of the world. The October Revolution was not a separate phenomenon, but a part of the common struggle of the workers and a part of the world revolution. Anton Pannekoek, at the same time, very eloquently depicts this issue:

"The common struggle against capital will unite the proletarian masses of the whole world. And when finally, at the end of the arduous struggle, the European workers, deeply exhausted, stand in the clear morning light of freedom, they will greet the liberated peoples of Asia in the East and shake hands in Moscow, the capital of the new humanity."<sup>95</sup>

The defeat of the German revolution and the subsequent quelling of the world revolution isolated the October Revolution and paved the way for the victory of the counter-revolution. The counter-revolution celebrated its triumph over the ruins of the October Revolution. After that date, the nature and goals of the October Revolution were distorted and reversed, by both the victorious counter-revolution and the global bourgeoisie, as well as some of its previous defenders. With the collapse of council communism and the emergence of councilism after the Second World War, the councilists questioned the proletarian nature of the October Revolution and instead emphasized the proletarian nature of the Paris Commune. Since councilism is

<sup>95</sup> World Revolution and Communist Tactics -Anton Pannekoek

genetically anti-organizational, the lifespan of such movements is usually not long and after some time they are removed from the political scene and prepare the ground for the formation of grey movements (which oscillate between revolutionary and antirevolutionary positions). In addition to these factions, in the political milieu, especially in Western countries, we are faced with different versions of leftism, which are accompanied by the seasoning of councilism and are usually known as "anti-parliamentarism" trends. Their common feature is a non-proletarian assessment of the October Revolution, downplaying the heroic struggles of the early 20th century, instead of glorifying the Paris Commune. The movement for the abolition of wage labour is the version of peripheral capitalism of one of these factions, so it is necessary to examine the Paris Commune from a Marxist perspective and show the irrelevance of such movements even in relation to the Paris Commune to Marx and Marxism. In an attempt to construct his image as a "lawful peaceful admirer" of Engels, Paydar writes:

"The anti-capitalist struggles of the working class in the 1840s to the 1870s, including the June Revolution, the First International, and the Paris Commune, have been fooling around...!! [Marx] ignored previous analyses and statements about the labour movement of those years, regarding the June Revolution, the Paris Commune and other events!! He would call the Paris Commune once again a desperate rebellion!! Finally, he would shout, I found it, I found it, and invite the workers of the world to parliament!!"<sup>96</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>96</sup> Rereading Marx's Capital, Paydar.

Marx has played different positions in relation to the Paris Commune. In other words, Marx's position was different before, during and after the Paris Commune. Understanding Marx's different positions is difficult for leftists and movements such as the one for the abolition of wage labour. The important point is that Marx did not change his position regarding the social revolution, but he made appropriate statements according to the social conditions. We will try to examine Marx's different positions regarding the Paris Commune at varying times.

#### Marx's Position Before the Paris Commune

Marx believed that the defeat of June 1848 had defeated the French working class so much that it could not straighten its back for years. The industrial boom and the electoral law had aggravated the consequences of the June 1848 defeat, so the working class had surrendered to fate afterwards and was unable to fight against the bourgeoisie. Marx describes the situation as follows:

"We must not forget that the year 1850 was one of the most splendid years of industrial and commercial prosperity, and the Paris proletariat was therefore fully employed. But the election law of May 31, 1850, excluded it from any participation in political power. It cut the proletariat off from the very arena of the struggle. It threw the workers back into the position of pariahs which they had occupied before the February Revolution. By letting themselves be led by the democrats in the face of such an event and forgetting the revolutionary interests of their class for momentary case and comfort, they renounced the honor of being a conquering power, surrendered to their fate, proved that the defeat of June, 1848, had put them out of the fight for years and that the historical process would for the present again have to go on over their heads."<sup>97</sup>

Marx was following the events in France, especially since the First International had tasked him with preparing a report on the progress of events in France. In September 1870, a few months before the Paris Commune, Marx wrote the address of the Central Council of the First International, in which he considered any attempt to overthrow the government to be a form of desperate madness. Marx believed that the material grounds for the proletarian revolution were not ready yet, and therefore he stated that French workers should fulfil their citizenship duties.

"The French working class moves, therefore, under circumstances of extreme difficulty. Any attempt at upsetting the new government in the present crisis, when the enemy is almost knocking at the doors of Paris, would be a desperate folly. The French workmen must perform their duties as citizens; but, at the same time, they must not allow themselves to be swayed by the national souvenirs of 1792, as the French peasant allowed themselves to be deluded by the national souvenirs of the First Empire. They have not to recapitulate the past, but to build up the future. Let them calmly and resolutely improve the opportunities of republican liberty, for the work of their own class organization. It will gift them with fresh herculean powers for the regeneration of France, and our common task – the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>97</sup> As source 63- page 34

emancipation of labour. Upon their energies and wisdom hinges the fate of the republic."98

### Marx's Position During the Paris Commune

When class battles are formed, it is certainly the duty of the revolutionaries to participate in those battles and maintain solidarity with them, and criticizing the ambiguities of the battles is the next stage of the revolutionaries' duties. Marx did the same thing during the class battles during the Paris Commune. When the Paris proletarian uprising took place, Marx likened the heroism of the Communards to "stormed heaven." During the Paris Commune, Marx did not just express his happiness over those battles, but also analysed them to provide their lessons. While criticizing, he published an international address of solidarity and support for the Paris Commune and criticized the Communards. Instead of marching to Versailles, they gave Thiers an opportunity to concentrate the hostile forces. Another criticism of Marx was the failure to confiscate the Bank of France, and Marx believed that the Commune could have forced Thiers to compromise by confiscating billions of francs. Despite these criticisms, Marx speaks of "heroic comrades," "historical initiative," "capacity for sacrifice," etc., writing to Ludwig Kugelmann in a letter dated 12 April 1871:

"If you look at the last chapter of my Eighteenth Brumaire you will find that I say that the next attempt of the French revolution will be no longer, as before, to transfer the bureaucratic-military machine from one hand to another, but to smash it, and this is

<sup>98</sup> The Civil War in France, Marx, page 12

essential for every real people's revolution on the Continent. And this is what our heroic Party comrades in Paris are attempting. What elasticity, what historical initiative, what a capacity for sacrifice in these Parisians!"<sup>99</sup>

Marx analysed historical events dialectically and from the perspective of historical materialism. He believed that the evolution of the bourgeois society and the rise of the working class as a social class caused the French working class to appear in the role of the vanguard of the modern proletariat, and that Prussia and Versailles had joined hands to massacre the proletariat together. He describes the background of the rise of the Parisian proletariat as follows:

"That, after the most tremendous war of modern times, the conquering and the conquered hosts should fraternize for the common massacre of the proletariat – this unparalleled event does indicate, not, as Bismarck thinks, the final repression of a new society up heaving, but the crumbling into dust of bourgeois society. The highest heroic effort of which old society is still capable is national war; and this is now proved to be a mere governmental humbug, intended to defer the struggle of classes, and to be thrown aside as soon as that class struggle bursts out into civil war. Class rule is no longer able to disguise itself in a national uniform; the national governments are one as against the proletariat! After Whit-Sunday, 1871, there can be neither peace nor truce possible between the working men of France and the appropriators of their produce. The iron hand of a mercenary soldiery may keep for a time both classes tied down in common

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>99</sup> Marx to Dr Kugelmann - Concerning the Paris Commune

oppression. But the battle must break out again and again in ever-growing dimensions, and there can be no doubt as to who will be the victor in the end – the appropriating few, or the immense working majority. And the French working class is only the advanced guard of the modern proletariat. While the European governments thus testify, before Paris, to the international character of class rule, they cry down the International Working Men's Association - the international counter organization of labour against the cosmopolitan conspiracy of capital – as the head fountain of all these disasters. Thiers denounced it as the despot of labour, pretending to be its liberator. Picard ordered that all communications between the French Internationals and those abroad be cut off: Count Jaubert. Thiers' mummified accomplice of 1835, declares it the great problem of all civilized governments to weed it out. The Rurals roar against it, and the whole European press joins the chorus. An honourable French writer [Robinet], completely foreign to our Association, speaks as follows:

The police-tinged bourgeois mind naturally figures to itself the International Working Men's Association as acting in the manner of a secret conspiracy, its central body ordering, from time to time, explosions in different countries. Our Association is, in fact, nothing but the international bond between the most advanced working men in the various countries of the civilized world. Wherever, in whatever shape, and under whatever conditions the class struggle obtains any consistency, it is but natural that members of our Association, should stand in the foreground. The soil out of which it grows is modern society itself. It cannot be stamped out by any amount of carnage. To stamp it out, the governments would have to stamp out the despotism of capital over labour – the condition of their own parasitical existence."<sup>100</sup>

Despite Marx's description of the French working class as the vanguard of the modern proletariat at that time, he guessed the fate of the Paris Commune based on his dialectical attitude, so he belatedly published the third address, which actually ends with a kind of obituary:

"Working men's Paris, with its Commune, will be forever celebrated as the glorious harbinger of a new society. Its martyrs are enshrined in the great heart of the working class. Its exterminators history has already nailed to that eternal pillory from which all the prayers of their priest will not avail to redeem them."<sup>101</sup>

## Marx's Position After the Paris Commune

When the Paris Commune failed and many years had passed since that glorious uprising, it was important for Marx to learn from it as the greatest workers' uprising. Marx knew that the Parisian proletariat could not win by rising in one city, despite their heroic actions. For Marx, it was quite clear that the communist revolution (social revolution) was not yet on the agenda of the proletariat at that time, and the communist revolution could only take the form of a world revolution. Ferdinand Domila Nieuwenhuis of the Dutch Socialists

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>100</sup> As source 98 - pages37,38

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>101</sup> As source 98 -, page 38

asked Marx what measures a workers' power could take to consolidate its power. In a letter 10 years after the Paris Commune, dated 22 February 1881, Marx wrote to Ferdinand Domila Nieuwenhuis in the Netherlands in this regard:

"Perhaps you will point to the Paris Commune; but apart from the fact that this was merely the rising of a town under exceptional conditions, the majority of the Commune was in no sense socialist, nor could it be. With a small amount of sound common sense, however, they could have reached a compromise with Versailles useful to the whole mass of the people -- the only thing that could be reached at the time. The appropriation of the Bank of France alone would have been enough to dissolve all the pretensions of the Versailles people in terror, etc., etc."<sup>102</sup>

Not Engels, but Marx, wrote 10 years after the Paris Commune, "With a small amount of sound common sense, however, they could have reached a compromise with Versailles useful to the whole mass of the people – the only thing that could be reached at the time." Or, according to Paydar's literature, "the Paris Commune was once again called a desperate rebellion." Paydar himself knows that he publishes a large amount of nonsense and rubbish, which is sometimes meaningless even to him. He produces a lot of worthless content that is only aimed at creating ambiguity and discrediting Marxists in the political milieu:

"Over the course of several decades, I have produced and published thousands of worthless and valuable pages on various

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>102</sup> Marx to Domela Nieuwenhuis

issues of class struggle and the anti-capitalist movement of the working class."<sup>103</sup>

#### **Conclusion from the Paris Commune**

Since the Paris Commune was the biggest and most significant labour uprising up to that point, its lessons are very important despite its short life. It should be emphasized that the Proudhonist and Blanquist attitudes prevailed in the administration of the commune, and the Marxist one was in the absolute minority. Despite this, the uprising, considering its proletarian nature, took actions against the ruling movements in both the political and economic fields.

"It is therefore comprehensible that in the economic sphere much was left undone which, according to our view today, the Commune ought to have done...but what is still more wonderful is the correctness of so much that was actually done by the Commune, composed as it was of Blanquists and Proudhonists. Naturally, the Proudhonists were chiefly responsible for the economic decrees of the Commune, both for their praiseworthy and their unpraiseworthy aspects; as the Blanquists were for its political actions and omissions. And in both cases the irony of history willed – as is usual when doctrinaires come to the helm – that both did the opposite of what the doctrines of their school proscribed."<sup>104</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>103</sup> "The Movement to Abolish Wage Labour Is Both a Strategy and a Tactic," Nasser Paydar.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>104</sup> Introduction by Frederick Engels On the 20th Anniversary of the Paris Commune

Before continuing the discussion, let's see how the movement for the abolition of wage labour evaluates the reasons for the failure of the commune:

"The influence of Proudhon's narrative of capitalism and socialism in the labour movement of his time was undoubtedly a disaster for the European working class, and its sinister and destructive effects can be clearly seen in the events of the Paris Commune and the prominent role of Proudhon's supporters in this failure."<sup>105</sup>

We ignore the influence of the narrative of capitalism in the labour movement of that time as the reason for the failure of the Paris Commune; Paydar himself probably does not know what he is talking about. But we cannot continue without referring to his argument, that is, if Proudhon's supporters had been in the minority and unable to have much involvement, the Paris Commune would not have failed. Such an attitude is devoid of dialectics and metaphysics and has nothing to do with historical materialism. The events are not analysed from a historical point of view, based on the growth of productive forces or the working class, but from the perspective of the role of Proudhon's supporters. They share the same attitude that Stalinists and Maoists have, following the death of Stalin in the Soviet Union and with of Mao in China, that the "socialist" mode of production will become capitalism. Contrary to the inversions of leftists appearing in the role of metamorphosed councilism, the fact is that Marx's attitude was dialectical: even if the Paris Commune survived Versailles, it could not defeat Bismarck and drive out the occupying forces of

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>105</sup> As source 103.

Prussia, and with the attack of the Communards on Versailles it was more likely that Bismarck himself would directly enter the war against the Paris Commune. Following the October Revolution, 14 imperialist countries joined together to curb the October Revolution and prevent the spread of the revolution to other nations. One of the reasons for the universality of the communist revolution, unlike the nationalist leftists, lies in this issue. The proletarian revolution will either spread to all countries or, like the glorious October Revolution, it will decline despite the sacrifices of the Russian proletariat.

The Paris Commune took very effective measures, including the burning of the guillotine, the separation of church and state, the prohibition of night work, the determination of maximum wages, etc., but the Paris Commune could not be a social revolution with the aim of socializing the means of production and the institutions of society, i.e., a revolution for the abolition of wage labour. Therefore, the socialization of the means of production, private property and capitalist institutions and the abolition of wage labour were not and could not be included in the agenda of the Paris proletariat. Instead of socializing the means of production, the Paris Commune began to create worker cooperatives and maintained a kind of tolerance with the remaining factory owners in Paris. This is why the production units whose employers did not flee continued to operate as before, even accepting orders from the commune. The competition of production units by employers with labour cooperatives was so prominent that Leo Frankel, the head of the Labour and Industry Commission, wrote a letter of protest to the commune, pointing to the decline in the population's standard of living and the reduction of wages. All those who question the proletarian nature of the October Revolution are

shamefully silent on this matter. Marx summarizes the Paris Commune with a dialectic attitude:

"The working class did not expect miracles from the Commune. They have no ready-made utopias to introduce par décret du peuple. They know that in order to work out their own emancipation, and along with it that higher form to which present society is irresistibly tending by its own economical agencies, they will have to pass through long struggles, through a series of historic processes, transforming circumstances and men. They have no ideals to realize, but to set free the elements of the new society with which old collapsing bourgeois society itself is pregnant. In the full consciousness of their historic mission, and with the heroic resolve to act up to it, the working class can afford to smile at the coarse invective of the gentlemen's gentlemen with pen and inkhorn, and at the didactic patronage of well-wishing bourgeois-doctrinaires, pouring forth their ignorant platitudes and sectarian crotchets in the oracular tone of scientific infallibility.

When the Paris Commune took the management of the revolution in its own hands; when plain working men for the first time dared to infringe upon the governmental privilege of their "natural superiors," and, under circumstances of unexampled difficulty, performed it at salaries the highest of which barely amounted to one-fifth of what, according to high scientific authority, is the minimum required for a secretary to a certain metropolitan school-board – the old world writhed in convulsions of rage at the sight of the Red Flag, the symbol of the Republic of Labor, floating over the Hôtel de Ville. And yet,

this was the first revolution in which the working class was openly acknowledged as the only class capable of social initiative, even by the great bulk of the Paris middle class – shopkeepers, tradesmen, merchants – the wealthy capitalist alone excepted. The Commune had saved them by a sagacious settlement of that ever recurring cause of dispute among the middle class themselves – the debtor and creditor accounts. The same portion of the middle class, after they had assisted in putting down the working men's insurrection of June 1848, had been at once unceremoniously sacrificed to their creditors43 by the then Constituent Assembly."<sup>106</sup>

Another weakness of the Paris Commune was the issue of women, which has historical roots. Proudhon and his followers had a misogynist attitude that was a historical problem within the labour movement. They were against the entry of women into the process of social production and believed that women's equal rights in society prevented them from performing their duties properly at home, which was rooted in Proudhon's misogynist thinking. Proudhon says in this regard:

"I deny her every political right and every initiative. For woman liberty and well-being lie solely in marriage, in motherhood, in domestic duties..."<sup>107</sup>

Despite the stubborn opposition of Marx and Engels, in 1866 the First International, under the influence of Proudhon, passed a

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>106</sup> As source 98- page 28

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>107</sup> The two souls of socialism - Hal Draper- page 11

resolution to abolish all types of women's wage labour. In fact, its purpose was to remove women from the social production process. After years of efforts, Marx succeeded in passing a law internationally in 1871, which quickly led to the recruitment of women.

Due to this historical background, women did not have the right to vote or be elected in the Paris Commune, despite the fact that they played a very important role in all areas during the Paris Commune, from services to defence. Compare the issue of women's suffrage and right to be elected in the Paris Commune with the October Revolution, where women occupied important positions and played an influential role in social events.

One of the most important achievements of the Paris Commune was the crushing of the bourgeois state machine. Although Marx had previously mentioned the subduing of state power and emphasized that the working class cannot take the bourgeois state and use it as a tool, he states:

"All revolutions perfected this machine instead of breaking it. The parties, which alternately contended for domination, regarded the possession of this huge state structure as the chief spoils of the victor."<sup>108</sup>

Nevertheless, it was the experience of the commune that showed that the working class cannot take over the state machine and use it as a tool in line with its goals.

"But the working class cannot simply lay hold of the readymade state machinery, and wield it for its own purposes."<sup>109</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>108</sup> As source 98 - page 61

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>109</sup> As source 98- page 23

# The Evolution of Capitalism and Labour Unions

The movement for the abolition of wage labour and Western versions similar to it, i.e., leftism mixed with councilism, are unable to understand that the form of the organization of the working class is determined not by the working class, but by the growth and development of capitalism. None of these movements have a dialectical explanation of their opposition to trade unions, and they are not even able to understand and digest ideas copied from others. These factions express their ambiguities and contradictions in relation to labour unions only with anti-capitalist rhetoric.

Leftists appearing in the role of metamorphosed councilism are not able to understand why, in the era of growing capitalism, trade unions were the labour organizations of the working class. Why did Marx and the First International consider trade unions a tool for the struggle of the working class? With capitalism entering its decadent era, why and how did trade unions integrate into the capitalist state? First, let's see what role trade unions played in the labour movement according to Marx. He believed they had an important part in the development of industry at that time and wrote:

"If combinations and strikes had no other effect than that of making the efforts of mechanical genius react against them, they would still exercise an immense influence on the development of industry."<sup>110</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>110</sup> The Poverty of Philosophy – Marx, page 77

It was the evolution of capitalism that forced the British bourgeoisie to make changes in its laws and it was modern industry that made the necessity of the creation and development of trade unions a reality at that time. Marx describes the material background that caused this as follows:

"In England, combination is authorised by an Act of Parliament, and it is the economic system which has forced Parliament to grant this legal authorisation. In 1825, when, under the Minister Huskisson, Parliament had to modify the law in order to bring it more and more into line with the conditions resulting from free competition, it had of necessity to abolish all laws forbidding combinations of workers. The more modern industry and competition develop, the more elements there are which call forth and strengthen combination, and as soon as combination becomes an economic fact, daily gaining in solidity, it is bound before long to become a legal fact."<sup>111</sup>

The First International Congress held in Geneva in September 1866 adopted the text provided by Marx regarding trade unions and made it available to the international members as a guide to the congress. In that text, Marx examines the past, present and future of labour unions. While emphasizing them as the organizational centres of the working class, he recommends that unions should help social and political movements. In parts of it we read:

"They must now learn to act deliberately as organising centres of the working class in the broad interest of its complete

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>111</sup> As source 110 - page 78

emancipation. They must aid every social and political movement tending in that direction. Considering themselves and acting as the champions and representatives of the whole working class, they cannot fail to enlist the non-society men into their ranks. They must look carefully after the interests of the worst paid trades, such as the agricultural labourers, rendered powerless by exceptional circumstances. They must convince the world at large that their efforts, far from being narrow and selfish, aim at the emancipation of the downtrodden millions."<sup>112</sup>

At that time, trade unions were the method of struggle for the working class, and for this reason, it was more necessary for workers to preserve trade unions against capitalism than to conserve wages. British economists were amazed at how workers would sacrifice a large part of their income for unions that economists thought were formed only to increase wages. Let's examine the description of the problem in Marx's language:

"England, whose industry has attained the highest degree of development, has the biggest and best organised combinations. In England, they have not stopped at partial combinations which have no other objective than a passing strike, and which disappear with it. Permanent combinations have been formed, trades unions, which serve as ramparts for the workers in their struggles with the employers. And at the present time all these local trades unions find a rallying point in the National Association of United Trades, the central committee of which is in London, and which already numbers 80,000 members. The

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>112</sup> Trades' Unions, Their Past, Present and Future - Karl Marx 1866

organisation of these strikes, combinations, and trades unions went on simultaneously with the political struggles of the workers, who now constitute a large political party, under the name of Chartists. The first attempt of workers to associate among themselves always takes place in the form of combinations. Large-scale industry concentrates in one place a crowd of people unknown to one another. Competition divides their interests. But the maintenance of wages, this common interest which they have against their boss, unites them in a common thought of resistance – combination. Thus combination always has a double aim, that of stopping competition among the workers, so that they can carry on general competition with the capitalist. If the first aim of resistance was merely the maintenance of wages, combinations, at first isolated, constitute themselves into groups as the capitalists in their turn unite for the purpose of repression, and in the face of always united capital, the maintenance of the association becomes more necessary to them than that of wages. This is so true that English economists are amazed to see the workers sacrifice a good part of their wages in favour of associations, which, in the eyes of these economists, are established solely in favour of wages. In this struggle -a veritable civil war -all the elements necessary for a coming battle unite and develop. Once it has reached this point, association takes on a political character"<sup>113</sup>

Both the economists and the socialists of the time, the Fourierists in France and the Owenists in England, rather than the pro-Marxist

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>113</sup> As source 110 - page 79

socialists, were opposed to trade unions, although they had different motives for condemning them.

"Economists and socialists are in agreement on one point: the condemnation of combination. Only they have different motives for their act of condemnation."<sup>114</sup>

It is important to mention Marx's position regarding labour unions in the growing era of capitalism. The left of capitalism, by seizing Marx's statements in the age of capitalist growth, extends them to the era of capitalist decline and makes a pretext of defending antilabour unions in the current period. On the other hand, the issue goes back to the leftist movements that have an anarchist-councilist flavour, especially in Western countries, who state in their imaginary world that the revolution could always be on the agenda of the workers. The workers only have to exert their will and overthrow capitalism. Then the question is, why did Marx recommend working in unions instead of overthrowing capitalism?

With these explanations, let's go back to the movement for the abolition of wage labour. In the first statement and programme presented by this group, like other leftists, it assigns a contradictory role to the unions in the organization of the working class, mentioning the red, white and yellow unions, and discusses:

"The labour movement and the union. The paradoxical role of the union in the formation and dispersion of the working class, red, white and yellow unions."<sup>115</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>114</sup> As source 110 - page 78

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>115</sup> As source 52 - page 42.

The first statement and programme of this movement do not see a problem in the concept, nature and structure of unions and consider them the organizations of the working class, but see the type of unions as the issue. In other words, workers can form their own red unions instead of white and yellow unions and use them as a tool of class struggle. At a later point, instead of promoting the red unions, this movement states that syndicalism or unionism is a compromise between workers and capital:

"Syndicalism is a compromise between workers and capital."116

If we delve a little more into the opinions of the movement for the abolition of wage labour, we will find that the unions are, according to this group, a vessel for the mass organization of workers. However, within the reformist protests of the working class, because the unions are the reformist element of the labour movement, they state:

"The union is the solution of the reformist movement inside or outside the labour movement for the type of mass organization of workers... What is in essential unity with syndicalism and unionism is not absolute legality but reformism and its place as a container for organizing the reformist protests of the working class."<sup>117</sup>

In the last case and recently, contrary to the anti-unionist gestures, with all its demagoguery, this movement has considered the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>116</sup> "Struggles of the Workers of the Bus Company, Astraies and Lessons of Class Struggle," Nasser Paydar.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>117</sup> As source 53.

unions in the struggle with capitalism and has practically assigned a proletarian nature to them, but they only try "to get a licence to survive in the black hell of capitalism," that is, they are reformists. Paydar speaks of two working class movements, the members of both of which are labour sellers. In both places, that is, within the trade union movement as well as the non-union proletarian struggle, workers struggle with capitalism:

"The working class may, and has so far, turned to two distinct, conflicting, differently oriented and different movements in content, purpose, and nature... It is clear that both movements, with all their fundamental differences, are nevertheless made up in common of the masses selling labour power. In both places, workers struggle with capitalism. In both movements, the demands and expectations, livelihood issues, social rights and welfare facilities of the working masses are the subject of controversy and division. However, these two movements are not fundamentally the same, and the relationship between them is absolutely not the growth and evolution of one and then becoming the other. Both of these two movements make the strength and power of the working masses the basis of their existence and survival and struggle, but one is the worker's cry of protest against the basis of capitalism's existence and the other is the crystallization of his appeal and lamentation to obtain permission to survive in the black hell of capitalism."<sup>118</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>118</sup> "The Movement to Abolish Wage Labour Is Both a Strategy and a Tactic," Paydar.

This movement has also published a book related to labour unions with the title *Union from Illusion to Reality*, which is necessary to look at before continuing the discussion. This book is not a theoretical or even a political discussion, but more like a kind of narrative and collection of materials for an educational course. It is not inappropriate that an employee of the social science library of the University of Hannover assisted in the selection of sources for the compiler. Farideh Sabeti writes in this context:

"Here, I find it necessary to sincerely thank Winfried Kullmann from the Social Sciences Library of the University of Hanover, who helped me in the selection of sources."<sup>119</sup>

The first pages of the book refer to the events in Germany in the early 20th century. With her narrative, Sabeti wants the reader to accept that the Spartacists were looking for a democratic republic. We will point out the strengths and weaknesses of the Spartacists in the discussion related to the events in Germany. Despite Sabeti's inversions, and the hatred that such movements have for the glorious October Revolution, she is forced to state that in 1918, workers in Germany sought the formation of **factory councils based on the model of the Soviet revolution**:

"In January 1918, a huge mass strike for the end of the war and the immediate establishment of a democratic republic was launched with the call of the Spartacists and the demand for an immediate end to the war, freedom of the press, assembly, strike and coalition rights, the release of all political prisoners and the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>119</sup> Union from Illusion to Reality, Farideh Sabeti – page 5.

formation of factory councils based on the model of the Soviet revolution."  $^{120}$ 

This movement acts as if the German bourgeoisie, that is, the slaughterers of the German revolution, the murderers of Luxemburg and Liebknecht, did not have a plan to save the bankrupt economy and were not ready to take advantage of the created revolutionary situation and establish a classless society. Contrary to Sabeti's inversions and demagoguery, the German bourgeoisie (German social democracy) had learned from the experience of the October Revolution and, with the help of the bourgeoisie of other countries, had a coherent plan to defeat the German revolution and, as a result, the world revolution, and it succeeded in doing so. Sabeti has proved with her narrative writing that she is really loyal to the tradition of inversion and demagoguery of the movement, which has a long history. She writes:

"In 1918, the strong public expectation from the Social Democrats was to eliminate poverty, hunger and disorder. To save the bankrupt war economy. But the Social Democrats were not ready for this and did not have a coherent plan to take advantage of the created revolutionary situation and build a classless society or even create a democratic republic."<sup>121</sup>

After the reversal of the events in Germany, it was time to reverse the nature of the unions. Sabeti states that unions are the economic representatives of the working class in real life, as sellers of labour goods:

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>120</sup> As source 119 – page 33.

 $<sup>^{121}</sup>$  As source 119 - page 34.

"The activity of the union in real life as mentioned is the economic representation of the working class as a seller of the good of labour power."<sup>122</sup>

Then the question is, who or what institutions are the political representatives of the working class in the opinion of this movement? In contrast to such subjugation in the age of capitalist decadence, we have only one type of class struggle.

More than a hundred years ago, Rosa Luxemburg emphasized this issue in her work titled *The Mass Strike, the Political Party and the Trade Unions*:

"There are not two different class struggles of the working class, an economic and a political one, but only one class struggle, which aims at one and the same time at the limitation of capitalist exploitation within bourgeois society, and at the abolition of exploitation together with bourgeois society itself."

With the patience of Job, we finally come to the discussion of changing the nature of unions. Sabeti tells a story without explaining why unions changed their nature. She states that the unions were the school of socialism in 1847, but with the passing of more than 150 years, they have distanced themselves from socialism, and the creation of a mass socialist movement by a union is an illusion. Sabeti writes:

"For example, in 1847, the unions were a school of socialism and they were leading a revolutionary struggle. No one denies this is the past, but the past should be put together with the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>122</sup> As source 119 – page 86.

present to see what has happened to it over time and where it stands now. Yes, more than 150 years have passed since then and many things have changed. During this long time, the union has moved away from that initial union and socialism and communism. And with these details, the vision of creating a socialist mass movement with the union is an illusion and does not fit with its current existence."123

Finally, we come to the main point of the matter, that is, the current nature of labour unions. Like other leftists, she claims that unions have a bureaucratic structure. She states that, of course, within the unions, not all leaders are bad people; among them, there are honourable people who want to promote the class interests of the workers, and the union itself is not a problem, but the issue is the bosses who oppress such leaders:

"Union leaders are not the same all over the world. Among them, there are honourable people who are workers themselves and want to do something for their class colleagues. They believe that there is no problem with the union itself, the problem is with the bosses, and a militant working class can force them to avoid the current conditions and lead an opposition labour movement and fight for the goals of the working class. This desire and even the only desire to defend the minimum interests of the workers is suppressed."124

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>123</sup> As source 119 – page 84. <sup>124</sup> As source 119 – page 85.

Apparently, the Trotskyists not only have a more radical position than the leftists who appear in the role of metamorphosed councilism, but also offer a solution: taking over the trade unions from within, cleaning out the corrupt bosses and replacing them with revolutionary leaders. Anton Pannekoek, in his valuable work entitled *World Revolution and Communist Tactics*, wrote a century ago about the nature and functioning of unions, stating as below:

"Marx' and Lenin's insistence that the way in which the state is organised precludes its use as an instrument of proletarian revolution, notwithstanding its democratic forms, must therefore also apply to the trade-union organisations. Their counterrevolutionary potential cannot be destroyed or diminished by a change of personnel, by the substitution of radical or 'revolutionary' leaders for reactionary ones. It is the form of the organisation that renders the masses all but impotent and prevents them making the trade union an organ of their will. The revolution can only be successful by destroying this organisation, that is to say so completely revolutionising its organisational structure that it becomes something completely different."

A large part of Sabeti's book is devoted to interviews with trade union officials in Germany, the Netherlands, France and England, which is not worth mentioning. This is despite the fact that the activists of this movement, if we want to use their own literature, are "shamefully silent" regarding labour struggles outside the control of labour unions and especially wildcat strikes. Addressing this amount of the book to interviews with the officials of the unions shows the institutionalized demagoguery and hypocrisy in this movement. We illustrate this discussion with a few specific cases to demonstrate where this movement and its allies stand in the real struggles of this upside-down capitalist world.

On 14<sup>th</sup> April, drivers of suburban trains decided to call a wildcat strike,<sup>125</sup> demanding the return of the train guards and safe duties. The strikers stated that they were defending their own safety and that of their passengers.

The Union for Service and Communications Employees (SEKO) found out about the wildcat strike but advised their members to show up for work, declaring the strike to be illegal. If unions are *organization* of the working class, why are wildcat strikes taking place? Why do workers leave their union? These false defenders of workers' rights issued the following statement:

"We have noted that an illegal strike is being planned and called for on the commuter trains in Stockholm. We assume that all our members will go to work."<sup>126</sup>

The SEKO also stated that it considered the organization of any illegal and wildcat strikes to be harmful to current negotiations:

"We are currently negotiating a new collective agreement for our members in the rail transport industry, which also includes our members in public transport in Stockholm. In the negotiations,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>125</sup> Wild strikes were common in Sweden in the 1970s, with about 300 wild strikes in 1975, but since 1991 they have been rare.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>126</sup> The Union for Service and Communications Employees

we pursue important issues to improve the conditions and working environment for our members. In that situation, organizing illegal and wild strikes hardly makes it easier to negotiate."<sup>127</sup>

Undeterred, the train drivers formed a strike committee, announced a three-day wildcat strike beginning at 3am on 17<sup>th</sup> April and set up a picket outside the central railway station. About 80% of drivers participated, with only those on probation, plus union representatives and activists, refusing. The position of drivers on probation is understandable because they would have been sacked, but if the *unions are workers' organization*, the union representatives and activists should have been in the front line of the picket. As a result of the strike, about 80% of suburban trains were cancelled.

There was incredible solidarity among the train drivers but also a lot of public support for the strike because it was about safety rather than about pay. Passengers understood the demands and concerns of the drivers.

The basic question that comes to the mind of every seeker of the truth is, at that moment, what were this movement and the friends of Paydar doing? Don't get the wrong impression that these friends were not following the Swedish political environment, but at that time, Paydar's friends, who also describe themselves as "anti-capitalist," were busy publishing an article entitled "From Anti-Capitalist Labour Internationalism to Fascist, Nazi Cosmopolitanism." The occasion of the publication of that article was that one of the members of the Sweden Democrats (an anti-foreign party) went to Ukraine and

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>127</sup> As source 126

participated in the war for the benefit of the Ukrainian army, and at that time, they wrote:

"Decades ago, when spontaneous anti-capitalism did not slaughter the world's workers by social democracy, bourgeois communism, and labour unions, and tried to search for and walk the right path of anti-capitalist struggle under the torch of Marx's radical teachings, yes, in those days, in the 1930s; only from Sweden, 2,000 workers secretly set out with determination and made their way to Spain to fight alongside the Republican regiment against Franco's fascist army and Hitler's Nazis."<sup>128</sup>

The above comment, not as an opinion, but as a fact, that is, a historical example that shows a certain reality, is worthless, like their other texts, because the figure of 2,000 workers is absolutely baseless. It was 600 Swedes, not workers, that left for Spain during the imperialist war; how many of these 600 were workers is unknown.<sup>129</sup> In the same way, it is not possible to consider the large number of people who travelled from Sweden to the war in Ukraine workers. In that case, the member of the Sweden Democrats party and former Member of Parliament who went to Ukraine would also be considered a worker. Leaving aside the misinformation aspect of the comment, the demagoguery and throwing dust in the eyes of the working class are important, i.e., the proletarianization of the Spanish imperialist war and

- The first resource is a humanities learning site for Swedish schools.
- The second is a Swedish history website.
- The third is the website of Swedish syndicalists.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>128</sup> The Telegram channel.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>129</sup> We checked this from several different sources, all of which emphasize the same 600 Swedes:

participation in the imperialist war under the title of "anti-capitalist labour internationalism."

Following the decisive victory of the "People's Front Republic" in the 1936 elections, the Spanish army prepared a coup under the command of General Franco against the republican government. During the coup, the workers of Barcelona armed themselves and stood up from their class ground to face it. But since the "proletarian front" dissolved in the quagmire of the anti-fascist front, all the political forces active in the working class demanded a fight against fascism instead of a class struggle. By accepting the struggle against fascism instead of the class one, many currents belonging to the working class joined the camp of capital forever and made the workers cannon fodder in the imperialist war.<sup>130</sup>

Contrary to the anti-fascism front, i.e., the different tendencies of the left of capital, the communist left stated that anti-capitalist positions should be determined so that the proletariat could gather around that class programme to fight against capitalism. The duty of the working class is to assemble around their class positions and fight against capitalism, regardless of its forms, whether dictatorial, fascist, democratic, etc.

Democratic historians describe the events in Spain in the late 1930s as a civil war, while leftists and anarchists evaluate it as the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>130</sup> During the events of May 1937, apart from the communist left, only a few Trotskyists around Munis and a small group of anarchists under the title "The Friends of Durruti" remained in the workers' front. The May movement revealed the true nature and role of anarcho-syndicalist leaders. The proletarian forces were in control of the streets for four and a half days; unfortunately, the labour forces lacked leadership and goals, and despite their fighting enthusiasm, the workers stopped a few metres from the Generalidad Palace and the workers began to retreat.

Spanish Revolution. For us the events of the late 1930s in Spain were neither a civil war nor a revolution, but an imperialist war whose two sides were formed by bourgeois factions, and it was considered an exercise for the slaughter of the working class in World War II. One side of the war front involved Franco with the support of German and Italian imperialism and the other consisted of the "People's Front Republic", which included Stalinists, anarchists<sup>131</sup> and the Workers' Party of Marxist Unification (POUM),<sup>132</sup> which was supported by the democratic imperialists.

During the wave of the world revolution and following the victory of the October Revolution, the CNT was able to gather the main forces of the proletariat in Spain and unite radical positions. When embracing the October Revolution, the CNT had shown its readiness to join the Communist International. But now, by turning around, it had accepted the bourgeois republic, which was itself an expression of betraying the working class and mobilizing the workers for the imperialist war.

Unlike the anarchists, Stalinists and other leftists, the communist left did not defend the republic at that time and did not

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>131</sup>The anarchists organized in the "Confederación Nacional del Trabajo" (CNT), which played an important role in suppressing the proletarian revolt in Barcelona, while anti-government champions entered the cabinet with four ministers. A very weak movement of anarchists in 1937 under the title "The Friends of Durruti" rose up to fight against the reactionary positions of the CNT and tried to remain loyal to the positions of the insurgent workers, but the CNT suppressed them as traitors.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>132</sup>The Workers' Party of Marxist Unification (POUM) was formed from the merger of the Trotskyists in the Izquierda Comunista de España (ICE) and the Workers and Peasants' Bloc (BOC) and was active during the Spanish imperialist war.

make the workers cannon fodder in the imperialist war. The communist left declared that "anti-fascism" was a formula for confusion and would only serve to obfuscate the positions of the proletariat and defeat the working class. Fascism would be able to seize power only with the defeat of the working class, so that social democracy after World War I, by suppressing labour struggles, and then Stalinism in the 1920s, by defeating the revolutionary struggles of the proletariat, prepared the ground for fascism.

The characteristic of the 1930s was the definite and temporary failure of the global working class and the preparation of the main imperialist powers for a global conflict. These paved the way for World War II.

Following the actions of Hamas on 7 October 2023, and the war in the Middle East, compared to other wars, Israel's brutality, which is carried out with the support of other democratic governments, is unfortunately having a more negative effect on the working class not only in the Middle East, but also in the whole world, and is poisoning the working class with nationalist propaganda and bourgeois pacifism. This is while the global working class has been trembling since 2022, and we have even seen an increase in wildcat strikes. The new conditions have created a good opportunity for trade unions or union leaders to present a militant image and gain some kind of credit and reputation. It is in such a context that the heads of the unions participate in peace and ceasefire demonstrations or call for strikes, in order to release the hidden anger and revolutionary potential of the workers and reduce their fighting spirit. Before continuing the discussion, let's see how Paydar's friends, who apparently do not accept labour unions either, demagogue and by republishing news about the strike of "workers for free Palestine" announce:

"More than four UK arms factories that produce fighter jet parts for Israel have been shut down by a strike by a thousand members of the trade union known as Workers for a Free Palestine... trade unions that include health workers, teachers, hospitality workers, academics and artists are calling for an end to arms sales to Israel and for the UK government to support a permanent ceasefire."<sup>133</sup>

One of the speakers was Mick Lynch, the radical leader of the National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers (RMT), who had mourned the queen's death and called off a planned strike. One of the same trade unions that called for a strike under the title "Workers for Free Palestine" was Unite, which pretends to be the good police.

Playing the role of police, by providing individual services on the one hand and suppressing workers on the other, is another part of the duties of the unions. In a recent example from the UK, i.e., in the democratic world, not a dictatorship, staff from the largest union, Unite, created a blacklist of workers whom they found to hold politically inappropriate view, which they provided to employers to prevent these workers from being hired, thereby ensuring the security of production and industry.<sup>134</sup>

The Guardian

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>133</sup> The Telegram channel.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>134</sup> Officials of the union Unite compiled a blacklist of more than 3,200 workers, in conjunction with 40 companies. Officials of the union divided the workers on their blacklist into three groups: "militant", "troublemaker" and with a warning to be "careful". The result of the blacklist was that many of the workers were left idle for a long time. Long-term unemployment has led to painful problems for these workers in the democratic country of the UK. *The Guardian* report can be read in the link below:

In the conditions of a stagnant class struggle, unions collate a blacklist of protesting workers to break their morale and confidence because the alternative is long-term unemployment. In the extreme conditions of class struggle, with the direct questioning of revolutionary workers, unions have fallen into the hands of the police; and, by questioning the most militant workers, through slander, defamation and even by considering themselves as policemen, revolutionary workers are attempting to undermine the class struggle. If necessary, as was the case with the German Revolution, they are responsible for the direct repression of workers by acting as a guard at the gates of capital.

And very briefly,<sup>135</sup> dialectically, why and how did trade unions change from vessels of labour struggle to the tools of the capitalist state? With capitalism entering the age of its decline, it was no longer possible to impose sustainable reforms on capitalism, and it could no longer bring about improvements in the life of the working class. After capitalism lost the possibility of imposing sustainable reforms, the working class faced a new historical situation that could only be overcome by abolishing wage labour and eliminating trade unions. Therefore, the class struggle for the abolition of wage labour made the dissolution of trade unions the order of the day. The only way unions could continue to survive in the new era was to integrate into the capitalist state and defend capitalist interests within the working class. The evolution of the union bureaucracy helped the state to absorb the unions within itself. Trade unions, like other institutions of capitalism,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>135</sup> For more information, refer to the article "Unions Against the Working Class."

such as the judicial system, education, etc., are part of the capitalist state.

The communist left movements, especially in Germany and the Netherlands, were able to achieve a very clear understanding of the changes of capitalism in the shadow of its development and take clear positions on trade unions, parliamentarism, national movements, etc.<sup>136</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>136</sup> The fact that after the 1920s the communist left of Germany and the Netherlands could not continue to defend the communist and proletarian positions does not diminish the value of their battles and consequently their achievements.

# Entryism in the Movement for the Abolition of Wage Labour

Entryism is a special policy on the part of the Trotskyists, according to which policy and their own assessment they infiltrate reformist parties, institutions and movements and, as they say, introduce their revolutionary programme into the mass organizations of the working class to fight against the reformism within them and, by radicalizing the reformist movement, lead it to the path that has a revolutionary programme and platform.

Following the crisis in the Worker-Communist Party in the spring of 1999, many of its members and activists left the party. Some of them, along with other leftist activists, sought to form a kind of union support organization which defined its goals as follows:

"The main goal of forming the Labour Foundation was to draw public attention to the news, developments, labour issues and problems in Iran and make it one of the central issues in society, including among the left, and to help the formation of independent labour organizations in Iran."<sup>137</sup>

The movement for the abolition of wage labour (at that time it called itself Today's Communist) knew the inviters and was familiar with their political positions and performance. However, it was involved in the establishment of the Labour Foundation. In other words, it wanted to influence it from within. Paydar, who has a long history of

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>137</sup> End of work statement of the Labour Foundation.

rewriting, explains their involvement in the establishment of the Labour Foundation approximately 20 years later:

"A few months after this event, some of the resigned members of the [worker-communist] party, along with Yadullah Khosroshahi and a number of other left activists, sent invitations to some people with the aim of holding a large conference in London. We were also among the invited. From the moment we entered at the conference, I realized that our coming there was strongly opposed by many. During the few years that have passed since the publication of 'The Face of Socialism,' the orientation of the publication against syndicalism and the union movement on the one hand, and the militant leftist reformism of party lords on the other hand, had created a wave of malice, enmity and opposition...When it was our turn to speak, an effort was made to explain the essential alienation of the entire existing left with Marxian communism and the abolition of wage labour, and this alienation and conflict in all aspects was taken from the narrative of socialism to explain the view of the labour movement and the various problems of the class struggle of the proletariat. The next part of the discussion was devoted to what should be done and how to establish and strengthen the homogenous anti-capitalist approach with the perspective of the abolition of wage labour in the labour movement. Marxian critique of the usual syndicalism and party lords caused most of the opposing speakers or even non-speakers but opposing guests to express their enmity and opposition with those words in a spiteful way during the conference in various ways. The result of this conference was an incomplete concoction of the syndicalist right called the Labour Foundation."<sup>138</sup>

The Labour Foundation was more like a gang to settle accounts with other leftists than a right-wing syndicate, and following a series of scandals, it was forced to announce its dissolution after a time. Despite tireless efforts, the policy of entryism and making changes in this group was defeated from within by Paydar's movement, and the Labour Foundation remained busy with its ultra-reactionary function. Many years after the liquidation of the Labour Foundation, Paydar only writes that the result of the conference was an incomplete concoction of right-wing syndicalism called the Labour Foundation. The fact that their names were recorded in the founding statement of the Labour Foundation and that Today's Communist activists (at that time, the movement was called this) were involved in the next conference and other activities of the Labour Foundation is consciously, and by resorting to the institutionalized tradition of inversion in this movement, omitted.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>138</sup> From Militant Religious Populism to Militant Populist Communism, Paydar – pages 394-395.

## A Well-Known Labour Figure or the Translator of Leader Capital

Before examining the desired anti-capitalism organizing of the movement for the abolition of wage labour, it is important to examine the role of one of the actors of the "anti-capitalist movement" in relation to it. Mohsen Hakimi is a writer, a member of the Iranian Writers Association, a leftist translator, and a workers and anticapitalist activist. First, let's see how Paydar and his movement got to know the partisans of the anti-capitalist movement and the workers' council organizer Hakimi. Paydar explains as follows:

"Among the many or few people who talked about anticapitalism and the council organizing of the working class, Mohsen Hakimi's name was the most popular."<sup>139</sup>

It was neither theoretical convergence nor closeness in the course of the practical struggle, but a kind of mutual benefit that put Hakimi on the side of the movement for the abolition of wage labour at that point. The movement for the abolition of wage labour was raised by Hakimi abroad, and he promoted the interests of the movement inside the country. This issue will be examined in the next chapter. Despite the fact that, according to Paydar, this movement was aware from the beginning of Hakimi's gross confusion and contradictions in his analyses and writings, as well as his self-opinionated, self-centred and anti-councilist personality, given the appeasement, opportunism

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>139</sup> "Replacing Class Struggle with Anti-Ideology," Nasser Paydar.

and bourgeois ethics institutionalized in this movement, the symbiosis between them was formed very quickly. As Paydar writes:

"But we had nothing to do with someone named Hakimi; we heard many things about him, including that he is very self-opinionated, self-centred, despite his claims, he is hostile to the council and against any councilist decision... Neither the gross confusion and contradictions in his analyses and writings nor what we heard from others from a distance, none of them stopped us making insisting and stubborn on the rightness of defending the efforts of the people crowd, the councilist organizing of the anti-capitalist movement of the working class, and criticizing and exposing the spectrum of right and left reformism."<sup>140</sup>

For Paydar's movement, the right opportunity had come to introduce Hakimi as a well-known labour figure and activist of the workers' anti-capitalist movement, especially in Western countries, and to arrange interviews with Western circles that were an amalgam of leftism, anarchism and councilism, or with the immigrant and refugee media. Paydar evaluates the criticism of his former comrades (once both were in the Communist Party) against Hakimi as the worst form of assassination of the personality and dignity of such a figure:

"Azerin in the text 'the no way of Socialism' under the name of criticizing Mohsen Hakimi has produced the worst distortions, falsifying all the facts related to the anti-capitalist movement and the abolition of wage labour of the working class, and in the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>140</sup> As source 139.

worst way has assassinated the personality and dignity of a wellknown and active figure of the anti-capitalist movement."<sup>141</sup>

Other members of the movement also published articles in defence of the well-known labour figure, namely Hakimi, and claimed that the slanders and defamations of other leftists against the famous labour figure had fuelled a wave of disgust among the conscious workers, and they wrote:

"The slanders and defamations of this sect against Mohsen Hakimi have fuelled a wave of disgust among the conscious workers of Iran."<sup>142</sup>

So far, we have noticed that other leftists, out of fear of the expansion of the anti-capitalist movement, attempted to assassinate a well-known figure of the labour movement in the worst possible way, and this issue generated disgust in conscious workers.

Due to the experiences gained and the popular protests in Arab countries, Hakimi wanted to extend the "anti-capitalist" attitude to Libya as well and at that point, he stated that if the people had overcome the weaknesses of the organizing of the council, they could have used North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) forces against the Gaddafi regime. The prominent figure of labour movment in an article entitled "Study of the Libyan experience" published in the 'Iran Tribune' on the 26<sup>th</sup> of January 2012, he reveals his extremely

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>141</sup> "Labour Movement, Yes, Against Wage Labour, No! Iraj Azarin and the Criticism of Mohsen Hakimi," Nasser Paydar.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>142</sup> "A Few Words with Comrades Ali Khedri and Mozafar Falahi," Jamshid Kargar.

reactionary and anti-communist nature in the form of a defense of NATO:

"In my opinion, getting help from an external force such as NATO is not wrong in this situation as long as the principle of the liberation of the people by themselves is not questioned... The Libyan people, considering the circumstances of their life, raised an armed revolt against Gaddafi's regime. In order to compensate for the revolt's weakness and inability, the progressive people in Libyan society should push it out to its widest and deepest limits, organising it independently and using the council of the people to direct it in the direction they wish. If this happened, it would also provide the right tactics which, using NATO forces, could be used against the Qaddafi regime... I disagree with the opinion that the Libyan people's movement would take the same actions with NATO as it did with Gadi's regime. The Forces that suppressed the people and spilled their blood belonged to Gaddafi's regime, not to NATO."

This "labour leader" of the reform movement (famous to the Second Khordad, 23 June) sees the intervention of external forces such as NATO as "help", rather than a clash of European and American gangs following their imperialist interests, vultures competing to pick the carcass.

This "non hero" and inferior advocate of capital disguised in "anti-capitalist" clothes, calls the rebellion led by criminals such as Gaddafi's former Justice Minister, Interior Minister and Foreign Minister, and others, the "armed rebellion of the Libyan people". Armed gangs, a tool in NATO's hands and in line with the interests of this imperialist institution, launched a dirty war, which disintegrated the structure of society, fuelled the pre-capitalist relations (tribal) in society and destroyed the need for independent Libyan working class movements, the working class could not actually be involved in developments. The Libyan war was by nature a war against the working class. This advocate of the reform movement in a country of advocates of the capitalist dictator was of course dubbed a "council activist", and plays his role well in sterilizing the struggles of workers and providing extremely reactionary and capitalist-friendly concepts in the decline of capitalism (imperialism), all while being named as a council and anti-capitalist activist.

Unfortunately, the "honeymoon" period between the wellknown labour figure, the anti-capitalist council activist and the movement to abolish wage labour soon ended, and with a twist of the pen, the former became the translator of leader capital. Paydar writes:

"A writer or leader capital translator who is a member of the mentioned association has a single meaning."<sup>143</sup>

In order for the transformation of a well-known labour figure into a leader capital translator to occur, the nature of Hakimi's movement had to be changed. Yesterday's anti-capitalist activist, believing in the movement for the abolition of wage labour, was transformed into a peaceful left-wing reformist or militant, such as Hakimi. Paydar explains this change in nature as follows:

"Demands can be the subject of struggle in two ways. The first form is the one that the entire right-syndicalist reformism, in

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>143</sup> As source 139

addition to the entire spectrum of peaceful or militant left-wing reformism, including people like Hakimi, put forward. They demand the realization of these expectations, in order to achieve the goal, as far as they can, they organize themselves in syndicates and unions, some establish committees, sometimes they call their syndicates and committees councils... The second form is the same as the anti-capitalist approach to the abolition of wage labour of the proletariat as its promoter."<sup>144</sup>

When we dig a little more, we realize that, according to the movement for the abolition of wage labour, the anti-capitalist lawsuit of the famous labour figure was apparently a tactic to deceive the workers and mobilize them behind the reformists and take individual privileges from them. In other words, in order for Hakimi to be able to extort from the writers' association or other reformist gangs (or in the literature of the movement for the abolition of wage labour, "take individual points"), he resorted to the tactic of deceiving the workers, and in doing so and mobilizing them behind the democratic reformers, he was able to implement his tactics. Paydar describes this issue as follows:

"His anti-capitalist claim was apparently a tactic to deceive workers and mobilize a few workers behind the democratic reformism of circles such as the writers' association, Mehranameh Quchani publication, or other reformist gangs and to score individual points from them."<sup>145</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>144</sup> As source 139.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>145</sup> As source 139.

In the early 2010s, the slogan "reformists, fundamentalists, the game is over" had not yet been raised, and the reformists<sup>146</sup> used the results of the presidential elections as an excuse and called the people the black army in the bourgeois power struggle. According to the movement for the abolition of wage labour, as well as the well-known figure of labour and yesterday's ally, this tendency not only called for a distinction between the bourgeois factions, in other words, that the reformist one should not be attacked, but it even recommended the hanging of the capitalistic government's lawbreaker. According to Paydar:

"During the outburst of mass protests after the elections, he demanded that the reformists and the dominant mafia of political power be distinguished, and on that day, he recommended that the latter should be attacked, but the former should be exposed. In those days, he considered the only reaction to the problems of capitalist society to be synonymous with anti-capitalist struggle!! He never made the legislature the object of a clear criticism against wage labour, and in some cases he not only condemned but even recommended the hanging of the capitalistic state on the gallows. Not only did he not throw away the wage slavery conventions of the International Labour Organization, but he also preached resorting to them."<sup>147</sup>

<sup>146</sup> The use of the term reformism here is merely a reference to the name with which these movements attribute themselves. Internationalists have no illusions that sustainable reform is not possible in the age of capitalist decline, and they are, like other bourgeois movements, reactionary.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>147</sup> As source 139.

Finally, we realize that Hakimi, whose character other leftists, fearing the spread of the anti-capitalist movement, attempted to assassinate in the worst possible way, fuelling a wave of disgust among conscious workers, in general is a distracted, turbulent and contradictory person who, in his political restless and theoretical excursions, has left some places, but has not reached anywhere. In other words, he is a political adventurer and vagabond in the beliefs of the movement for the abolition of wage labour. Paydar explains this issue as follows:

"Mohsen Hakimi's recent writing entitled 'Communism of the Abolition of Wage Labour in the Captivity of Marxism Ideology' is a manifestation of the intellectual confusion, chaos and contradictions of a human being who, in his restless political and theoretical excursions, has left some places, but has not reached anywhere."<sup>148</sup>

Finally, Hakimi, believing in the movement for the abolition of wage labour, engages in demagoguery and asks the workers to resort to the constitution of the Islamic bourgeoisie in order to save their lives, or, in terms of their labour activity, the agreements of the International Labour Organization (ILO). The famous labour figure and anticapitalist activist of yesterday also wanted to replace the Islamic bourgeoisie with a secular bourgeoisie instead of the revolutionary overthrow of the bourgeois government. In other words, he is an antidictatorship activist. According to the movement for the abolition of wage labour, a long list of his counter-revolutionary performances in all fields can be prepared, and at least in this case, the movement is

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>148</sup> As source 139.

right. The basic and fundamental problem is that, Paydar claims, he witnessed this long list, but he did not react and considers himself to blame for it. Let's hear the issue from the words of Paydar:

"He asked the workers of Iran to adhere to the 'International Labour Organization' agreements; he asked them to make the constitution of the Islamic Republic a covenant to protect their lives against the agents of this regime. He talked about agreeing with the criticism of the party, but he replaced establishing the party above the labour movement with establishing the committee. He made the replacement of the religious state of capitalism with the secular state of the bourgeoisie an alternative to the struggle for the complete overthrow of any type of bourgeois state, he even further demanded that the workers differentiate between the government reformists and their class rivals in the power structure and other issues that need not be listed... I should have explained the multitude of contradictions, illusions and fundamental shortcomings of what he said. I did not do this and I consider myself blameworthy. As to why I didn't do it, you can still make a list of reasons."149

For every seeker of the truth and serious person, the basic question arises as to why Paydar and his movement did not react against Hakimi's reactionary and anti-revolutionary actions, but also raised him to the level of a well-known labour figure and anti-capitalist activist, especially in Western countries. Contrary to the above statements, Paydar later claims in the same article that this trend only defended some of his actions and statements. But the reality is that

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>149</sup> As source 139.

Paydar wants to cover up an institutionalized tradition by considering himself to be blameworthy, by (somewhat) underestimating their defence of Hakimi. With a broken ego, Paydar personally takes responsibility for the mistakes, to cover up the appeasement, opportunism and bourgeois ethics institutionalized in this trend, which made this coexistence possible between them, and writes:

"I and the activists of the movement for the abolition of wage labour have defended some of Hakimi's actions and statements over a certain period of time. I personally take responsibility for all the mistakes made during this period."<sup>150</sup>

Paydar states that his defence of Hakimi has led to misleading and spreading illusions among the workers, and according to himself, this mistake is very deep and unforgivable, and he personally bears its burden. It is completely natural for a person or a political trend to make errors, as only those who do nothing do not. But Paydar tries his best to change the bourgeois culture, values and ethics, as well as opportunism, reversing, submission to the right positions, compromise, breaking the comradely values, etc., in other words, the leftist values that the tradition of the left of capital institutionalized in him and his movement, and reduce his actions to a mistake. Paydar writes:

"But my own very deep and unforgivable mistake also occurred, right here, within these calculations. In this mistake, none of the activists of the movement for the abolition of wage labour were involved, and I take the entire burden of this mistake on my shoulders without any modesty. What was wrong? Among the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>150</sup> As source 139.

discussed crowd, unfortunately, only Hakimi was speaking and the spectrum of right and left reformism was also advancing its raid against the organizing of the anti-capitalist workers' council, in the form of a campaign against Hakimi. I wrongly, without considering the very wrong and misleading consequences of my work, defended Hakimi against the attacks of reformism. This defence could certainly be true if at the same time all of Hakimi's contradictions and lack of intellectual restraint, in relation to his account of the anti-capitalist movement of the working class, were recounted very clearly and without any ambiguity but I did not do this and by necessity my defence of him, to the extent that it found listeners among the workers, actually became misleading and spread illusions."<sup>151</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>151</sup> As source 139

## The Anti-Capitalist Organization

The movement for the abolition of wage labour, with its reformist evaluation of trade unions, recommends anti-capitalist organization within the workers' struggle. We have already noted that this trend does not have a correct understanding of the change in the nature of labour unions and how to integrate them into the capitalist state, and this issue also affects its attitude towards anti-capitalist organization. If the leftists consider the anti-labour unions part of the workers' struggle and prevent the formation of the independent proletarian movement, the ones appearing in the role of metamorphosed councilism also do so in another way. Those who are against trade unions, especially in Western countries, evaluate the "anti-capitalist organization" within the workers' struggle, and the type they want is an amalgamation of a workers' committee with an informal syndicate. We follow this discussion with a specific case of the so-called anti-capitalist movement, the results of which can be extended to any other country, especially those in Western Europe. The movement for the abolition of wage labour believes that, following the growth and development of the anti-capitalist movement of the working class and especially following the announcement of the existence of the coordination committee to create an anti-capitalist organization of the working class in Iran, many groups attempted to consider themselves part of this movement. Paydar does not include the name of the committee by mistake, but because he consciously wants to place in the reader's mind the anti-capitalist organization of the working class:

"During the last one or two years, with the growth and development of the anti-capitalist movement of the working class, and especially following the announcement of the existence of the coordination committee for the establishment of the anti-capitalist organization of the working class in Iran, many sects and currents... have tried to consider themselves part of the anti-capitalist movement. It is very gratifying that the radical upsurge within the labour movement has brought these groups, sects and currents to this position."<sup>152</sup>

To understand the anti-capitalist movement intended by this trend, which was formed in reality, in the words of this faction, which at some point made a lot of noise about it, it is necessary to go back in time. Unlike leftist demagoguery and the political apparatus of capital, the election of Khatami was not "against the regime", but was rather a suitable alternative provided by the bourgeoisie for the special circumstances in Iran. Khatami, with his mottos of "reforms" in Iran and the "dialogue of civilizations" with the external world played a special role in the developments. Khatami wanted to play the role that the Democrats play in the West, i.e. a dictator. The rise of the reformist labour movement (famous as the Second Khordad, 23 June) and in line with the goals of the International Labour Organization, was the response of the Second Khordad (the "reformist" bourgeoisie) to the labour movement and workers' protests in order to deviate it and prevent its radicalization and advancement through legal channels, while also becoming a platform for the "reformist" gang of the bourgeoisie to take power.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>152</sup> As source 103.

The reformist movement failed, due to its historical limitations and time conditions, and a part of it metamorphosed into the opposition of reform. It is in such a context that dozens of circles, tens of public and semi-public committees and tens of false leaders of the labour movement were formed in the light of the reform movement. Paydar explains the conditions of that day years later:

"In the days before 1 May 2004, a group of syndicalist labour activists and members of militant left reformist movements in Kurdistan invited the speaker of last year's Labour Day in Karaj to go to Saqqez and speak at the ceremony of this day. As usual, it was attacked by the regime forces and nine labour activists, including the speaker, were imprisoned, and their captivity lasted for several days. During this period, many activities were carried out to support them abroad. Different circles and political groups, from parties to syndicalists, each took action from their position and point of view. We also did everything we could."<sup>153</sup>

At that time, the Islamic bourgeoisie wanted to become a member of the World Trade Organization, the condition of which was to cooperate with the ILO. Therefore, gaining the support of the ILO was important for the Islamic bourgeoisie, which took measures in line with the goals of the ILO. One of these was the introduction of government-created organizations under the name of labour organizations. It was in this context that the ILO recognized the Islamic labour councils as the representatives of Iranian workers. Some workers protested the ILO and the government in a statement, arguing that they were looking for non-governmental organizations. In

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>153</sup> As source 138 – page 398

continuation of these protests and activities, in February 2004, the follow-up committee for the creation of free labour organizations announced its existence. First, let's see how Paydar describes the formation of this committee years later:

"Activists in the leader circle were looking to hunt workers, to use their existence as a tool of their sect's power and their workers' name and symbol. It was in the scope of these hunts that a combination of nationalist circles and left reformism formed a committee named the 'Follow-up Committee...' and by collecting a sealed petition signed by more than 2,000 workers, through referring to government institutions, they demanded the legal agreement of the Islamic Republic to the establishment of labour organizations."<sup>154</sup>

At another point, Paydar describes the formation of the followup committee and also the reasons for the development of another one that had an anti-capitalist approach, which was created a few weeks after the follow-up committee:

"A group with syndicalist, reformist and sometimes leftist affiliations formed a committee under the name of the 'Followup Committee for the Creation of Labour Organizations,' [and] by attracting the support of about 3,000 workers and sending a petition to the Ministry of Labour of the Islamic Republic, they demanded legal recognition and the issuance of a licence for their freedom of activity. Syndicalists and some parties abroad

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>154</sup> "Six-Year Track Record of Organizing the Labour Movement of Iran," the activists of the movement for the abolition of wage labour.

immediately supported them and praised their efforts. A few weeks after this date, another announcement was published with the signatures of four labour activists, including two people with an anti-capitalist approach, attached to a list signed by 4,000 workers. The signatories spoke about the establishment of a coordination committee to establish a labour organization. Contrary to the founders of the first committee, they declared that the organization of the working masses is their inalienable right and the workers do not see any need to refer to the capitalist government and obtain legal permission."<sup>155</sup>

As mentioned before, getting the support of the ILO at that time had prepared the ground for the rise of the reformist labour movement, which in turn had laid the groundwork for the rise of dozens of public and semi-public movements and gatherings as well as leaders of the labour movement. The movement for the abolition of wage labour had nothing to do with workers and these circles. One of those who played an active role in the labour developments at that time, Hakimi, was the same "famous labour figure" or "defender of NATO" who was examined in the previous chapter. Paydar described this issue years later as follows:

"We had no connection with any of these workers. They were in Iran's capitalist hell, and we, the fugitives of that hell, spent our days in Western Europe or elsewhere, not to live, but to survive, hoping to influence our class's struggle against capitalism. We were not with those workers and we could not have any direct influence on their daily activities. The Internet was the only

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>155</sup> As source 138 – pages 398-399.

space for communication... Among the many or few people who talked about anti-capitalism and organizing the working-class councils, the name of Mohsen Hakimi was the most popular."<sup>156</sup>

After the existence of the follow-up committee was announced, Paydar criticized it from his own point of view, and stated that its dominant approach was syndicalist and an obstacle to the anti-capitalist approach of the working class. Paydar's article was critiqued by other leftists, leading to one of the four founding members of the coordination committee, namely Hakimi, also writing an article disparaging the follow-up committee, to defend Paydar's criticism. Paydar explains the beginning of the convergence of the movement for the abolition of wage labour with the "famous labour figure" as follows:

"After the announcement of the existence of the first committee, in the period in which the majority of syndicalists and leftist circles abroad, with enthusiasm, broke each other's heads to buy its participation shares [he means to become involved in it], I wrote a detailed article criticizing the dominant approach. In this article on the syndicalist nature of the leader party, and its destructive role in misleading the workers and blocking the path of the radical anti-wage labour approach of the working class, I finally pointed out that it is sterile and doomed to failure. This article fuelled a wave of opposition from the syndicalists and circles of bourgeois communism and the Paltaks [online discussions] of these groups became a place for cursing the author. At the same time, one of the four founding members of

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>156</sup> "Replacing Class Struggle with Anti-Ideology," Paydar.

the coordination committee stood up by writing an article defending our position and radically criticizing the follow-up committee."<sup>157</sup>

Following the announcement of the existence of the follow-up committee, some workers criticized it, as it addressed the International Labour Organization and the government instead of the workers. Therefore, shortly after that, four labour activists, one of whom was the "famous labour figure or leader capital translator," formed a coordination committee to create a labour organization. Although they addressed the workers, they sent a copy of their statement to the ILO, the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, Human Rights Watch, etc. They considered the negotiations of the ILO with the Workers' House<sup>158</sup> and the Islamic labour councils to be invalid and asked the labour organizations and progressive parties of the world to protest against this recognition:

"We consider the recognition of these anti-labour organizations not only contrary to the conventions of the ILO, but also a kind of participation [of the ILO] in the crime of these organizations. And, therefore, we call on the labour organizations and progressive parties of the world to protest against this kind of complicity of the ILO."<sup>159</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>157</sup> As source 6 – page 399.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>158</sup> After the writing of Iran's labour law in 1958, the Workers' House was established as a governmental labour organization. After the developments of 1979, the Workers' House, as a tool of the ruling government, has played an important role in suppressing labour activities and protests, and in international bourgeois assemblies, it pretends to be the largest union.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>159</sup> Statement of the Coordinating Committee to Form Workers' Organization.

Before continuing the discussion, it is necessary to see which social conditions caused the movement for the abolition of wage labour to form the coordination committee and how it describes its class affiliation and approach:

"Following the formation of the follow-up committee, another number of left activists and the labour movement with more or less different orientations, compared to the above approaches and in the course of referring to about 4,000 employed and unemployed workers, created an institution called the 'Coordinating Committee to Form Workers' Organization.' In the first declaration of its existence, this committee emphasized its belonging to the anti-capitalist approach, announcing that its work plan, of organizing the anti-capitalist movement of the working masses, postponing the organization of workers to the agreement of the government, and linking their struggles to the capitalist law chain, is rejected. By proposing these points, the founders of the committee pointed out their demarcation with other movements involved in creating syndicates or claiming to organize the labour masses."<sup>160</sup>

Contrary to the demagoguery of the movement for the abolition of wage labour, the coordination committee did not have, and could not have, the anti-capitalist organizing of the working masses' movement in its work programme. This was because this committee did not consider itself a labour organization, but a committee that wanted to strengthen the culture and spirit of the workers. In other words, it aimed

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>160</sup> As source 154.

to strengthen the culture and spirit of organization among the workers so that the latter could establish a labour organization. The Committee wrote in its presentation:

"The 'Coordinating Committee to Form Workers' Organization" is not a labour organization. The committee is composed of labour activists who fight for the following goals: 1-Paving the way for and creating Culture and the spirit of organization among workers in different ways including advertising, promotion, helping expand trade organizations of workers such as cultural, artistic and sporting workers, supporting workers activities and protests such as strikes and workers' control etc."<sup>161</sup>

With the beginning of the "Coordinating Committee to Form Workers' Organization" a statement was issued, which assessed it as a class and anti-capitalist response to the needs of the organization of the labour movement by militant and radical elements within the labour movement. In a radical break with all syndicalist and sectarian solutions among the masses of the working class, it proposed and propagated the necessity of creating a nationwide anti-capitalist organization of the working class. The signatories of the statement were among the activists of the movement for the abolition of wage labour, who declared their support for the formation of the coordination committee. The statement clearly explains the attitude of its exporters in relation to the coordination committee, describing:

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>161</sup>About "Coordinating Committee to Form Workers' Organization" published in the site of Committee

"The beginning of the work of the 'Coordinating Committee to Form Workers' Organization' stone by stone, in the process of a class and anti-capitalist response to the vital requirements of the organization of the Iranian labour movement. It is a measured step in consolidating the achievements of the radical and anticapitalist movement within the working class, and a hopeful move in igniting the united and organized struggles of the working masses, against wage slavery and against all forms of poverty, misery, injustice, oppression and discrimination of this system, in various realms of human social life. The members of the committee are all militant and radical elements within the labour movement. All of them are activists with a brilliant history of fighting against wage slavery and against all forms of capitalism's domination over people's working and living conditions. All of them believe that relying on the decisive and decisive power of the working-class struggle is the only way to impose the demands of the labour movement on the capitalists and their government. The activists of this committee, for their part, have tried to plan and promote the necessity of creating a nationwide anti-capitalist organization of the working class and the importance of a fundamental break from all syndicalist and sectarian solutions among the masses of the working class of Iran.

The Coordinating Committee to Form Workers' Organization has clearly stated that it will not postpone the continuous effort to organize the labour movement to obtain any kind of permission from the bourgeois government or any other capitalist institution. The activists of the committee have stated with full transparency that organizing against exploitation, misery and injustices caused by the capitalist system is the most obvious and primary right of the working masses, anywhere in the world, including in Iran.

The support of thousands of workers for the coordination committee's call to establish a labour organization in the very first step is clear proof of the readiness and broad capacity of the working masses to advance a united and organized struggle against the existing conditions of work and life, and a clear sign of their active vitality to fight against the capitalist system. At the same time, the widespread support of the workers for the call of the 'Coordination Committee...' is a very telling document about the baselessness of the arguments of all the reformists who deny the real readiness and capacity of the Iranian labour movement to exercise independent class power against the capitalists and the capitalist state.

We appreciate the formation of the coordination committee for the establishment of a labour organization and the broad reception from Iranian workers of this basic measure, and we declare our readiness to unhesitatingly support the efforts of the activists of the Iranian labour movement in this direction and in all other areas of the struggle against capitalism."<sup>162</sup>

We understand the opinion of the movement to abolish wage labour in relation to the anti-capitalist organization (coordination committee). The basic question that arises is, what kind of organization was the anti-capitalist organization from the point of view of the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>162</sup> From the statement "We Support the Coordination Committee to Establish a Labour Organization." The names of several people from Paydar's circle, including the name of Paydar himself, are among the signatories.

coordination committee itself? The committee believed that the anticapitalist organization should be created by the workers themselves and there was no need to obtain permission from the government (we will return to this issue later). The committee later requested permission from the government. It evaluated the council structure as the most suitable one for the anti-capitalist organization, and this will be examined in the next chapter. However, it did not limit the anticapitalist organization to the council organization and believed that other forms of organization such as committees, associations and syndicates can also be anti-capitalist organizations. The coordination committee explains this issue as follows:

"The desired organization of the 'Coordination Committee' is an anti-capitalist organization, which is created by the workers themselves without obtaining any permission from the government... The most suitable structure for such an organization is the council structure. However, the 'coordinating committee' does not limit the anti-capitalist organization to the council organization, and believes that other forms such as committees, associations and syndicates can also be anti-capitalist."<sup>163</sup>

According to the belief of the movement for the abolition of wage labour and in its imaginary world, the formation of the coordination committee and the expression of the anti-wage labour approach in it suddenly upset the balance of equations in the political atmosphere. Everyone felt the danger and declared that it was serious, urgent and certain. They all started to attack and in a short period of

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>163</sup> About the Coordinating Committee to Form Workers' Organization.

time, a large number of articles and even books were published against the movement for the abolition of wage labour, according to Paydar:

"The formation of the committee and the expression of the antiwage labour approach in it suddenly upset the balance of equations, everyone felt threatened and they shouted why you are sitting!! The danger is serious, urgent and certain!! In a short period of time, the amount of articles and even books that were published against the movement for the abolition of wage labour on the websites increased to tons."<sup>164</sup>

We are skipping over the articles, but as the books are described with a plural noun, we request that Paydar provide a list of these. Apparently, the movement for the abolition of wage labour has entered into an exaggeration contest with worker-communism. Disintegrating the coordination committee to create a labour organization was on the agenda of the leftists, leader party and syndicalists. They started a new tactic to dismantle the coordination committee to create a labour organization and wanted to do so from outside. In order to do so, they tried to hold few-member actions abroad and consider the paper support of unions to be the support of the international working class for the Iranian labour movement, describing the:

"Ridiculous actions full of lies by the few people of their sects abroad presented as the massive and nationwide support of the international trade unions of the Iranian labour movement. All of them have tried equally and in a united and complicit way to

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>164</sup> As source 6 - page 402.

disintegrate the coordination committee to create a labour organization."<sup>165</sup>

According to the movement for the abolition of wage labour, since this strategy of the leftists and syndicalists to break the committee from the outside did not work, they changed tactics to a combined attack, including striking from both the outside and the inside: following the announcement of the existence of the Coordinating Committee to Form Workers' Anti-Capitalist Organization, this anticapitalist organization was targeted by the Islamic bourgeoisie, syndicalists and the Tudeh-Majority gang<sup>166</sup> from the outside, and from the inside by left-wing reformism. The name of the committee Coordinating Committee to Form Workers' Anti-Capitalist Organization is not a typographical error, but was a conscious decision to emphasize the anti-capitalist goals of this committee. Since the bourgeoisie and syndicalists could not capture this committee, this fortress of the proletariat, from the outside, the task was assigned to the leftist reformists, who, like in the Trojan War, used a Trojan horse to enter the battlefield from within. But the left-like reformists, in their calculations to capture it from within, did not take into account an important issue, namely the reaction of the movement for the abolition of wage labour. As soon as the left-wing reformists began their bloody attack, the activists showed resistance, just as the followers of Marx reacted to the opposition of Bakunin and his supporters to the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>165</sup> "International Alliance in Support of Iranian Workers! And the Dismissal of Mehdi Kohestani."

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>166</sup> The Tudeh Party was pro-Soviet and acted in line with the Soviet foreign policy. The Majority organization also played this role after the split. Both fell to the level of intelligence appendages of the Islamic bourgeoisie.

destruction of the First International and defended it. Let's hear the story of this resistance, which is more epic than that of the Paris Communards, in the movement's own language:

"The workers who declared their existence under the name of supporters of anti-capitalist organizing, in the blink of an eye, were bloodily attacked from the outside by the bourgeois Islamic State and the Tudeh-Majority gang, and the right-wing syndicalists, and from the inside, in a much more effective and powerful way, by the spectrum of left-like militant reformism. The parties and circles of the recent spectrum brought the most elements and all their winning cards into the battlefield in the manner of the Trojan War and by using the leverage of the Trojan horse. The purpose of the war was clear for them. To capture from within what was wrongly created under the name of the 'Coordinating Committee to Form Workers' Anti-Capitalist Organization' of the working class... The activists of tendency of the abolition of wage labour, after observing this situation abroad, decided to resist against this bloody attack in the same space of the Internet."<sup>167</sup>

Seeing their fierce resistance, more left-wing reformists who were the occupants of the "Trojan horse" entered the bloody attack to crush the anti-capitalist councilist movement of the working class. An unwritten alliance was formed between the syndicalists, leader party, etc., to target Marxian communism and the anti-capitalist movement in the dirtiest and most vile ways. Let's hear the story of heroic battles in the words of the movement for the abolition of wage labour:

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>167</sup> As source 139.

"The preparation period continued, then the occupants of the 'Trojan Horse' of left reformism opened all the boards and began to fight bloodily against the anti-capitalist approach within the committee. Those who, after release from Saggez prison, were participating in a large meeting of Paltaki [on the Internet] shouted very loudly that the period of syndicate activity was over and they have been active in the anti-capitalist movement since this date, suddenly drew their swords and announced that the committee should erase the word anticapitalism from its identity and become a syndicate defender from head to toe!! Everything was clear. The dirtiest and most vicious conspiracies under the name of the left, communism, and workers fell out from behind the curtain, and a wide range of leader party and syndicalists gave their support to the victory of this brazen conspiracy. Everyone shouted 'Jaw al-Haq and Zahaq al-Batil<sup>168</sup> and they sanctified and praised the bloody syndicalist attack from the sects of bourgeois communism against Marxian communism and the anti-wage labour approach!!"169

In the course of the class battles, which took place within the coordination committee, the presence of a gleam of the anti-wage labour approach in the coordination committee created the conditions for entire parties, organizations and groups, as well as their syndicalist allies, to form a common nationwide front, which was highly incendiary and aggressive against the approach of the anti-wage labour

 <sup>&</sup>lt;sup>168</sup> Paydar has quoted the phrase from the Quran and verse 81 of Surah Al-Asra, which translates as "Truth came and falsehood was destroyed."
 <sup>169</sup> As source 6 – page 400.

movement. The allies attacked the anti-capitalist approach within the committee under the name of the committee's support for the establishment of any labour organization. In the shadow of this bloody attack of the allies and following the class battles, two approaches were essentially formed within the committee:

"The controversy between the two approaches on these issues engulfed the entire committee and all the efforts surrounding its existence. The truth was that the presence of a glimmer of an anti-wage labour approach or Marxian communism and the abolition of wage labour in the committee created the conditions for all parties and organizations and scattered and hostile groups of the spectrum of bourgeois communism, in addition to their syndicalist allies, to form a very inflamed common nationwide front to organize an offensive against this approach."<sup>170</sup>

During these class battles, between the two internal approaches of the coordination committee, each side accused the other of starting the war. The abolishing wage labour faction of the committee blamed the leftists and the syndicalists, arguing that the initiator of the war in the coordination committee was not the ally of this trend, Hakimi (the well-known labour figure), but rather the former party members, the syndicalists, who slandered the anti-capitalist approach within the coordination committee on TV shows:

"From his point of view, Mohsen Hakimi is the initiator of the dispute in the coordination committee!! But he himself is fully aware that the history of this conflict has its roots in the house

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>170</sup> As source 6 – pages 401-402.

of his former party members. They were the ones who falsified everything under the name of the assessment of the coordination committee and made the most baseless and hateful slander against the anti-capitalist activists. They were the ones who spent days and weeks writing materials whose purpose was nothing other than to help organize a conspiracy and hysterical attack against the anti-capitalist activists of the coordination committee... These TV shows were organized with the sole purpose of defaming the anti-capitalist approach within the Coordination Committee."<sup>171</sup>

We were reading the story of the heroism and epic resistance of the activists of the movement for the abolition of wage labour in front of the bloody attack of the left-like reformists, aiming to take over from within the coordination committee, and we were saluting them for their heroism in defending the anti-capitalist organization, when it was pointed out that the creation of committees above the heads of the workers is not compatible with the movement for the abolition of wage labour. This news was like a cold shower when we found out that the movement for the abolition of wage labour has been a critic of the creation of organization beyond the workers, under any name, including the committee. This faction only supported the positive aspects of the work of the anti-capitalist activists within the committee and did not hesitate these possible:

"It did not take long for the committee to announce its commencement and at the same time many individuals and groups supported the action of the founders. The spirit of this

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>171</sup> "A Look at the Benevolent Sermons of Farhad Shabani," Jamshid Kargar.

work, i.e., creating a committee and setting up an office over the heads of the workers, under the name of trying to organize this movement, was not compatible with what we believed as activists of the movement to abolish wage labour. From our point of view, the role of conscious and active workers is not to start building organizations apart from the masses of their class and their ongoing struggles and above them. It does not matter what the name of this created organization beyond the workers is, whether it is a party, a group, a committee or anything else. For us, this issue was worthy of criticism, but we tried to rely on the positive aspects of the work of anti-capitalist activists within the committee and while seriously supporting their work, let's plan whatever we can think and do whatever we can for their success."<sup>172</sup>

We have already observed that according to the movement for the abolition of wage labour, the coordination committee, the class and anti-capitalist response to the requirements of the organization of the labour movement and the militant and radical elements within it **were all activists with a brilliant background of fighting against wage slavery**, who, with a fundamental break from all syndicalist and sectarian solutions, proposed and propagated the necessity of creating a nationwide anti-capitalist organization of the working class among its masses. We also observed that after the formation of the committee, when the expression of the anti-wage approach in it suddenly upset the balance of equations, everyone felt threatened and began to attack the committee, and we also observed the heroic story of its defenders. Following the failure of the coordination committee project, the class

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>172</sup> As source 6 – pages 399-400.

and anti-capitalist response of militant and radical elements within the labour movement, against the brilliant background of the fight against wage slavery and all those class battles, with a twist of the pen suddenly became activists for the nationalist movement, the right to selfdetermination and people's democratization:

"The series of activists who founded and continued the work of the committee were all workers, but they were often not activists of the class struggle of the working masses against the capitalist system, they did not take their political nature from the heart of this struggle... the influencers, and the supporters of the work of the committee had spent a lifetime in political struggle, this life was lost not in the depth of the anti-capitalist movement of the working masses, but in other movements, in the nationalist self-determination, movement. the right to people's democratization, trans-class overthrow, syndicalism and the like."<sup>173</sup>

Activists of the movement for the abolition of wage labour had once announced that the coordination committee was the class and anticapitalist response to the vital needs of organizing the labour movement, in contrast to the syndicalist and reformist affiliations, that is, the follow-up committee. We were examining the basic issue of how the anti-capitalist partisans became the partisans of the nationalist movement when the activists of the movement for the abolition of wage labour proposed a new idea that it was not the class and anticapitalist response, but the competition with the founders of the followup committee that played a big role in the formation of the coordination

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>173</sup> As source 154.

committee, and by appealing to the tradition of opportunism and institutionalized culture in their orientation, they declared that the:

"Sect's competition with the founders of the follow-up committee played a big role in the formation of the second committee."<sup>174</sup>

On 11 April 2008, a general assembly of the coordination committee was held for the new organization and investigation of the crisis of the coordination committee. The name of the committee was also changed from "Coordinating Committee to Form Workers' Organization" to "Coordinating Committee to Help Form Workers' Organizations." Some members did not participate in this general assembly. In other words, a kind of unwritten division was formed, and in reality, two committees continued to operate in parallel for a while with slight changes in the name:

- Coordinating Committee to Form Workers' Organization (the movement of anti-capitalist activists)
- Coordinating Committee to Help Form Workers' Organizations (the labour movement activists)

The question that arises at this point is, how does the movement for the abolition of wage labour evaluate the committee with the new name, or in other words, the one without the anti-capitalist movement?

"The self-expression of a phenomenon called the Coordinating Committee to Help Form Workers' Organizations was just a deception."<sup>175</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>174</sup> As source 154.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>175</sup> As source 154.

The Coordinating Committee to Help Form Workers' Organizations (the labour movement activists) later registered the committee as a legal labour organization with the Ministry of Labour, but received a negative response. While protesting their decision, the committee also filed a complaint against Iran with the International Labour Organization to pursue the matter. The executive board of the coordination committee writes in its report:

"In line with the consolidation and stabilization of the coordination committee and according to the decision of the fourth General Assembly, we requested the registration of the coordination committee to help create labour organizations from the Ministry of Labour. After the negative response of the relevant body, this issue was followed up by us in another letter, while protesting against this decision; we sent a copy of it to the International Labour Organization to follow up on the matter and officially complained to Iran."<sup>176</sup>

The important political scandal was not the act of registering the Coordination Committee as a legal labour organization with the Ministry of Labour by the labour movement activists, but that it was done by the anti-capitalist movement. The anti-capitalist movement of the coordination committee called for the creation of labour councils under the name of the Islamic labour council<sup>177</sup> in the Iran Khodro

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>176</sup> Report of the Executive Board to the Annual General Meeting of the Coordinating Committee to Help Form Workers' Organizations.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>177</sup> Islamic work councils are legal institutions in the workplace and their role is to prevent disruptions in workplaces and spy for security institutions. They are highly disliked among the workers.

company,<sup>178</sup> considering this issue a step forward for the workers and their organization, and even emphasized that the workers of Iran Khodro would welcome this:

"In the current situation, the reality of accepting the real organization of workers in Iran Khodro under the management of this company, even under the name of the Islamic labour council, is a step forward... In the current situation, the mass of workers of Iran Khodro, in the face of the current disorganization and helplessness (i.e., worse situation) will welcome the establishment of their desired labour council (i.e., a bad situation)."<sup>179</sup>

This political scandal, in the name of anti-capitalist workers, was very disgusting, because the Islamic labour council is not even comparable to government organizations, but is an institution whose purpose is to spy on workers for security institutions and works for the ideological advancement of Islamic bourgeois positions in the workplace, an institution that is very infamous among workers. The political disgrace of the anti-capitalist workers was so disgusting and nauseating that it also generated a response from the movement for the abolition of wage labour. In this regard, the movement writes as follows:

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>178</sup> Iran Khodro Industrial Group is the largest automobile company in Iran, which manufactures different products and is one of the most important sectors in Iran after the oil industry.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>179</sup> "Iran Khodro Workers on the Verge of Organizing: Coordination Committee for Creating a Labour Organization."

"The committee's advice to the workers to go to the Islamic labour council, apart from its capitalistic and reformist nature, also raises important questions. The first question is what will be the task of the committee after several years of intense and severe claims about being anti-capitalist, and sticking to the issue of organizing an anti-capitalist council of the working masses? This is a very important question. How can anticapitalism and the struggle to establish an anti-wage organization come out of the Islamic labour council?!! The committee seems to have camouflaged its many contradictions, confusions and mess over the years."<sup>180</sup>

With the passage of time, more information and new opinions were published by the movement to abolish wage labour in relation to the coordination committee. By examining the new opinions, we come to the conclusion that the entire coordination committee, including the "anti-capitalist" faction within it, resorted to the labour law, the "legal" scaffolding of the capitalist state, with appeasement and the ILO conventions. But the activists of the movement for the abolition of wage labour, by appealing to the culture of opportunism and the decadent leftist tradition institutionalized in it, claim that they were the only approach that stood in front of all this appeasement of the committee:

"We, the activists of the movement to abolish wage labour, were the only approach that, for example, protested the entire

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>180</sup> "Getting the Iran Khodro Workers Organized and the Reformism of the Tudeh Party," the activists for the abolition of wage labour.

coordination committee, including the 'anti-capitalist' tendency within it, resorting to the conventions of the ILO, the appeasement of this institution and the current, with the labour law. We criticized very seriously and deeply the recourse to the 'legal' scaffolding of the capitalist government or the 'labour law' of that government, etc."<sup>181</sup>

The follow-up committee for the creation of labour organizations, the Coordinating Committee to Form Workers' Organization and the Coordinating Committee to Help Form Workers' Organizations all fell apart. Today, they exist only on paper, and each of them has a Telegram channel, which publishes news articles. Unlike other times when the bourgeoisie suppresses a labour organization, apart from its approach, performance and direction, in this specific case, the main reason for the collapse of the coordination committee was its internal contradictions. Of course, the activists of the movement to abolish wage labour admit that the anti-capitalist approach of the coordination committee contributed to its collapse, or in other words, played a role in it. All this implies that bourgeois repression did not have a part or was a secondary factor. Some of the activists of the committee had been persecuted by the Islamic bourgeoisie before the formation of the committee, and the suppression of the coordination committee was not to the extent that it caused its collapse. The activists of the movement to abolish wage labour explain the reasons for the disintegration of the coordination committee as follows:

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>181</sup>"Tudehism of the 'Coordinating Committee to Form Workers' Organization' and the Ugly Opportunism of Some Left Reformism Circles," the activists of the movement to abolish wage labour.

"It wasn't long before the 'coordinating committee...' fell apart. The campaign of the parties, alliances and syndicalists achieved the set goals and the partisans returned to their bases safely!! Why did the committee break up? Undoubtedly, the nationwide invasion of the coalition of left reformism and syndicalism played a major role, but more importantly, the very weak position of the approach to the abolition of wage labour. A large number of workers of various factories who welcomed the formation of the committee and wanted to take a step for the anti-capitalist organization of the chained masses were very discouraged when they faced the conflict within the committee. After seeing the usual pattern of cult games, leaders of the party and their unnamed alliance with the right reformists, they came to the conclusion that they had the wrong address and left the scene very soon. Some of the anti-capitalist activists were crushed by the regime, and finally, the shortcomings, mistakes and unrefined biases in the anti-capitalist approach also contributed to the collapse of the committee and the success of the parties' campaign."182

After the collapse of the coordinating committee, the movement to abolish wage labour admits that it exaggerated about the anticapitalist or anti-wage labour tendencies within it. The activists of this trend, aiming to advance the movement not by using the method of the capitalist police, but by attacking the spectrum of reformism inside and outside the country, completely emptied the field and what remained were the same reformists. The same remaining people, who were from the reformists, started shamefully supporting the Islamic labour council

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>182</sup> As source 6 – page 403.

and the reformists. The movement to abolish wage labour describes the sad and unfortunate situation as follows:

"We admit that our assessment of what was called anti-capitalist or anti-wage labour within the Coordination Committee had serious weaknesses and deficiencies. We were aware of many of the reformist movements' weaknesses and shortcomings and criticized them wherever necessary, but the problem was actually far beyond these limits. Later experiences showed that, despite their significant number, the labour activists within this tendency, sometimes faced with a broad, nationwide and rebellious attack of the reformism spectrum inside and outside the country and within the coordination committee, completely emptied the square and what remained under this name were no longer the real activists of the anti-capitalist approach, but the person or persons from the ranks of other right and left reformists accompanying or criticizing them within the left spectrum and within the same coordination committee. The latest text of the charter of basic demands published by them, some of the so-called 'analyses' and their words about the street riots after the elections, are so far more disastrous than all their recent positions on the Islamic labour council and their latest, very shameful and disgraceful support of the reformists and... everyone showed that they had no similarity with the real anticapitalist movement of the working class."183

The movement for the abolition of wage labour does not only speak of the "expedient-minded encounters" or the "be silent till the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>183</sup> As source 181

end" attitude of its activists, but also their dressing and covering up of the "fundamental and destructive slippages" of the anti-capitalist tendency of the coordinating committee by the activists of the movement to abolish wage labour as well. This is the bourgeois morality, appeasement and institutionalized opportunism in this movement that we have repeatedly pointed out. Of course, their argument is similar to the Trotskyist entryism that we examined earlier. They justify that perhaps the activists of the movement for the abolition of wage labour could influence the anti-capitalist approach in the process, and the anti-capitalist approach would change from a reformist foundation to an anti-wage one. Activists of this movement, with their appeasement, opportunism, compromise and expedient attitudes, describe themselves as follows:

"The mistakes, skewed thinking and expedient approaches of the activists of the tendency of the abolition of wage labour, outside the fence of the committee, can also be seriously criticized in their place. These people, in spite of years of extensive struggle, against right and left reformism, and any kind of party building or committee creating over the workers' heads, seeing the presence of anti-capitalist approach, kept silent till the end in the process of forming the committee !!! They had no connection at any level with the committee and its formation process, but they could criticize the reformist foundation contrary to its principles against wage labour, while they put the seal of silence on their lips. People's argument was mostly that maybe the anti-capitalist approach would change the way of work in the practical process, an argument that was completely false and lacked a materialistic basis against wage labour. The range of

mistakes and errors of the activists of the tendency of the abolition of wage labour outside the committee was not limited to this. Despite observing the wrong policies and orientations of the anti-capitalist activists of the committee they practically focused the entire criticism on the opposite spectrum, i.e., right and left reformism. Within the committee, they refused to explain and expose the mistakes of anti-capitalist activists and in many cases, they even covered up their basic and destructive slips."<sup>184</sup>

Following the collapse of the coordination committee, and the resulting silence, it became necessary to sanctify the movement for the abolition of wage labour, despite the fact that it raised some criticisms about itself, regarding the coordination committee and the anticapitalist movement. It was in such a context that the movement for the abolition of wage labour denied any organized connection with the coordination committee or the so-called "anti-capitalist" movement within it. It announced that, according to their view of communism, the activists of this movement have condemned the idea of building a committee or any cult above the labour movement:

"Activists of the tendency of the abolition of wage labour have never, under any circumstances, of any type and at any level, had an organized group relationship with the coordination committee or the so-called 'anti-capitalist' trend inside it and its continuation inside Iran, and in the base of their work and their way of looking at the communism of the working class, they

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>184</sup> As source 154

have declared the creation of committees or the creation of any kind of sect, party and institution above the labour movement to be false, reprehensible and rejected."<sup>185</sup>

Finally, Paydar admits that he was not engaged in anti-capitalist campaigns and the defence of Marxist positions, or in class battles with proletarian principles, but was involved in "common sectarian gossip" and in these sectarian disputes, even he has not respected the "privacy of personal rights" but has made "unjust accusations" instead of arguments. This is the same bourgeois morality, the decadent culture of the left of capital and institutionalized opportunism, in this movement that we have repeatedly pointed out. Paydar writes:

"I absolutely do not claim that, in writing the text and writing the answer, I am free from the impurity of common sectarian gossip, defending the privacy of personal rights, or removing unjust accusations and the like."<sup>186</sup>

With the investigations we undertook regarding the follow-up committee as well as the coordination committee, apart from its internal movements, the following basic question arises: were the workers unable to do anything at that point? Have all their efforts been aimed at spreading illusions and creating deviations in the class struggle? The answer to both questions is absolutely negative.

Unionism and syndicalism are recommended by the leftists to prevent the independent struggle of the workers (independent means

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>185</sup> As source 181.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>186</sup> As source 139.

independence from any capitalist institution and not just the capitalist state). In order to channel the workers' struggle towards unionism and syndicalism, the leftists appearing in the role of metamorphosed councilism, by introducing institutions that are a mixture of committees and illegal syndicates under the title of anti-capitalist organization, prevent the formation of independent workers' struggle in another way. Unfortunately, in order to create a barrier against independent labour struggle, both complement each other.

Unionism and syndicalism do not need additional explanation, but the movement for the abolition of wage labour creates demagogic illusions, as if it is a concoction of the committee and the illegal syndicate is the labour council, which they wanted to establish as an anti-capitalist and nationwide worker organization. If the same coordination committee had abandoned the exaggeration and illusions related to the creation of a nationwide organization and its propaganda, which was meeting the needs of the leftists and reflecting the reality of the protest, it could be in line with the expansion of the class struggle. In the course of the class struggle, especially at the beginning, no one is free from mistakes or defects. The very existence of labour struggle is the first victory. When increasing numbers of workers are involved in labour committees, strike committees, independent public assemblies, etc., this causes more workers to discuss or even argue about advancing the struggle and labour issues. It is during these discussions that the workers come to the conclusion that they can lead protests and strikes independently, and as a result, they are able to organize independent struggle and create appropriate forms of organization, according to the level of class struggle. It is only in the process of struggle and the confrontation of workers with deviations

that the workers' struggle is strengthened and raised to a higher level every day. In the evolution of the class struggle, there comes a point that it becomes so acute that it challenges the capitalist system. The introduction of an amalgamation of the committee and illegal syndicate, the movement for the abolition of wage labour and its sympathizers under the title of a workers' council, is the subject of the next chapter's examination of how this leads to the political disillusionment of the workers.

### Labour Councils or Caricatures Called Councils

After analysing the desired anti-capitalist organization of the movement for the abolition of wage labour, examining the labour councils of this faction is important. It is not only the left of capital that drags the ideas, ideals and values of the proletariat into the mud; the leftism that appears in the role of metamorphosed councilism, including its versions, is equally involved. The content and nature of labour councils, created by the leftists appearing in the role of metamorphosed councilism, whether in metropolitan or peripheral capitalism, are devoid of the Marxist concept. Therefore, it is necessary to explain or defend, however brief, the Marxist concept of labour councils before continuing the discussion.

Workers' councils are the highest form of labour organization. When the class struggle develops at a higher level and the two social classes challenge each other, the bourgeoisie is incapable of continuing to rule, while the proletariat has yet to overthrow capitalism. Under certain historical conditions, namely, when the state of a society has a dual power, workers' councils will be formed. In such a situation, workers' councils are formed to take control of factories and neighbourhoods from the bottom up and present themselves as alternatives to capitalist power. Workers also form organizations to defend their councils, which are **the earliest spins of the dictatorship of the proletariat**.

Workers' councils were formed in 1905 and 1917 in Russia and in 1918 in Germany. It is necessary to point out that the growth of the working class is not linear, so the working class offers different political tendencies, which is quite natural. It is important to note that councils do not necessarily have the reversal of capitalism and the conquest of political power on their daily agenda. The reason for this, as previously stated, is that workers' councils include different political tendencies, perhaps among the majority, along with non-revolutionary tendencies. For example, in December 1918, in Germany, Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht were not even allowed to attend the Congress of Councils to address the audience. Both in Russia and in Germany, it was only due to the tireless activity of revolutionaries that anti-revolutionary or "wobbly" representatives were set aside, to be replaced by revolutionary representatives on revolutionary councils.

Outside the ventricle of society, the possibility of managing a factory by a workers' council under the capitalist system, even in the metropolis of capitalism, is just an illusion. It is not possible to create a separate island within the framework of capitalist relations that is not governed by the rules of capitalism. Capitalism is a dominant global production system which has penetrated even the worst periods on the planet.

With the fall of the Berlin Wall and the collapse of Stalinism, a large number of Stalinists shifted towards social democracy and other capitalist right movements, but there were circles or movements that metamorphosed in the other direction, although the metamorphosis of these circles was very slow. One of these circles was the movement for the abolition of wage labour, which became "councilist." It replaced the word "people" with "workers" and the "people's democratic republic" with the "Workers' Soviet Republic." Instead of the people's democratic republic, which it promoted in the Nabard group, it placed the slogan "Long live the Workers' Soviet Republic" on its website. It modified the same minimum programme of the people's democratic republic with some changes and presented it under the title of Workers' Soviet Republic. The movement for the abolition of wage labour explains the metamorphization of organizations and groups as follows:

"Many organizations and groups also started manipulating their terms and modifying their political literature, for example, they became councilists!! They put the workers in the place of the people and replaced the 'Soviet Republic of Workers and Toilers' with the People's Democratic Republic!"<sup>187</sup>

These individuals also became councilists in the same way they described and claimed that the councilist movement is not a phenomenon that should be created, but is alive and present, although weak, everywhere in the life of the labour movement.

"The councilist movement is not a phenomenon that should be created. This movement exists but is weak, broken and walking with a stick in the general life of the labour movement of Iran and the world."<sup>188</sup>

According to the tendency of the abolition of wage labour, since the councilist movement exists everywhere in the life of the labour movement, it is therefore possible to establish a councilist movement in any conditions. We skip the contradiction that this movement claimed above, that although weak, there is a councilist movement in the whole world. However, this faction claims, those who consider the formation of councils a product of the period of elevation and acquisition of political power negate socialism as a movement, and do

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>187</sup> As source 154.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>188</sup> The Face of Socialism, No. 4.

not consider the struggle for socialism to be the current affairs of the working-class masses. Accordingly, it asks, why shouldn't the workers demand **a free, prosperous and equal life** right now?

"Is it possible to establish a councilist movement under any conditions?

This is one of the most basic questions that are raised in relation to councils and the practical plan of their organization. Most of the left currents consider the councils to be only spontaneous labour organizations during the period of promotion and gaining political power. This view, as we have said many times, implies the negation of socialism as a movement, and does not consider the struggle for socialism to be the current affairs of the workingclass masses. We reject this theory, and we consider the establishment of a councilist movement with urgent demands corresponding to the equipping of the proletariat for the socialist revolution to be a constant matter of the working class of the countries, as why shouldn't the workers demand a completely free, prosperous and equal life right now?"<sup>189</sup>

The idea of a "completely free life" is one of the inventions of this trend and is very meaningless and absurd, like the campaign promises of parliamentarians intended to heat up the oven before the election circus. There is nothing "free," but everything that appears to be free is paid for by the surplus value of the workers. Apparently, for this trend, socialism is equivalent to a completely free, prosperous and equal life for the members of society. The question then arises as to where the welfare of the society comes from. Contrary to the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>189</sup> As source 188.

demagogues of this tendency, in a socialist society, all human beings capable of working are workers in the sense of the active noun, that is, workers, not sellers of labour power. In other words, work as a social activity replaces wage work. Luxemburg explains this issue as follows:

"Socialism cannot be realized with lazy, careless, egotistic, thoughtless and shiftless men and women. A Socialist state of society needs people every one of whom is full of enthusiasm and fervour for the general welfare, full of a spirit of self-sacrifice and sympathy for his fellow men, full of courage and tenacity and the willingness to dare even against the greatest odds."<sup>190</sup>

We pointed out that, according to this tendency, the councilist movement is capable in any conditions and although it is weak, it exists everywhere. Therefore, in line with the examination of the labour council of this trend, we will examine one specific case, so that in the light of social events, the performance of the labour council of this trend can be better exposed to the public. On 1 May 2008, the news of the formation of the "GRUNERLØKKA Council, a spark in the dark" was published on the website of this movement. Upon reading this news, the idea arose that if at the beginning of the 20th century in 1905 St Petersburg became the flagship of the workers' council movement, in the beginning of the 21st century, Oslo (Grunerløkka is a neighbourhood in Oslo) could become the flagship of the workers' council movement. Capitalism was challenged not in the peripheral type but in Western Europe, in the metropolitan form. Not in the weakest circle of capitalism, but in one of its strongest, the workers had

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>190</sup> What is Bolshevism? - Rosa Luxemburg

raised the banner of the councilist movement. All the hopes were that this council would flow like an avalanche from Northern Europe to Southern Europe and then spread to other regions of this earth. The horizon of the councilist movement had been opened; a great amount of propaganda was produced in relation to it. In order for the conditions of the formation and the wishes and demands of the council to be better presented, and to leave no room for any bias, we have decided to provide the statement of the formation of the council as well as its wishes and goals directly from the words of the council itself:

#### **"Formation of GRUNERLØKKA Labour Council**

Today, 1 May 2008, we announce the formation of GRUNERLØKKA district labour council. The goal of the GRUNERLØKKA Workers' Council is to become an organ of workers' power and to continuously strive to establish other workers' councils in the workers' centres and establish cooperation between them. The formation of this council shows that the time has come for us to settle the score with the union movement. Since 2008, the closure of labour centres, the pressure on the living standards of the working class and the creation of difficult conditions in working environments has reached its peak. Many efforts made by the labour body to prevent these attacks were silenced by our own labour unions. We lost work and production centres, our rights to sick leave law and additional pay for overtime were attacked, some days of annual leave were taken from us together with our cook colleagues, and the ground was created for temporary contracts. Despite the fact that we paid several thousands of kroner annually for union membership, we witnessed the withdrawal of

workers' welfare facilities, one after another. It is because of these issues that we decided to withdraw from the union and form our own labour council, in order to provide grounds for building solidarity among workers to prevent employers from attacking our workers' living standards. The trade unions have shown that creating solidarity among the ranks of our workers is not only not important for them, but they have actually divided our ranks.

We, the workers organized in the GRUNERLØKKA Labour Council, call all the workers to establish independent labour councils in the work and production centres. Also, we call on all the workers of the GRUNERLØKKA neighbourhood to join the labour council of this neighbourhood.

The GRUNERLØKKA Labour Council

#### Our demands

- 1. Pay extra wages to workers who are engaged in dangerous work during working hours.
- 2. Any plans and programmes on the part of the employer that lead to changes in the conditions of the working environment must be approved by the general assembly of the council.
- 3. Any transfer of people and changes in the work environment without the intervention of the council must be stopped immediately.
- 4. The minimum wage of the workers working in GRUNERLØKKA neighbourhood should not be less than 150 crowns per hour.

- 5. Contract workers must have formal jobs; otherwise their wages must be equal to the wages of formal workers.
- 6. Teacher workers and other workers working in schools should be fully paid during school holidays.
- 7. Employ cooks in centres that need cooks.
- 8. At least 500 kroner per month for work clothes.
- 9. Vacancies in labour centres must be filled quickly.
- 10. All budgets related to salary increases should be national and not divided among local municipalities.
- 11. A contract worker should be hired to fill the place of a sick worker from the first day of the declaration of the worker's illness.
- 12. At least nine additional days off for workers who work with children, the disabled and mentally ill.
- 13. Immediate stop of any discrimination in work and production centres.
- 14. The employer must pay the wages during the strike in full.
- 15. The activities of labour councils in labour centres should be considered a job and the employer is obliged to pay for the activities of these councils.
- 16. Any hiring of new workers must be done in consultation with the representative of the workplace council.
- 17. Service centres such as kindergartens and schools should be constantly growing and developing without making the working conditions of these centres difficult."

Among the actions that this council succeeded in doing during its lifetime, the following can be mentioned:

- Issuing an invitation to the 1 May demonstration in the city square on the online forum<sup>191</sup>
- Advertising a public meeting related to the council and council organizing on the online forum<sup>192</sup>
- Condemning the arrest of anti-capitalist activists in Iran.<sup>193</sup>

Another very important and anti-capitalist action of the council was to write letters to employers about increasing the wages of workers who were members of the council as well as those who were not members of any union. In other words, the council wanted to increase the wages of its members as much as those of the unions, and emphasized that it would not tolerate any discrimination between the wages of its members and the members of the unions:

"In an official letter dated 25 August, signed by 40 workers, members of the GRUNERLØKKA Labour Council announced to the employers of the GRUNERLØKKA district that it wants an increase in the wages of the council members and all workers who are not members of any union. In this letter employers are warned that the council will not tolerate any discrimination between the wages of its members and those of union members and will fight against such evils in every way it can."<sup>194</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>191</sup> Invitation to 1 May demonstration.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>192</sup> Public meeting announcement.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>193</sup> In the announcement, the GRUNERLØKKA Labour Council condemns the arrest of anti-capitalist activists.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>194</sup>"Our Labour Council and Mercenaries' Attitude to the Trade Union for Capital."

In the council's response letter, the employers informed the labour council that the negotiation process on the wage increase had ended and the wages of the council members and workers who are not members of any union had been increased, in the same way as all other workers. In other words, the employers had bargained with the unions and had reached a certain figure to increase the wages of all workers. Later, it turned out that the service union had informed the employers that the wage increase only included the members of the service union and that those who were not members of the union were not included in the negotiation process and would therefore not receive the wage increase. The union wanted to punish its former members who had left it and now called themselves the council, and tried to prevent them from getting a raise. But this demand of the trade union was opposed by the "fair," "compassionate" and "justice-seeking" employers. In other words, the employers stood up to defend the rights of the members of the council against the trade union. One of the council members explains the matter as follows:

"Employers have responded negatively to this capital-friendly, treacherous and mercenary-driven demand of the service sector union leaders."<sup>195</sup>

It was a big step forward that some members, activists and union representatives realized the anti-worker nature of unions and left them and sought non-union struggles to defend their standard of living.<sup>196</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>195</sup> As source 194.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>196</sup> We will not enter here into the issue of how some of the founders of the council were activists and union representatives until the time of its formation, when they began to consider themselves anti-capitalist, and were apparently against labour unions. This issue can only be explained by the decadent leftist tradition and institutionalized hypocrisy in this tendency.

However, placing an organization whose basic rights are defended by employers in front of anti-labour unions as a workers' council is throwing dust in the eyes of the working class and is demagoguery. If leaving the union and starting an independent struggle was a big step forward, the demagoguery of the fake council was an illusion and dozens of steps back. The GRUNERLØKKA workers' council disappeared as quickly and suddenly as it had appeared.<sup>197</sup> There is an essential difference between labour councils and other forms of labour organization. Workers' councils are the highest form of workers' organization. In other words, there is a qualitative difference between workers' councils and factory committees, strike committees, general meetings, etc., because workers' councils are part of a movement towards a united, political and offensive struggle of the working **class**. Let us see how some people artificially and in a caricaturizing way call their union a council in the language of the movement for the abolition of wage labour:

"It is quite clear that the real communists or the real communist tendency in the labour movement always criticize the syndicate, the union and the union movement, even if it is artificially and mockingly called the council and council organizations, they fundamentally criticize it."<sup>198</sup>

This movement wants workers to take over factories and workplaces. We have examined this issue in detail in the book *The* 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>197</sup> In relation to the performance of the workers' councils of this trend in peripheral capitalism, which was more ridiculous and awful than the case of Oslo, refer to the chapter "Anti-Capitalist Councils" from the book *The Anti-Capitalist Workers, A Manifestation of the Non-Horizon of Councilism*. <sup>198</sup> As source 188.

Anti-Capitalist Workers, A Manifestation of the Non-Horizon of Councilism, and here we will limit ourselves to only a brief explanation.<sup>199</sup> Occupying the factories and workplaces alleged by this movement is as pro-capitalist as its alleged workers' councils. Those in favour of occupying the factory and workplace are aware that it will work within the framework of the market and all the laws of the market (capitalism) will govern it. More importantly, they are aware that in labour management (labour self-management), the worker becomes the employer and has to adjust the production organization based on the government and the market. The partisans of factory occupation urge the workers to selflessly occupy enterprises and institutions, some of which are bankrupt, to organize their own exploitation and to guarantee the process of capital accumulation. All these sacrifices and offerings of workers for capitalism are also described with eloquence and anti-capitalist rhetoric of "externalizing the results of labour and production from the clutches of capitalists," "disrupting the process of producing surplus value," etc.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>199</sup> In relation to the issue of occupying factories and workplaces targeted by this trend, refer to the chapter "Partisans of Occupying Factories" from the book *The Anti-Capitalist Workers, A Manifestation of the Non-Horizon of Councilism.* 

#### Marx's Irresponsibility?

A political current's appearance and formation reflects the historical conditions which surround it. Marxism demonstrates the ascension of the working class as a social class - for the first time in human history, a class was formed that was able to carry out the Communist Revolution and end the exploitation of human beings by other human beings. We do not believe that Marx, with his genius, invented the theory of the emancipation of workers but, on the contrary, we believe that the process of the formation of the working class as a social class considered Marx as the great thinker of the working class among of dozens of theoreticians.

Marx, a passionate person who was forced to leave Germany due to his revolutionary thoughts and activities, went to France and was expelled. He went to Belgium and was ejected. Eventually he had to spend the rest of his fruitful life in poverty and hardship in London. He was a thinker who was not always able to pay the entrance fee to the British Museum library for his research and had to pawn his coat to buy paper to write his works. Before he was an economist, a sociologist or a philosopher, Marx was a revolutionary who, unlike other philosophers, thought about changing the world. Marx spent his full life working for the liberation of wage slaves, with the result that he produced many teachings. As long as the capitalist system remains, these show the way to the liberation of wage slaves like a torch. Only in a classless society will Marx and Marxism be a thing of the past.

Let's go back to the beliefs of Paydar and his explanations for the failure of the labour movement in the 19th century, that is, the era when Marx played a main and direct role. He claims, yes, like in other cases, he alleges that the European labour movement in England failed, as well as in France in the revolutions of February and June failed in the rebellion of the Communards, because it was not councilist and against wage labour and he writes:

"The European labour movement in England, in the revolutions of February and June in France, in the rebellion of the Communards, failed because it lacked the necessary structure and council with a nationwide anti-wage labour approach."<sup>200</sup>

Then he continues that the past of the labour movement, especially the important events from the 1840s to the 1880s, should have been analysed, or in other words, that they have not. If those important labour events were examined, he claims, today a strong, anticapitalist, councilist labour movement would be formed:

"The essence of the speech is that the past of the labour movement, especially the important events of the 1840s to the 1880s, should be analysed, and if this work was done with a Marxian and anti-wage labour perspective, naturally the urgency of establishing a solid, strong, nationwide, organized, councilist and anti-capitalist movement would be the result of radical criticism."<sup>201</sup>

Paydar expects us to look at his new discoveries as an elixir that, if heeded, would miraculously save the labour movement. The "Marxian view" in the above quote is only in line with the rejection of

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>200</sup> As source 2.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>201</sup> As source 2.

loss. He uses past tense verbs such as "was" and "would." The interpretation of Paydar's statements is that from the early 1840s to the mid-1880s, which was a very important period in the labour movement that coincided with Marx's political activity, Marx was irresponsible and did not pay attention to the analysis of these events. If Marx had felt responsible and analysed all the events of that time, we would now see more anti-capitalist councils, like the Grunerløkka workers' council in metropolitan capitalism, in which the employers defended the rights of the council members against the anti-labour unions, or in peripheral capitalism, in which anti-capitalist councils instead of municipalities are busy concreting alleys and streets.<sup>202</sup>

Unfortunately, Marx is not alive to directly answer such gibberish, but fortunately, Marxism is flourishing based on Marx's rich teachings. Contrary to Paydar's nonsenses, Marx did not ignore criticism, analysis and active involvement in social events for a moment, from the *Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right*, which is one of his early works, to the third volume of *Capital*, which was published after Marx's death. In *The Communist Manifesto* and the controversies within the Communist League, *The Class Struggles in France, The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte, The Civil War in France* and so on, the analysis of the same events is from the dialectical horizon and the Marxists after Marx have published texts based on Marx's teachings, thousands times more so than Paydar. The problem of Paydar and his movement is not the lack of access to analyse or, according to Paydar, the lack of Marxist analyses of those events, but the class affiliation of him and his movement and as a result,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>202</sup> For more information, refer to the chapter "Anti-Capitalist Councils" from the book *The Anti-Capitalist Workers, A Manifestation of the Non-Horizon of Councilism.* 

the class attitude of leftist circles, which appear in the role of metamorphosed councilism.

We have already seen that Paydar himself admitted that he produces a lot of worthless content, and these statements are also of that nature. From the perspective of his political life, Paydar accuses Marx of irresponsibility. Contrary to Marx's fruitful and moment-tomoment anti-capitalist life, Paydar's political life has always been capitalist-friendly and began with being active in the nationalist movement. Later he found the truth in Islam and learned "the way of the prophets, the way of humanity." After that he became a Stalinist, then he created different versions of his Stalinism, and finally, after its collapse, he dresses his Stalinism in the clothes of councilism.

Unlike the leftists who appeared in the role of metamorphosed councilism, criticism is one of the basic foundations of Marxism, and this tradition, i.e., criticism, has made Marxism fluid. In contrast to other social movements, the labour movement and class struggle do not seek momentary successes, and only by criticizing their past and failures can they overcome doubts and open the way to the future.

## Faking Class Battles in the Style of Stalinism

At first glance, it seems that Paydar smears Engels in the most unscrupulous and immoral way in order to present him as a "peaceful worshipper of legality," but the fact is that Paydar has resorted to falsifying and inverting Marxism and the history of the labour movement in the most unprincipled way possible. Paydar writes:

"The Second International fell into the abyss of division. The social democratic parties, the leader of the labour movement, including the same party of which Engels describes a large number of its members as a sure example of the workers reaching the 'lifeboat' and 'guiding lamp' in the same parliament, which Engels called the real place of class struggle and the field of victory of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie, voted in favour of the war credits of the governments, for the biggest anti-human arson. Following this incident, social democracy, while maintaining unity in the way of looking at capitalism, socialism, the labour movement, the future perspective of this movement, the state and the fundamental issues of the class struggle in the area of how to advance the campaigns and achieve the goals, was divided."<sup>203</sup>

Pages or even books could be written about this paragraph; unfortunately, the limitation of this book forces us to be brief. Paydar only writes: "The Second International fell into the abyss of division... while maintaining unity in the way of looking at capitalism." If we want to use the words of his friends, Paydar apparently keeps "an ignominious silence" regarding the causes of the split. But in reality,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>203</sup> As source 2.

by playing the role of a professional fraud, he appears as the defender of Ebert and Noske, and resorts to Goebbels-like lies in "maintaining unity in the way of looking at capitalism." The split happened because the majority of the Social Democrats betrayed the positions of the working class and made the workers cannon fodder in the imperialist war, but the minority of the Social Democrats remained loyal to the positions of the proletariat and, in continuation, held the Zimmerwald Conference. Who formed the left wing of the Zimmerwald Conference? Did the positions of the left wing of the Zimmerwald Conference have the same view of capitalism as Ebert and Noske? What was Lenin's position at the Zimmerwald Conference? What was the role of Liebknecht? Unlike Paydar's nonsense, Liebknecht was a political compass and moral conscience of the German and even global proletariat during the war against warlords like Ebert and Noske.

The Zimmerwald Conference has been a reference for internationalists. This is why the communist left currents have referred to the tradition of the Zimmerwald Conference in both the joint statement of the international communist left currents regarding the war in Ukraine and the appeal of the communist left concerning the war in the Middle East:

# "The political tradition that has fought for, and continues to fight for, internationalism against imperialist war.

The villages of Zimmerwald and Kienthal in Switzerland became famous as the meeting places of the socialists from both sides in the First World War to begin an international struggle to bring the butchery to an end and denounce the patriotic leaders of the Social Democratic Parties. It was at these meetings that the Bolsheviks, supported by the Bremen Left and the Dutch Left, brought forward the essential principles of internationalism against imperialist war that are still valid today: no support of either imperialist camp; the rejection of all pacifist illusions; and the recognition that only the working class and its revolutionary struggle could put an end to the system that is based on the exploitation of labour power and permanently generates imperialist war."

What has been the performance of Paydar and his friends in relation to imperialist wars?<sup>204</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>204</sup> Words cannot describe the brutality and crimes committed by Israel in Gaza. This is the logic of all imperialist wars, and communists, while remaining loyal to internationalism, have condemned such atrocities, while at the same time trying to counter nationalist propaganda and bourgeois pacifism, which poison the working class. At this time, Paydar's friends are republishing the news of imperialist news agencies such as the BBC (Britain), Sputnik (Russia), Al-Arabiya (Saudi Arabia and Kuwait), etc., on their Telegram channels. While creating illusions in relation to imperialist informants, Palestinian nationalism and bourgeois pacifism, they demagogue and throw dust in the eyes of the working class. For example, in a post they write:

<sup>&</sup>quot;An Icelandic militant woman protested the government's support of Israel's war crimes in Gaza by splashing red paint on the head of her country's foreign minister. Protests against Zionist criminals and their international camp continue in various forms around the world, and this flame that started, long live the solidarity of the people of the world with the Palestinian masses, let Zionism and the holocaust-making state of Israel be destroyed!"

Such actions, although they express people's anger at the brutality of criminal governments, do not provide a horizon for the future, only the class struggle of the workers can provide a horizon in the struggle against the imperialist war. The most ludicrous repost of all is Angelina Jolie's post, in which she stated "Gaza is turning into a mass grave from an open-air prison." And anticapitalist workers write: "This artist's words are admirable as far as Israel's creating holocaust in Gaza is concerned." We have repeatedly announced that anti-dictatorship is a more suitable description for these individuals. The Telegram channel.

During the First World War, the majority of the Social Democrats betrayed the proletariat and joined the camp of the bourgeoisie forever; prominent representatives of this faction include Scheidemann, Ebert (the murderer of the German revolution) and Noske (the hunting dog, according to himself). Among the minority who remained loyal to the proletarian positions, we can mention Lenin, Pannekoek, Gorter, Luxemburg and Liebknecht. Paydar lies in broad daylight, falsifies historical events, and only states nonsense when he says:

"social democracy, while maintaining unity in the way of looking at capitalism, socialism, the labour movement, the future perspective of this movement, the state and the fundamental issues of the class struggle in the area of how to advance the campaigns and achieve the goals, was divided."<sup>205</sup>

Was the view of Lenin, Pannekoek, Gorter, Luxemburg and Liebknecht in relation to capitalism, socialism, the labour movement, etc., in contrast to Scheidemann, Ebert and Noske? Luxemburg's *The Crisis of Social Democracy (The Junius Pamphlet)*, written in the prison of the same hunting dogs, describes the essential core of imperialism, stating that, in the age of imperialism, all states are imperialist. Seventy years later, Paydar called a criminal like Khomeini an anti-imperialist imam and talked about the **anti-imperialist** actions of the Islamic Revolutionary Committee and the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps. While Ebert, Scheidemann and Noske were busy slaughtering the German revolution, Pannekoek was busy creating one of his most valuable works, "*World Revolution and Communist* 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>205</sup> As source 2.

*Tactics.*" Luxemburg and Liebknecht were murdered while organizing the communist revolution. Will anyone be inclined to raise their heads and defend their leader's disgusting statements that the Ebert-Noske-Scheidemann gang of murderers were united with Luxemburg, Liebknecht, Lenin and Pannekoek in their view of capitalism and the labour movement? As we have already shown, Paydar produces a lot of worthless content, nonsense and trash, which is only aimed at creating ambiguity and discrediting Marxists in the political milieu, as he admits:

"Over the course of several decades, I have produced and published thousands of worthless and valuable pages on various issues of class struggle and the anti-capitalist movement of the working class."<sup>206</sup>

He falsifies the entire glorious era of the world revolution and the heroic years of labour struggles in Europe, especially Germany and Russia. Even bourgeois ideologues, whose job it is to falsify facts and engineer public opinion, do not fall to this level. Apparently, Paydar has reached out to the teachings of Goebbels in his hatred for the Marxists, and in order to smear them, he run circles around the other movements of the left of capital. Paydar explains the fate of social democracy as follows:

"The influential part [social democracy] in the working class of advanced industrialized countries explicitly and officially declared everything that showed the class struggle rejected and

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>206</sup> "The Movement to Abolish Wage Labour Is Both a Strategy and a Tactic," Paydar.

obsolete. It raised the flag of protection of capitalism and the liquidation of the labour movement in the economic, political, legal, civil, police, military, ideological and moral structure of capitalism. The second part, in areas with less developed capitalism, followed the same path with another strategy, a different twisted version and seemingly conflicting slogans. The parties of this sector, together with the social democratic party of Russia, later the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Comintern, based their work on paving the way for the further expansion of capitalism, popular anti-imperialism and the strategy of guaranteeing a greater share of surplus values for the domestic bourgeoisie, overthrowing the united regimes of Western imperialists, the rise of popular and camp parties to the throne of the political power of the countries, the establishment of state capitalism and the advancement of this whole strategy were established under the umbrella of 'Marxism-Leninism' or other extensions."207

Pannekoek, Gorter, Luxemburg and Liebknecht, who were prominent figures of social democracy in advanced industrial countries, are ignored when resorting to the Stalinist tradition institutionalized in Paydar; the entire German revolution is subject to Paydar's censorship. It was only after the systematic slaughter of thousands of political opponents by death squads in the heart of Europe that the German revolution was drowned in the blood of the German proletariat. The death squads not only peacefully coexisted with the official organs of the democratic government, but also actively cooperated with them. The media played a key role in the systematic

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>207</sup> As source 2.

massacre, first justifying the killings in advance, then the death squads carrying out the murders.<sup>208</sup>

Paydar resorts to a disgusting lie and states that the other part of social democracy in peripheral capitalism, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Comintern were founded to pave the way for the further expansion of capitalism with the ideology of "Marxism-Leninism." Stalinism with the nickname "Marxism-Leninism" has long been the ideology of this tendency, among the different versions that this trend creates for its Stalinism. Stalinism in the form of "Marxism-Leninism" represents the victory of the counter-revolution over the ruins of the October Revolution and the bones of its creators. With his extraordinary talent in lying and misrepresenting, Paydar changes the places of the killer and the victim. Let us examine this issue very briefly.

The great wave of labour struggle, which was formed after the imperialist war, was expanding every day, and since 1917, we have seen the growth of working-class struggles on a global level. The rise of the class movement of workers across the globe was an expression of revolutionary conditions. The October Revolution in Russia by the workers' councils under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party had opened a new horizon: overthrowing capitalism and establishing workers' rule through workers' councils. The wave of global revolution challenged capitalism at the global level. Labour battles had spread from Europe to America, but the beating heart of capitalism at

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>208</sup> In 1924, Gumbel published a book entitled *Four Years of Political Murders*. He was not a revolutionary communist but a defender of the bourgeois republic established in Willmar. Despite his bourgeois thoughts, unlike some who seek to falsify the truth, he was searching for the truth about how political murders took place in Germany.

that time, Germany, had become the centre of class battles. Labour uprisings happened one after another. A danger threatened the growing movement of the working class. If the proletarian struggles are not led by a communist international with a clear and organized platform and programme at the international level, this will bring heavy consequences for the world revolution.

The movement for the abolition of wage labour, which at that time represented a kind of radical Stalinism, and had not yet started the process of metamorphosis into leftism in the guise of councilism, wrote the following in relation to the October Revolution in the first issue of its publication:

"A different situation took place in Russia. The working class of that country, under the leadership of Bolshevism, formed its independent class line, and pushed its class struggle forward until the victory of the October Revolution and the overthrow of the capitalist state machine. The October Revolution was the biggest revolutionary event in contemporary history and the starting point of a new chapter in the history of revolutions in general. The last win of the changes in all the old revolutions was the replacement of one form of exploitation by a more modern one, but October spoke to mankind with a skyscraper slogan, erasing all forms of exploitation. In the old revolutions, the maximum desire of people was to replace one type of state with another. But in October, there was talk of an end to the life of any kind of government or state over the masses."<sup>209</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>209</sup>"The Statement and Programme of the Union of the Communist Workers" - pages 9-10, republished in the first issue of *The Face of Socialism* - pages 59-58.

The failure of the proletarian uprising in Berlin in January 1919, which led to the massacre of the proletarian leaders, was partly the result of the inability of the young Communist Party, which was unable to keep the proletariat away from the trap of the bourgeoisie, i.e., a premature uprising, and save it for a more appropriate moment. This was what the Bolsheviks had done in July 1917, and this act showed the maturity of the Bolsheviks. In fact, without the tact of the Bolsheviks in July 1917, the victory of the October Revolution would have been very difficult.

In response to such imperatives, albeit very late in March 1919, the Communist International, the global party for world revolution, held its founding congress. At the same time, the Soviet Republic of Hungary declared its existence, so that despite the defeat of the proletarian uprising in Berlin, the proletarian battles in Germany were still going strong. Workers' battles were going on all over the globe, and the horizon of world revolution was still in front of the proletariat.

There are people who are obliged to tell the truth if they cannot find a lie. If he is not able to falsify or revert or lie, Paydar is also forced to tell the truth. But it must be acknowledged that Paydar has an extraordinary talent and brilliant courage in misrepresentation and inversion, which few people have, so Paydar does not have this compulsion and is able to fabricate and mislead at any moment. Paydar claims that, in the "Tax in Kind" article, even in the days of the October Revolution, Lenin did not consider the Russian society to be a truly capitalist one. In other words, in the following quote, in the first sentence, before the parenthesis, Lenin is referred to:

"Even in the days of the October Revolution, Russian society was not a truly capitalist society, nor a society based on wage labour, but a society of 'small peasants'. (Lenin, The Tax in Kind) A society whose dominant economic class is not the capitalist class but a handful of small-scale producers and in this regard, the proletariat's work programme, not the organization of the abolition of wage labour in the process of production and social work, but the 'NEP' was considered."<sup>210</sup>

All our efforts to find this comment, "Even in the days of the October Revolution, Russian society was not a truly capitalist society, nor a society based on wage labour, but a society of 'small peasants'" in Lenin's "The Tax in Kind" were unsuccessful.

Contrary to Paydar's Goebbelsian lies, upon his return from exile in April 1917, as soon as Lenin arrived in Petrograd, he rode into the railway station on top of an armoured train car, and delivered his famous speech to the thousands of assembled workers, ending it with the slogan, "*Long live the world socialist revolution!*":

"Dear comrades, soldiers, sailors, and workers! I am happy to greet in your persons the victorious Russian revolution, and greet you as the vanguard of the worldwide proletarian army ... The piratical imperialist war is the beginning of civil war throughout Europe ... The hour is not far distant when at the call of our comrade, Karl Liebknecht, the peoples will turn their arms against their own capitalist exploiters ... The worldwide socialist revolution has already dawned ... Germany is seething ... Any day now the whole of European capitalism may crash. The Russian revolution accomplished by you has prepared the way

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>210</sup> As source 206.

and opened a new epoch. Long live the worldwide socialist revolution!"<sup>211</sup>

If the society is not capitalist, how can one demand a world socialist revolution? To the knowledge of the activists of this movement, unlike the exaggerations of those who are not familiar with the basics of Marxism, the 1905 Russian revolution was a bourgeois one, which was delayed due to a series of issues that are outside the topic of this discussion. After the revolution of 1905, the dominant mode of production in Russia was capitalism. This meant the transition of capitalism to the era of capitalist decline and imperialism. In the age of imperialism, the possibility of a bourgeois revolution is not feasible anywhere on this planet, and it is ruled out, because the bourgeoisie has lost its progressive role. All the "revolutions" that the leftists call bourgeois revolutions after 1914 have been nothing but the displacement of the bourgeois powers.

But dialectically, why and how was the New Economic Policy (NEP) developed in Russia?

In 1918, with the start of the imperialist governments' hostile operations against the Soviets, which were carried out in order to contain the October Revolution and prevent its spread, the continuation of the Soviet government's political life faced a serious threat. The civil war indicated that if the victories of the October Revolution were not strengthened by the world revolution, the danger of the destruction of the October Revolution would be serious. But the world revolution could not make serious progress outside of Russia, so the Russian proletariat had to fight essentially alone against the attacks of the White counter-revolution and its imperialist supporters.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>211</sup> At the Finland Station

Militarily, the heroic resistance of the Russian workers was victorious, but politically, when the Russian proletariat emerged from the civil war, it was exhausted and scattered, having suffered heavy casualties, and most importantly, it had essentially lost control over the Soviets. Enthusiasm for military victories hastened the decline of the political power of the working class with the continuous militarization of social and economic life. The accumulation of power in the upper ranks of the government apparatus made it possible for military campaigns to be pursued in a ruthless and effective manner, but this issue further weakened the real strongholds of the revolution, such as mass-unifying organs.

Years of imperialist war, revolution and then civil war destroyed the Russian economy and the social fabric of the society, and its infrastructure was torn apart. After the end of the civil war, coal production fell to less than one tenth and iron and steel production to one twentieth of the pre-war rates. The production of consumer goods decreased by a quarter and agriculture was also decimated.

The new conditions were, on the one hand, the result of the civil war that the imperialists imposed on the young government of the Soviets, and on the other, the result of the isolation of the October Revolution and the new Soviet government. The October Revolution and the Soviet government needed the cooperation of the working class of other countries.

To prevent the collapse of society and rebuild its ruins, the Bolsheviks adopted the policy of war communism. On the one hand, the policy of war communism could not save the Russian economy, which was in decline, and on the other, with the subsidence of the waves of the world revolution, the Russian proletariat found itself in isolation. In 1921, during the Third Congress of the Communist International, the absolute failure of the March operation in Germany was revealed, which caused the revolutionary wave that had started in October 1917 to fall from its peak. This issue made the Bolsheviks unable to count on the immediate help of the global proletariat. In such a situation, the proletariat in power, which could not receive immediate help, had to take the necessary economic measures for its own survival until the world revolution started again. The isolation of the Russian proletariat was the result of the international situation.

Lenin had no illusions about the economic nature of the NEP. He emphasized that the NEP was a form of state capitalism. The NEP was introduced at the 10<sup>th</sup> Congress of the Bolshevik Party in 1921, which Lenin presented as a strategic retreat, necessitated by the isolation and weakness of the Russian proletariat.

Lenin argued that the state machine was not directed by the proletariat but by another hand (capitalism), stating in his speech:

"Never before in history has there been a situation in which the proletariat, the revolutionary vanguard, possessed sufficient political power and had state capitalism existing alongside it. The whole question turns on our understanding that this is the capitalism that we can and must permit, that we can and must confine within certain bounds; for this capitalism is essential for the broad masses of the peasantry and for private capital, which must trade in such a way as to satisfy the needs of the peasantry. We must organise things in such a way as to make possible the customary operation of capitalist economy and capitalist exchange, because this is essential for the people. Without it, existence is impossible. All the rest is not an absolutely vital matter to this camp. They can resign themselves to all that. You Communists, you workers, you, the politically enlightened section of the proletariat, which under took to administer the state, must be able to arrange it so that the state, which you have taken into your hands, shall function the way you want it to. Well, we have lived through a year, the state is in our hands; but has it operated the New Economic Policy in the way we wanted in this past year? No. But we refuse to admit that it did not operate in the way we wanted. How did it operate? The machine refused to obey the hand that guided it. It was like a car that was going not in the direction the driver desired, but in the direction someone else desired; as if it were being driven by some mysterious, lawless hand, God knows whose, perhaps of a profiteer, or of a private capitalist, or of both. Be that as it may, the car is not going quite in the direction the man at the wheel imagines, and often it goes in an altogether different direction "212

As you can see, according to Lenin's statements, the state was not created by the communists, nor by the proletariat, but by some other force, and not in line with the will of the Bolsheviks and the proletariat, but in the opposite direction. That great force was world capital, which undeniably determined the course of the movement of "proletarian state capitalism" and the Russian economy. However, the solutions provided by the Bolsheviks do not match the nature of the problem. The Bolsheviks did not put the proletarian antidote to such a problem, i.e., the political revival of soviets and other class bodies, on the agenda.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>212</sup> Speech in the eleventh congress of the R.C.P.

#### History Writing in the Style of Stalinism

Paydar has spent most of his political life as a Stalinist, regardless of its different versions. Lately, he has only clothed councilism in his Stalinism.<sup>213</sup> In the same way that even if a faithful Christian who has tried to live a life as a disciple of Christ suddenly has doubts about the resurrection of Christ, although this Christian believer no longer believes in the "first resurrection," those Christian habits and attitudes are still a part of the believer, who remains a believer with the same approach. It is with such an explanation that we can understand Paydar's reference to a verse of the Quran that we have seen in the previous pages, in other words, a reference to his time as a Muslim out of habit. This also makes it possible to understand the style of Paydar's history writing. Paydar has spent a lifetime in Stalinist currents, in which censorship has been one of the basic functions, and he himself points out several cases that "turned the organization into a copy of the capitalist society, where self-censorship, opportunism and the destruction of comradely values rained from its doors and walls," referring to "the strong censorship dam" and so on. Even after the metamorphosis, he repeats the same actions out of habit, remains

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>213</sup> The basic and fundamental feature of Stalinism is the anti-Marxist thesis of **socialism in one country**. For example, on paper, Trotskyists do not believe in this thesis, and Maoists are the real children of Stalinism. The counter-revolution, which had been advancing since 1921, succeeded in 1928 in imposing the anti-Marxist thesis of socialism in one country on the Comintern and making the latter a part of Russian foreign policy. By adopting the anti-Marxist thesis, socialism in one country announced its death and ended its life as an international just as the Second International signed its death warrant in 1914 by participating in the imperialist war.

faithful to the Stalinist tradition and writes historiography in the same style.

Leftism appeared in the role of metamorphosized councilism by resorting to the tradition institutionalized in this tendency to invert and falsify the positions of the first Communist Party. One of its founders, Avetis Mikailian, known as Avetis Sultanzade, does the same as in the case of Germany, that is, a lie that the Ebert-Noske-Scheidemann and Luxemburg-Liebknecht-Pannekoek movements were united in their view of capitalism and socialism. Without referring to a text from the early Communist Party or Sultanzade himself, Paydar has introduced a series of lies about the positions of that party and claimed that it had no horizon beyond the one of capitalism in front of it:

"The programme, policies and practical policy of the Communist Party of Iran, which was formed in 1920 by the former members of the Justice party and based on the isolation of the left wing, are also basically the expression of the horizons and movements of the same movements of the middle and small bourgeoisie of Iran on the one hand and the expectations of the Comintern and the Bolshevik Party on the other hand. Expelling the British from Iran, cancelling the 1919 agreement, overthrowing the Qajar monarchy, establishing a republic and democracy, and forming a national army!!! This determined all the high and low demands of the party. The party had no horizon beyond the horizon of capitalism."<sup>214</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>214</sup>"Statement and Programme of the Union of the Communist Workers"page 28.

About a hundred years ago, in 1920, the first Communist Party of Iran, unlike the Leftists appeared in the role of metamorphosed councilism, believed that **due to the existence of private property** even the most democratic parliamentary system represents a bourgeois dictatorship. The first Communist Party of Iran, beyond the democratic revolution of the UCM and the council (Soviet), was presented as the only alternative to capitalism and it emphasized that the duty of party propaganda is relentless Soviet power. About a hundred years ago the following was written:

"Even the most democratic parliamentary system or bourgeois republic where the slogan expresses the will of all people, all nations, and all classes, due to the private ownership of land and the means of production, will continue to be in operation under a bourgeois dictatorship. In opposition to this system, the proletarian democracies or councils (Soviets) that have been realized in Russia and a number of other countries and power mass organizations, the captive capitalist class - The proletarians and the semi-proletarians, namely the vast majority of the population, are converted to the sole and fixed basis of the state apparatus, from the bottom up to the top, from the local to the central one. Thus, it is only council rule that can supply local and regional self-management in an incomparable manner more broadly than anywhere else and without authority from above. It is the duty of the party to endlessly explain to the Iranian workers and peasants that the council is the only power that can become a real power for the working people to save them from the exploitation and tyranny of the landlord."

Paydar claims, yes, he alleges that even the most left-wing members of the early Communist Party, such as Sultanzade, who was busy building an organization consisting of workers and employers, created fake radicalism for themselves:

"The most left-wing people of this [early communist] party, who are still some people by mentioning their name, create fake 'Radicalism' for themselves in a very clumsy way! They spread the union game and build a union organization consisting of workers and employers as a way of fighting against capital in front of the workers! Syndications recommended by Sultanzade in Azerbaijan and other places were really like this."

Certainly, the early Communist Party, like all new organizations, had its strengths and weaknesses, which can be analysed from a Marxist perspective. Avetis Mikailian (Sultanzade) had strengths and weaknesses like any other Marxist. However, contrary to the lies and mudslinging of Paydar and his tendency, who have spent a lifetime in Stalinism before and after the metamorphosis, and whose job is to sprinkle dust in the eyes of the working class, Sultanzade emphasized the "world party of World Revolution" and that "the age of the world revolution has begun," and because of defending the same communist positions, his head was thrown on the ground.

In the documents of the Second Congress of the Comintern in 1920, we can find one called "Worker's Revolution and the Communist International", in which it is emphasized that the Comintern is the global workers' Revolutionary Party and the dictatorship of the proletariat. It was signed by Sultanzadeh, along with Lenin, Trotsky, Bordiga, Panchurch and so on. At the Second Congress of the Communist International, in discussions on one of the most sensitive topics of the Congress, the national question and colonies, Sultanzadeh, the delegate of the Iranian Communists on the left wing of Congress said during the fifth session of Congress:

"Just imagine that the Communist Revolution has begun in India. Could the workers in this country, without the help of a revolutionary movement in Britain and Europe, resist an attack against the bourgeoisie? Naturally not...the revolution that has begun in the West has also prepared the background in Iran and Turkey and has given power to the revolutionaries. The era of World Revolution has begun....The issue is that, unlike the bourgeois-democratic movements, a true Communist movement must be created and be kept on foot. Any other assessment of the realities can lead to unfortunate results."

We have seen part of the programme of the early Communist Party as well as the positions of Sultanzade as the founder and leader of the left wing of the party; however, Paydar continues with his inversions and misrepresentations. Paydar claims that the early Communist Party led the workers to form a united anti-imperialist front with the liberal and industrial bourgeoisie as well as pan-Islamist reactionaries:

"The working masses of Iran, when they saw the Communist Party of the Comintern era, turned to this party out of protest against the exploitation and conditions of their work and life and because of the need for a united and organized struggle against the exploitation, oppression and injustice of capitalism but the party led the workers to nowhere to form an anti-imperialist united front with the liberal and industrial bourgeoisie and pan-Islamist reactionaries."<sup>215</sup>

It is said that a liar has a poor memory. Paydar has forgotten that elsewhere he was forced to admit Sultanzade's radical positions in relation to "national issues and colonies":

"One of the hot topics of the Second Congress of the Comintern was the debate between communists such as 'Roy' and 'Sultanzade' with Lenin over the same issues or theses known as 'national issues and colonies'."<sup>216</sup>

Approximately 60 years after the admirable communist positions of Sultanzade, a prominent Marxist who emphasized the "World Party of Workers' Uprising" and that "the age of the world revolution has begun," that is, in the summer of 1979, Paydar and his Nabard group were busy making "an anti-imperialist imam" out of a criminal like Khomeini, or they "did not doubt that Imam Khomeini was a revolutionary." Shouldn't the faces of Paydar and his friends in the movement for the abolition of wage labour, with all these inversions, misrepresentations and lies, be drowned in shame?

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>215</sup>"Labour Movement, Yes, Against Wage Labour, No! Iraj Azarin and the Criticism of Mohsen Hakimi," Paydar.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>216</sup> As source 40 - page 70.

## Social Democracy, the Murderer of the German Revolution

As noted earlier, this movement asserted that the general expectation of the Social Democrats in Germany in 1918 was to eliminate poverty, hunger and **disorder** and to create a classless society. Again, according to this faction, the Social Democrats were not ready for this work and also did not have a coherent plan to use the created revolutionary situation and establish a socialist society (a classless society). To refresh the memory, the quote is reproduced below:

"In 1918, the strong public expectation from the Social Democrats was to eliminate poverty, hunger and disorder. To save the bankrupt war economy. But the Social Democrats were not ready for this and did not have a coherent plan to take advantage of the created revolutionary situation and build a classless society or even create a democratic republic."<sup>217</sup>

This word "disorder" is important because the ruling class accuses any effort and struggle of being disorder, and the Ebert-Noske-Scheidemann gang of criminals accused the working class, the revolutionaries and above all Liebknecht and Luxemburg of disorder and rioting. At that time, there was a revolution going on in Germany which was a part of the world revolution process. The triumph of the German revolution would have greatly increased the chances of the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>217</sup> As source 119 – page 34.

victory of the world revolution, considering the role of Germany at that time in global capitalism. Let's go back to the statements of Paydar:

"The Second International fell into the abyss of division... Following this incident, social democracy, while maintaining unity in the way of looking at capitalism, socialism, the labour movement, the future perspective of this movement, the state and the fundamental issues of the class struggle in the area of how to advance the campaigns and achieve the goals, was divided."<sup>218</sup>

Only a proletarian and revolutionary force strives to establish a classless society. Isn't Sabeti's statement, apart from its correctness, in complete contradiction with Paydar's? Don't Sabeti's words and, as a result, the movement for the abolition of wage labour, give a proletarian nature to social democracy, which wanted to create a classless society, although it did not succeed? The fact is that this trend is not one that has internal coherence in its opinions, but a group that expresses contradictory and inconsistent views and changes them every day. The common denominator of this incongruous group is that it considers Stalinists, Maoists, Trotskyists and their different versions to be "Leninist," then spreads mud against Marxists and creates ambiguity in the political environment.

In contrast to the leftists, who appeared in the role of metamorphosed councilism, except for its different versions, which only have different languages, the majority of Social Democrats, by betraying the proletariat, joined the camp of capitalism forever. The minority, whose origin goes back to the Zimmerwald Conference in

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>218</sup> As source 2.

declaring an imperialist war, and whose prominent figures include Lenin, Pannekoek, Gorter, Luxemburg and Liebknecht, defended the position of the proletariat.

Among these figures in the minority, Lenin was one of the architects of the October Revolution, while Pannekoek and Gorter played a role in the German revolution. Here we will ignore the prominent role of Bordiga. However, Luxemburg and Liebknecht, like Lenin, were creators of the German revolution. This is why, dialectically, unlike the nationalist leftists, the reason for the collapse of the October Revolution should be sought in the failure of the wave of world revolution, especially the defeat of the German revolution, which led to the isolation of the October Revolution and then its decline. The world revolution and, as a result, the October Revolution, failed not in Moscow or Petrograd, but in Berlin and Munich. Before continuing the discussion, it is necessary to see how this tendency, when it represented a kind of radical Stalinism, that is, shortly before its metamorphosis to leftism appeared in the role of metamorphosized councilism, examined the failure of the October Revolution. This movement writes:

"If the October Revolution had achieved the final victory, surely the old world, full of exploitation and oppression and the darkness of capitalism, would have begun its irreversible retreat against the socialist movement of the proletariat. But October was defeated very quickly. The Soviet proletariat advanced until the overthrow of the bourgeois government in Russia, but it was not able to establish a new socialist order. The effective factors in imposing this failure on the Russian working class were:

- The lack of a socialist horizon and the lack of separation of Bolshevism from the bourgeois horizon.
   Bolshevism, despite its radical labour policies and firm adherence to revolutionary Marxism, lacked a clear horizon for the socialist transformation of the capitalist economic and social order...
- 2. Russia's socioeconomic problems and the stubborn resistance of the international bourgeoisie."<sup>219</sup>

How did Bolshevism have radical labour policies and adhere to revolutionary Marxism, but still failed to break away from the bourgeois horizon? Leaving aside the internal coherence of the topics, is sticking together contradictory sentences considered a position? Would the October Revolution have won if instead of Russia, which had a backward capitalism, it took place on an advanced island like Britain, which did not have economic problems?

This issue proves the validity of the theory of internationalists, which is that in the era of the decline of capitalism, the age of imperialism, the period in which all states are imperialists regardless of their large or small size, the communist revolution is only possible at the international level. The German bourgeoisie was and is one of the strongest strongholds of the world bourgeoisie, which was not as easy for the proletariat to conquer as others. One of the consequences of the failure of the German revolution was the massacre of a generation of communists, first in Germany by the Social Democrats (by hunting dogs such as Noske, by his own admission) or, as the movement for the abolition of wage labour calls it, those who were not ready to reach a classless society, and then in Russia, by the communist

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>219</sup> As source 209.

killer Stalin. Therefore, it is important for the revolutionaries and the proletariat to understand the causes of the failure of the German revolution, analyse it and learn from its strengths and weaknesses.

How did the German Social Democrats or, as the movement for the abolition of wage labour call it, those who were not ready to build a classless society, but were very well prepared for the most brutal white terror, organize the massacre of the German proletariat? How did the German Social Democrats suppress the German revolution, and in the course of it torture the workers, even the soldiers who had befriended the revolutionaries, in the heart of Europe, and did not refrain from raping women and children in the working quarters, even desecrating the dead bodies? What is the role of the party of the proletariat? It is to counter the early or late action of the proletariat, as well as the bourgeois traps? How did the mistake of a revolutionary such as Liebknecht, who was a political compass and moral conscience of the German and even global proletariat, affect the defeat of the German revolution?

To answer the above questions, we have selected a part of an article from the International Communist Current, to show by referring to the experiences of other internationalists, contrary to the falsehoods and lies of this movement, that social democracy was not only not united in its views on capitalism, socialism, the perspective of the future of the movement and so on, but was divided into two different camps and two class enemies. In addition, we aim to demonstrate that while the Social Democrats did not have a plan or the preparation to establish a socialist society (a classless society), the Ebert-Noske-Scheidemann gang were prepared and had a coherent plan to suppress the German revolution, even by torturing workers and raping women. "The whole machinery of provocation was again flung into motion.

**Torrent of lies**: Eichhorn is corrupt, a criminal, payed by the Russians, preparing a counter-revolutionary putsch!

**Ultimatum**: Eichhorn must immediately resign, or be removed by force!

**Display of brute force**: This time, 10,000 troops were posted in the city centre, 80,000 more drawn together in the vicinity. These included the highly disciplined elite divisions of General Maercker, infantry troops, an "iron brigade" from the coast, militias from the bourgeois districts, and the first *Freikorps*. But they also included the "Republican Guard", an armed militia of the SPD, and important troop contingents which directly sympathised with Social Democracy.

The trap was ready to close.

#### The fatal trap of January 1919

As the bourgeoisie expected, the attack against Eichhorn did not mobilise those troops in the capital who sympathised with the revolution. Nor did it arouse the workers in the provinces, where the name Eichhorn was unknown.<sup>220</sup>

But there was one component of the new situation which took everyone by surprise. This was the massive extent and the intensity of the reaction of the proletariat of Berlin. On Sunday, January 5, 150,000 followed the call of the *Revolutionäre Obleute*<sup>221</sup> to demonstrate in front of the police headquarters at Alexanderplatz. The following day, over half a million workers downed tools and

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>220</sup> There were sympathy strikes, demonstrations and occupations of buildings in a number of cities, including Hamburg, Stuttgart and Düsseldorf.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>221</sup> Revolutionary delegates in the factories

took possession of the city centre. These workers were ready to fight and to die. They had immediately understood that not Eichhorn, but the defence of the revolution was the real issue.

Although taken aback by the power of this response, the counterrevolution was cold blooded enough to go ahead with its plans. Once again *Vorwärts* was occupied, but also other press offices in the city centre. This time, *agents provocateurs* from the police had taken the initiative.<sup>222</sup>

The young KPD immediately warned the working class. In a leaflet, and in front page articles in the *Rote Fahne*, it called on the proletariat to elect new delegates to its councils and to arm itself, but also to realise that the moment for armed insurrection had not yet come. Such an insurrection required a centralised leadership at the level of the whole country. This could only be provided by workers' councils in which the revolutionaries held sway.

On the evening of January 5 the revolutionary leaders came together for consultations in the headquarters of Eichhorn. Around 70 Obleute were present, of whom roughly 80% were supporters of the left of the USPD, the rest supporters of the KPD. The members of the central committee of the Berlin organisation of the USPD turned up, as well as two members of the central committee of the KPD: Karl Liebknecht and Wilhelm Pieck..

At first, the delegates of the workers' organisations were unsure as to how they should respond. But then the atmosphere was transformed, indeed electrified, by reports coming in. These reports concerned the armed occupations in the newspaper district and the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>222</sup> This development, already amply documented by Richard Müller in his history of the German Revolution, written in the 1920's, is today an accepted fact among historians.

alleged readiness of different garrisons to join an armed insurrection. Liebknecht now declared that, under these circumstances, not only the repulsion of the attack against Eichhorn, but armed insurrection had become necessary.

The eye-witness reports of this dramatic meeting indicate that Liebknecht's intervention constituted the fatal turning point. Throughout the war, he had been the political compass and the moral conscience of the German and even the world proletariat. Now, at this crucial moment of the revolution, he lost his head and his bearings. Above all, he prepared the way for the *Unabhängigen*, the *Independents*, who were still the dominant political force. Lacking clearly defined principles, a clear long term perspective and a more profound confidence in the cause of the proletariat, this "independent" current was condemned to vacillate constantly under the pressure of the immediate situation, and thus to compromise with the ruling class. But the reverse side of the coin of this "centrism" was the strongly felt need to participate whenever unclear "action" is on the agenda, not least in order to put one's own revolutionary determination on the record.

"The Independent Party had no clear political programme; but nothing lay further beyond its intentions than the idea of toppling the Ebert-Scheidemann government. At this conference, decisions lay in the hands of the Independents. And here it became clear that in particular those wavering figures who were sitting in the Berlin party committee, who normally did not like to put themselves in danger, but at the same time always wanted to participate in everything, turned out to be the wildest bawlers, presenting themselves in the most 'revolutionary' manner possible."<sup>223</sup>

According to Richard Müller, the situation thus escalated into a kind of competition between the USPD leadership and the KPD delegation.

"Now the Independents wanted to show courage and consequence by outbidding the goals proposed by Liebknecht. Could Liebknecht, in face of the 'revolutionary' fire of these 'wavering and hesitant elements' restrain himself? That did not lie in his nature." (ibid).

Warnings, such as those of soldiers' delegates who expressed doubts about the readiness of the troops to fight, were not listened to.

"Richard Müller spoke out in the sharpest possible terms against the proposed goal of the struggle, the toppling of the government. He declared that neither the political nor the military preconditions existed. The movement throughout the country was growing from day to day, so that very soon the political, military and psychological preconditions for the struggle for power would be achieved. A premature, isolated action in Berlin could put the further development of the revolution in danger. Only with difficulty could he present his attitude of rejection in face of objections from all sides.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>223</sup> Volume 3 of Müllers *History of the German Revolution: Civil War in Germany*. pp35, 36.

Pieck as representative of the central committee of the KPD spoke sharply against Richard Müller and demanded in very definite terms an immediate vote and the commencement of struggle."<sup>224</sup>

Three major decisions were voted and adopted. The call for a general strike was taken unanimously. The two other decisions, the calls to topple the government and to maintain the occupation of the press offices, were adopted by a large majority, but with six votes against.<sup>225</sup>

A "*provisional revolutionary action committee*" was then formed, with 53 members and three chairmen: Liebknecht, Ledebour, Scholze.

The proletariat was now caught in the trap.

#### The so-called Spartakus Week

There now ensued what was to become a bloody week of fighting in Berlin. The bourgeoisie called this the "Spartakus Week": The foiling of a "communist putsch" by the "heroes of freedom and

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>224</sup> Müller ibid p33. Richard Müller was one of the most experienced and talented leaders of the movement. There are certain parallels between the role Müller played in Germany and that of Trotsky in 1917 in Russia. Both were chairman of the action committee of the workers' councils in the capital city. Both went on to become the historian of the revolution they directly participated in. It is painful to see the summary way in which Wilhelm Pieck brushed aside the warnings of such an experienced and responsible leader. <sup>225</sup> The six opponents were Müller, Däumig, Eckert, Malzahn, Neuendorf and Rusch.

democracy". The fate of the German and the World Revolution was largely decided in this week, from January 5 to 12.

On the morning after the formation of the revolutionary committee, the strike in the city was almost total. Even more workers poured into the city centre than the previous day, many of them armed. But by midday all the hopes of active support from the garrisons had been dashed. Even the sailors' division, a living legend, declared itself neutral, going as far as to arrest its own delegate Dorrenbach for what they considered his irresponsible participation in the call for insurrection. The afternoon, the same same Volksmarinedivision turned the revolutionary committee out of the Marstall, where it had sought protection. Similarly, the concrete measures taken to remove the government were foiled, or even ignored, since there was no visible armed power behind them!<sup>226</sup>

Throughout the day the masses were in the streets, awaiting further instructions from their leaders. But such instructions were not forthcoming. The art of the successful execution of mass actions consists in the concentration and direction of energy towards a goal which goes beyond the point of departure, which advances the general movement, which gives the participants the feeling of collective success and strength. In the given situation, the mere repetition of the strike and mass demonstrations of the previous days was not enough. Such a step forward would have been, for instance, the encirclement and agitation of the barracks in order to

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>226</sup> The case of Lemmgen, a revolutionary sailor, is legendary, but unfortunately true. After the failure of his repeated attempts to confiscate the state bank, the Reichsbank (a civil servant called Hamburger disputed the validity of the signatures under his order), poor Lemmgen was so demoralised that he went home and crept into his bed.

win the soldiers over to the new stage of the revolution, disarming the officers, beginning a broader arming of the workers themselves<sup>227</sup>. But the self-appointed revolutionary committee did not propose such measures, not least because it had already put forward a course of action which was much more radical, but sadly unrealistic. Having called for nothing less than armed insurrection, more concrete but far less spectacular measures would have appeared as a disappointment, an anti-climax, a retreat. The Committee, and with it the proletariat, was the prisoner of a misguided, empty radicalism.

The leadership of the KPD was horrified when it received news of the proposed insurrection. Rosa Luxemburg and Leo Jogiches in particular accused Liebknecht and Pieck of having abandoned, not only the decisions of the party congress of the previous week, but the party programme itself.<sup>228</sup>

But these mistakes could not be undone, and as such were not (yet) the question of the hour. The turn of events placed the party before a terrible dilemma: How to lead the proletariat out of the trap it was already caught in?

*This* task was much more difficult that that mastered by the Bolsheviks during the famous "July Days" of 1917 in Russia, when the party succeeded in helping the class to *side-step* the trap of a premature military confrontation.

The astonishing, paradoxical response which the party, under the impetus of Rosa Luxemburg's urging found, was as follows. The

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>227</sup> Precisely this course of action was proposed in public by the KPD, in particular in its central press organ the *Rote Fahne*.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>228</sup> In particular the passage of the programme which declared that the party would assume power only with the support of the great mass of the proletariat.

KPD, the most determined *opponent* of an armed revolution up till then, must now become its more fervent *protagonist*. This for a single reason. Taking power in Berlin was the only way of preventing the bloody massacre which was now looming, the decapitation of the German proletariat. Once this danger had been averted, the Berlin proletariat could tackle the problem of holding out or of retreating in good order until the revolution was ripe in the country as a whole.

Karl Radek, the emissary of the Russian Party in hiding in Berlin, proposed an alternative course of action: immediate retreat while keeping their weapons, but if necessary surrendering them. But the class as a whole still *had no arms*. The problem was that the appearance of an "undemocratic" communist "putsch" gave the government the pretext it needed for a bloodletting. No retreat of the combatants could undo this.

The course of action proposed by Luxemburg was based on the analysis that the military balance of forces *in the capital* was not unfavourable to the proletariat. And indeed: if January 6th immediately dashed the hopes of the revolutionary committee in "its" troops, it soon became clear that the counter-revolution had miscalculated also. The Republican Guard and those troops who sympathised with the SPD now refused, for their part, to use force against the revolutionary workers. In their accounts of events, both the revolutionary Richard Müller and the counter-revolutionary Gustav Noske later confirmed the correctness of the analysis of Rosa Luxemburg: From the military point of view, the balance of forces at the beginning of the week was in favour of the proletariat. But the decisive question was not the military but the political balance of forces. And this weighed against the proletariat for the simple reason that the leadership of the movement was still in the

hands of the "centrists", the wavering elements, and not yet those of the consequent revolutionaries. According to the Marxist "art of insurrection" the armed rising is the *last* step in the process of enforcing the revolution, which merely sweeps away the last posts of resistance.

Realising the trap into which it had manoeuvred itself, the provisional committee, instead of arming the proletariat, began to negotiate with the government it had just declared to be ousted, and without even knowing what it wanted to negotiate. Given this attitude of the committee, on 10th January the KPD obliged Liebknecht and Pieck to resign from it. But the damage was already done. The policy of conciliation paralysed the proletariat, bringing all its doubts and hesitations to the surface. The workers of a whole series of major plants came out with declarations condemning the SPD, but also Liebknecht and the "Spartakists", calling for reconciliation between the "socialist parties".

At this moment, when the counter-revolution was reeling, the Social Democrat Noske saved the day. "Somebody has to be the bloodhound. I am not afraid of the responsibility" he declared. While pretending to "negotiate" in order to gain time, the SPD now openly summoned the officers, the students, the bourgeois militias to drown the workers resistance in blood. With the proletariat divided and demoralised, the way was now open for the most savage white terror. These atrocities included the shelling of buildings with artillery, the murdering of prisoners and even of negotiation delegates, the lynching of workers, but also of soldiers who shook hands with revolutionaries, the molesting of women and children in the workers districts, the desecration of dead bodies, but also the systematic hunting down and murdering of revolutionaries such as Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg".

### **Rosa Luxemburg and Misleading Workers**

As has been pointed out many times, Marxism is not a dogma, it is fluid. Marxism is not a religion that cannot be criticized, but criticism is vital to the enrichment of Marxism, and is very important and is always welcome. One of these reviews was conducted by Luxemburg with the book *The Accumulation of Capital*.<sup>229</sup>

The majority of those who want to kill Salman Rushdie for writing the book *The Satanic Verses* have not read this book at all.<sup>230</sup> Even the person who issued the fatwa to kill Salman Rushdie for the first time, namely Khomeini, had not read the book himself, because the book had not been translated into Persian at that time and Khomeini was not familiar with languages other than Persian and Arabic. Others had explained things to him about the book, and he therefore announced a fatwa against Rushdie, not because of his religious beliefs, but in line with his imperialist interests, to become the leader of the world's Muslims and gain hegemony.

Luxemburg's *The Accumulation of Capital* has not been translated into Persian, or into a European language of which Paydar has any knowledge. In other words, the probability that Paydar has read this book is very small because, in the sermon that he published in the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>229</sup> We will not go into the topic of capital accumulation and related discussions by Marxists, so as not to deviate from the subject of this discussion. For more information, refer to the chapter on capital accumulation from the book *Worker-Communism, Radical Conscience of the Left of Capital.* 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>230</sup> "Sir Salman Rushdie Attack Suspect 'Only Read Two Pages' of Satanic Verses."

name of criticizing it, there is no reference to Luxemburg's work *The Accumulation of Capital*. Nevertheless, Paydar, like Peter, went up to the pulpit to denounce the devil; this time, Luxemburg appeared in the role of the devil, and showing his faith and loyalty he began to curse and blaspheme against her. He published his sermons as a "holy story" and calls it criticism. Readers can judge by themselves: how, without reading a book and based solely on the statements of others, can you criticize? How scientific, logical and ethical will be the result of such criticism?

Paydar, whose entire political life has been spent in demagoguery, lying, opportunism, falsifying other people's opinions, being unprincipled, inverting, obeying the right positions, compromising, destroying comradely values, etc., in other words, in the decadent culture and values of the left of capital, accuses one of the great Marxists and one of the pioneers of the world proletariat, Luxemburg, of misleading the workers. Previously, Paydar had falsely claimed that social democracy was united in its view of capitalism, socialism, labour movement, basic issues of class struggle, etc., and it split only because of disagreements over how to advance and achieve its goals. He demagogues like this:

"It is possible to love the ideal of human liberation, to die very sincerely and passionately for this ideal, to get a deeper understanding of this path, to rely on Marx and his great teachings, but she got lost in the middle of the path and also led others astray. Rosa Luxemburg and many communists were captured by this situation."<sup>231</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>231</sup>"Rosa Luxemburg, Theory of Accumulation and Criticism of Marx," Nasser Paydar.

According to this movement, Luxemburg was lost in the middle of the road because she did not have clear goals, and after she was lost, she also started misleading the workers. Since, again according to this trend, Luxemburg was busy misleading the workers due to her confused thoughts and goals, she therefore could not criticize the right reformism of social democracy, i.e., the Ebert-Noske-Scheidemann gang, and the left reformism of militant social democracy, i.e., Lenin's faction against capitalism. Paydar claims:

"Rosa Luxemburg took these stances and criticisms boldly, but neither her revolutionary criticism of the reactionary solutions of the leaders of the Second International nor her criticisms of Lenin's strategies and opinions, despite all their radicalness, never rose to a radical and anti-capitalism critique of reformism of the right of social democracy and the reformism of left militant Leninism."<sup>232</sup>

Contrary to the inferiority of this trend in smearing Luxemburg, the right reformism of social democracy, according to this trend, and the murderers of the German revolution, in our opinion, the hunting dogs, were after the head of the proletariat, Luxemburg. How can the bourgeoisie be a reformist in the era of capitalist decline? The same reformists, according to this trend, and the executioners of the German revolution, in our opinion, in order to suppress the revolution, encouraged the people to reveal the hiding place of Luxemburg and Liebknecht, and according to the posters they had installed on the walls of Berlin, the reformists (!) wanted to kill these proletarian leaders. The theme of the posters was clear:

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>232</sup> As source 231.

"If you want peace, work and bread, kill Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht."

Waldemar Pabst, the head of the Cavalry Division who ordered the killings, later served in the Nazi regime and subsequently in the Federal Republic. Years later, he spoke of the importance of what he had done, namely, the suppression of the German Revolution and consequently the salvation of capitalism, which in turn condemned the German people:

"These German idiots should drop to their knees and thank Noske and me, streets and squares should be called after us!"<sup>233</sup>

Did the criminal Ebert-Noske-Scheidemann gang or, as this tendency calls it, the right-wing reformism of social democracy, come to the theory that all states are imperialist? More than 60 years after Luxemburg, this movement called a criminal like Khomeini an "antiimperialist imam" and spoke about the anti-imperialist actions of the Islamic Revolution Committees and the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps.

Can anyone be found in this tendency to have the courage to hold their head up and continue to defend that social democracy was united in its view of capitalism, class struggle, etc., and split only because of how to proceed, or are they all ignominiously silent?

One can speak of opposition to capitalism in the most irreconcilable terms, one can make noise and uproar, and talk about the abolition of wage labour, while not only not making any struggle against the system of wage slavery, but instead, day and night,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>233</sup> From Noske to Hitler

throwing dust in the eyes of the working class. At least in this case, this trend agrees with us and writes:

"One can talk very loudly, using the most 'irreconcilable' words, about the opposition to capitalism, without starting any radical struggle against the system of wage slavery."<sup>234</sup>

Apparently, this trend has started a race with workercommunism to smear proletarian concepts, values and ideals. If worker-communism muddies the concepts of revolution, communism, internationalism, etc., this faction also confuses anti-capitalism, the abolition of wage labour, etc. In the name of anti-capitalism, they became the black army of bourgeois movements, they repeatedly bring disgrace and don't have the courage to raise their heads and defend their scandals. Instead, they just keep ignominiously silent.

It may seem at first sight that a person or a movement is suffering from narcissism and is delusional, and from another perspective it may appear that Paydar has come to believe that he is advancing his mission through a new cult, with a new terminology, and his sermons are "The Sermon on the Mount" for his disciples who are supposed to join his way in the future. The latter has recently become very fashionable everywhere, especially in America. Such statements cannot be dialectical.

The question that arises is, how is this issue explained? It can only be understood through understanding the function and nature of the left of capital. The reactionary and capital-friendly nature of the left of capital sometimes causes criticism of individuals or movements of the left of capital. Radical criticism is the first step in escaping the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>234</sup> As source 231.

nightmare of the bourgeois left. **Radical criticism is a necessary and essential but not sufficient condition for reaching a communist position.** If, instead of a radical critique, a person or a movement criticizes the left of capital from a reactionary angle, the result will not be freedom from the nightmare of the left of capital, but rather further sinking into the mud with a new rhetoric.

Paydar writes in relation to "well-known labour figure" or "anticapitalist movement activist" or "NATO defender." Which one of these titles applies depends on the degree of agreement of that person with this movement at that time:

"Mohsen Hakimi's recent writing entitled 'Communism of the Abolition of Wage Labour in the Captivity of Marxism Ideology' is a manifestation of the intellectual confusion, chaos and contradictions of a human being who, in his restless political and theoretical excursions, has left some places, but has not reached anywhere."<sup>235</sup>

Apparently, Paydar knows his friend from yesterday well, because he is of the same kind and they are familiar with each other's characteristics, features and goals. Therefore, in the above quote, we only change the place of the names to explain the reality of Paydar and his tendency, and the result is as follows:

"Paydar and his tendency's texts and function are a manifestation of intellectual confusion, chaos and contradictions of a human being who, in his restless political and theoretical excursions, has left some places, but has not reached anywhere."

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>235</sup> As source 139.

Paydar and his movement have attracted criticisms from a reactionary angle to the left of capital with their intellectual confusion and contradictions, and they have not reached anywhere in their restless political and theoretical excursions. As much as they struggle to spread more mud against the Marxists and throw dirt in the eyes of the working class, they sink into the mud more.

One of the ideologues of the Islamic bourgeoisie, who has recently metamorphosed from the right wing of capitalism to the left, that is, Dr Mohammad Qaraguzloo, presents the "getting lost of Rosa Luxemburg," but in a different way. It seems that Luxemburg had lost the boundary between socialist democracy and bourgeois democracy. It is better for the doctor that, instead of spreading mud against the "Eagle of the Proletariat," Luxemburg, he should continue praising the octopus intelligence ministry of the Islamic bourgeoisie<sup>236</sup>

There were differences of opinion between Luxemburg and Lenin on a series of fundamental issues, and this difference of opinion even turned into a controversy between them.<sup>237</sup> Nevertheless, Lenin believed that Luxemburg was an eagle of the proletariat, and would

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>236</sup> The doctor, an ideologist of capital, in his praise of octopuses, such as the Ministry of Intelligence of the Islamic bourgeoisie and the Supreme Leader of the Islamic bourgeoisie, once wrote:

<sup>&</sup>quot;Taken together, these two goals, first and foremost, would drag Mohammad Khatami's seizure policy into a completely blind and dark impasse. The conspiracy was barred by the intelligence of the Supreme Leader, the pursuit of the President, and the intelligence, tact and rationality of the Ministry of Information and the enlightenment of the press."

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>237</sup> In theoretical differences, Lenin was right in some ways, and Luxemburg in others. We have mentioned some of them in the content of the book, but their explanation is outside the content of this section.

remain one, and that life and her works would be a source of inspiration for the education of a generation of communists:

"Eagles may at times fly lower than hens, but hens can never rise to the height of eagles. Rosa Luxemburg was mistaken on the question of the independence of Poland; she was mistaken in 1903 in her appraisal of Menshevism; she was mistaken on the theory of the accumulation of capital; ...(she corrected most of these mistakes at the end of 1918 and the beginning of 1919 after she was released). But in spite of her mistakes she was—and remains for us—an eagle. And not only will Communists all over the world cherish her memory, but her biography and her *complete* works (the publication of which the German Communists are inordinately delaying, which can only be partly excused by the tremendous losses they are suffering in their severe struggle) will serve as useful manuals for training many generations of Communists all over the world."<sup>238</sup>

Rosa Luxemburg was a red star who shone in the proletarian political milieu. Although those civilized barbarians, who called themselves democrats, murdered her in the heart of Europe, this source of inspiration for the proletariat, as well as her teachings in particular on the development of capitalism, the concept of imperialism, the national question etc., is still alive. Contrary to the wishes of the killers of this proletariat leader, she is alive in class battles. The spectre of Rosa Luxemburg is still haunting us. In her last essay, written under the conditions of repression in relation to the order of capital, she said:

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>238</sup> Notes of a Publicist

"Order prevails in Berlin!" You foolish lackeys! Your 'order' is built on sand. Tomorrow the revolution will 'rise up again, clashing its weapons,' and to your horror it will proclaim with trumpets blazing: I was, I am, I shall be!"

248

# The Nationalism of the Movement for the Abolition of Wage Labour

Internationalists believe that capitalism is a global production system that has spread to the ends of the earth. The bourgeoisie is a world class and accordingly the proletariat is also a world class. Therefore, the communist programme and platform in the era of capitalist decline and imperialism can only be internationalist. Internationalism is a measure of distance or proximity of a political movement to proletarian positions.

Although Marx did not live long enough to witness the age of imperialism and analyse it, the concept of world revolution is nevertheless based on his teachings and especially his analysis of the growth of productive forces. While summarizing the class struggles in France, Marx assessed the possibility of a proletarian revolution within the national boundaries of France, along with other bourgeois nations, as an illusion and wrote:

"Just as the workers thought they would be able to emancipate themselves side by side with the bourgeoisie, so they thought they would be able to consummate a proletarian revolution within the national walls of France, side by side with the remaining bourgeois nations."<sup>239</sup>

As referred to by Marx, the proletarian revolution is, in its essence, a world revolution. For the first time in history, the exploited

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>239</sup> As source 62 – page 19

class, the proletariat, is responsible for this mission to achieve sovereignty and create new production relations. This class cannot free itself unless it liberates the whole of humanity from the yoke of the class system and then eliminates itself as a class. The difference between the communist revolution and other revolutions is in the destruction of social classes and consequently the elimination of nationalities. Such a thing is not feasible within the framework of a country and this problem is only possible in a global dimension. Marx explains it like this:

"In all revolutions up till now the mode of activity always remained unscathed and it was only a question of a different distribution of this activity, a new distribution of labour to other persons, whilst the communist revolution is directed against the preceding mode of activity, does away with labour, and abolishes the rule of all classes with the classes themselves, because it is carried through by the class which no longer counts as a class in society, is not recognised as a class, and is in itself the expression of the dissolution of all classes, nationalities, etc. within present society"<sup>240</sup>

The communist revolution is a world revolution. In other words, the communist revolution is a political earthquake that has its centre in the country or countries but where the condition of its victory spreads the waves of the political earthquake to other regions and countries. If this is not the case, as in the October Revolution, despite the sacrifices of the Russian proletariat, the revolution will be isolated and will eventually fail. **The socialist relations of production are only** 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>240</sup> The German Ideology- Karl Marx

### possible on a global scale and cannot form islands of socialism within capitalism.

Unlike the nationalist leftists, apart from its different versions, the programme and platform of the internationalists relate to the internationalist horizon, because the struggle of the working class is global, so the militants can be active in such trends and be part of the internationalist struggle of the working class, regardless of their geographical location.

With minimal explanations regarding the concept of the proletarian revolution, which is universal in its nature, let's see what the movement for the abolition of wage labour has said regarding the scope and content of the social revolution. This faction believes that such topics as linking the victory of the workers' struggle to the world revolution are completely irrelevant to the struggle of the working class against wage labour and is a stubborn supporter of establishing socialism in its own country:

"Tying the victory, the anti-capitalist war of workers everywhere in the world, to the simultaneous occurrence of 'world revolution' and issues like it, we also consider these to be at the base unrelated to the radical movement of the working class against wage labour."<sup>241</sup>

Contrary to the opinions of Marx, who believed that the proletarian revolution is only possible in a period when two factors, the **modern productive forces** and **bourgeois forms of production**, have come into conflict with each other, this trend believes that the conditions for a socialist revolution (proletarian revolution) have

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>241</sup> The *Negah* magazine, No. 32 – page 50.

existed for a long time. In other words, it is enough for not the working class, but the "**working masses**" to act and start a revolution:

"From our point of view, the formation of workers' councils and the preparation of the working masses is a routine and actual matter for the socialist revolution, the conditions of which have existed for a long time and are fully present now."<sup>242</sup>

As mentioned, according to this movement, the socialist revolution is an actual prospect, so what are the real problems for the proletariat of Iran in preparing for it? In the first issue of its publication, this faction presents a list, some of which are:

"The real problems on the way to the preparation of the socialist revolution by the proletariat of Iran, in the current conditions, in general and listed are:

The deprivation of political and social freedoms and necessary conditions to carry out organized and united struggle against the economic, political and social disenfranchisement.

The lack of an independent communist movement and a real Worker-Communist Party, which is needed to create this movement and to lead the workers' struggle...<sup>243</sup>

In other words, if Iran's capitalism had a bourgeois democratic superstructure instead of a dictatorial superstructure, and enjoyed political and social freedoms, and the workers also enjoyed the freedom to organize and strike, then one of the real problems on the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>242</sup> As source 188.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>243</sup> As source 38 – page 90.

way to preparing a socialist revolution would disappear. Then one can raise the following question: all these features are present, at least in Western Europe, so why does the proletariat of these countries not start a socialist revolution? The answer is probably that the working class of these countries have become bourgeois, and now the peripheral capitalist proletariat has become the standard-bearer of the socialist revolution, and the task of liberating the metropolitan proletariat is also the responsibility of the peripheral capitalist proletariat. For us, the struggle of the working class is a global struggle, and the workers of different countries, as battalions of the world proletariat, advance the internationalist class struggle.

The second factor is the lack of a true Worker-Communist Party. According to this trend, it lost its meaning after completing its metamorphosis. At that point, this comment could have served to recruit dissidents from the Worker-Communist Party. This movement now rejects any party formation, and regards it as a tool to dominate the class struggle of the workers. Again, another fundamental question is raised, which is that if this issue has also lost its meaning according to the belief of this movement, why don't the workers in Iran start a socialist revolution?

This movement, like its European and Western versions, is a nationalist one. In other words, its positions are prepared for a particular country. In order to not be accused of nationalism, articles have been translated into English and published on its website. But the internationalists are not publishing articles in different languages. Instead, they are considering the class interests of the entire working class, contemplating the class struggle of the working class from an internationalist perspective, and looking at the historical goal of the working class, i.e., world socialism, as opposed to socialism in one country. Because this trend, like its other versions, is a nationalist one, only people who belong to a certain area can become active in such a movement. Imagine, for example, that a militant from Norway or Germany became interested in this trend and wanted to try to advance its positions. This Norwegian or German activist went to his/her colleague, as part of his/her duty, to promote the demands of this trend (minimum demands) and presented to his/her colleague that this trend argues that:

"Free treatment, free healthcare, free education, and in this context free commuting and other free social facilities are the daily demands of the working class of every society."<sup>244</sup>

Please pay attention: these demands are the daily demands of the working class of **every society**. Won't the Norwegian or German worker tell him/her how far backward these demands are? Because in these countries, not only are treatment, health and education paid from the surplus value of workers, or according to the literature of this trend, they are free, but social insurance, which means more than the demands of this trend, also covers citizens. Despite all this, in these countries there is still wage slavery, and workers are exploited and produce surplus value, so that capital can be accumulated.

Let's go back to the socialist revolution intended by this movement. The result of a socialist revolution within the national borders of a country will not be considered a workers' state or a workers' socialist soviet republic by this movement if it does not start planning work and production in order to eliminate wage labour:

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>244</sup> As source 103.

"The anti-capitalist movement... does not consider any state, under any name, to be a workers' state or a workers' socialist soviet republic as long as it is not actively involved in direct, conscious, organized and councilian intervention of the working class and is not engaged in active work, planning work and production planning aligned with the elimination of wage labour."<sup>245</sup>

So far, we have found that this trend accepted the workers' state and the workers' soviet socialist republic, provided that it placed on its agenda a plan to eliminate wage labour. We were examining the consequences of this opinion, when we suddenly realized that, in another place, this movement has stated that, after the fall of the political power of the bourgeoisie, i.e., after the overthrow of capitalism, the proletariat will have "**the vast mass of humans**" in its councils. It will organize and, **free of any type of state** or higher force, it will disrupt the practice of wage labour and eradicate the buying and selling of labour power.

"The term workers' state has been accompanied by various interpretations and narratives since the beginning of time. The Bolsheviks called the state after the days of the October Revolution a 'workers' state' or a 'dictatorship of the proletariat'. The contributions of the proletariat are a clear task in the days after the fall of the political power of the bourgeoisie. The vast mass of united and organized humans, in their councils, councils free from any kind of state and force above the head, free from any constraint beyond themselves, will disturb the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>245</sup> The *Negah* magazine, No. 32 – page 45.

enclosures of wage labour and will consign the relationship of buying and selling labour power to the graveyard of history. They will put an end to the existence of the state and classes and what the legacy of the class society is. They will plan work and production in line with their real human needs, and they will implement this plan."<sup>246</sup>

The alleged socialist republic of this trend is Stalinism with councilist rhetoric. Socialism is a global society without wage labour, without money, without classes, and therefore without a state, in which the mode of production is socialist. It is even more ridiculous that the proletariat wants to organize the "vast mass of humans" in its council. Humanity has no class burden. Jeff Bezos, Elon Musk, Bill Gates and other capitalists are also human. Worse than that, all warlords like Putin, Biden, Macron, Khamenei, etc., are also human. When the employers against the anti-labour unions, in metropolitan capitalism, defended the rights of the members of the council of this movement, or when the anti-capitalist councils, in peripheral capitalism, started concreting alleys and streets instead of the municipality, then the members of those councils became human and not workers.

It may be difficult for readers to understand how this trend wants to destroy wage labour within the framework of a country after the revolution, that is, in a peripheral capitalism in crisis. We will try to explain the topic with a real example so that it is easier to understand. The slogan of the Maoists is "the communist revolution and nothing less!" but these same Maoists joined the Joe Biden election campaign in the last US presidential election and showed that what they meant by "communist revolution" was to heat up the election oven and

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>246</sup> As source 245.

become Joe Biden's campaign. The intention of this movement is to abolish wage labour through council planning, something similar to the slogan of the Maoists. Without the world communist revolution and consequently without the implementation of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the dictatorship of the working class through national councils, not a party dictatorship, talking about the abolition of wage labour is only demagoguery and throwing dirt in the eyes of the working class.

This trend considers tying the workers' struggle to the world revolution irrelevant to the workers' anti-capitalist movement and believes that the "working masses" of each country can make a revolution in their own country. Since in recent times this trend does not evaluate the October Revolution as a proletarian revolution, it is important to find a desired revolution by this trend. Finally, our efforts came to fruition and we managed to find a revolution based on this trend, although it also failed. In an article titled "Why Did the Revolution Happen and Why did the Revolution Fail?" Paydar writes:

"The 1979 revolution took place in a society whose labour power, goods and work and production processes, law and state, and the structure of social order and everything, were capitalist and the fabric of the domination of the capitalist mode of production for decades...What was peaking at the mid-1970s and was stolen by the worst movements of the bourgeoisie in the moments of the beginning of the peak."<sup>247</sup>

Paydar repeats the nonsense of the other bourgeois trends. The revolution of 1979 occurred in society, but the revolution was stolen

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>247</sup> The *Negah* magazine, No. 23 – page 10.

by the worst movements of the bourgeoisie. It is an indisputable fact that since 1968 we have seen the heightening of the class struggle throughout the world, centred in France. The waves of this class struggle spread all over the world and reached Iran as well, and we witnessed the intensification of the class struggle between 1977 and 1980 in Iran. The class struggles of the Iranian working class of that day, despite all their weaknesses, ambiguities and even mistakes, still inspire the current struggles. However, in neither 1968 in France nor in 1979 in Iran, the proletarian revolution could not be included in the agenda of the proletariat. During the same class struggle, unlike the nationalists, the internationalists declared that Khomeini was no more progressive than the queen of England or Emperor Bokassa I. This position of the communist left, due to the undisputed dominance of the leftists and their uproar, did not have an echo in the political milieu. Nevertheless, it is still evidence of the correctness of the positions of the communist left in social events. At that time, the leftists, including Paydar's group, helped a great deal to stabilize the Islamic bourgeoisie under the name of being anti-imperialist.

Let's go back to the desired society of this nationalist trend after the workers gain political power, that is, the "workers' soviet republic." In the soviet republic of these friends, within the national borders of a country, wage labour will be destroyed, therefore so will money and the acquisition of surplus value, and as a result, the social classes. The dismantling of social classes means the destruction of the state, and in turn the nation as a bourgeois concept. The question is, in this soviet republic, what will be the interests and relations of the proletariat in association with other capitalist states? First, let's take a look at the guidelines and instructions, then let's analyse them. This movement describes these as: "Planning economic exchanges with capitalist states, based on guaranteeing the greatest benefits for the Iranian proletariat and the international working class, regulating political relations with states, corresponding to the maximum defence of the interests and struggles of the working class of different societies, cutting off any kind of economic and political relations with states, in all cases where the interests of the working class and interests of the labour movement of the countries are somehow endangered."<sup>248</sup>

The economic exchanges of the soviet republic with capitalist states will be based on guaranteeing the greatest benefits for the Iranian proletariat and the international working class. For example, the soviet republic will sell oil, gas, electricity, cars, etc., more expensively, to ensure the interests of the Iranian proletariat. Leaving Marx's economic teachings aside, you don't need to be a first-year student of economics to understand the absurdity of such statements. You only need to review the news of the day to see such nonsense as the interests of the proletariat.

There is still no news of a proletarian revolution, Iran's oil is embargoed, and with thousands of issues, it smuggles its oil at a huge discount and below the market price. The big problem arises later. Because of the sanctions, Iran is unable to receive its money from the sale of oil, gas, electricity, etc. Money is blocked in banks.

Contrary to the demagogues of this nationalist trend, history has shown that bourgeois states put aside all hostilities in the face of the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>248</sup> As source 188.

danger of proletarian revolution, in order to jointly suppress their class enemy. Versailles and Prussia put aside their enmity and joined hands in brotherhood and friendship to massacre their common enemy, the proletariat (the Paris Commune). It was in line with this joint suppression that Bismarck released 60,000 captured French soldiers to suppress the Paris Commune. In a way, this issue also occurred in Russia, and the bloc of imperialist countries intervened and organized a military invasion to crush the soviet republic.

Most ridiculously, the arrangement of the political relations of the soviet republic with other states corresponds to the maximum defence of the interests and struggles of the working class of different societies. Imagine that Tesla or Land Rover workers protest and strike in defence of their living standards, and the American and British states not only do not meet the demands of the workers, but also oppress them. The soviet republic ends its political and economic relations with America and Britain in defence of the struggles of Tesla or Land Rover workers. The question is, is there a state in the world that does not oppress workers? Therefore, we should break political and economic relations with everyone.

Apart from all this, in the utopia of these individuals who think they have eliminated wage labour, there is apparently still a proletariat. If there is no wage labour in a society, there will be no proletariat. In socialism, talking about the proletariat, the working class and wage labour is meaningless. Only in history books can one find such concepts in relation to the past. In socialism, work is understood only in the form of social activity and social work.

All the noises of this trend, with anti-wage rhetoric, only consider a series of anti-dictatorship, nationalist and leftist campaigns

anti-capitalist and that it is not possible to eliminate wage labour within the national borders of a country, unless it is done in the Khmer Rouge way, through sending everyone to labour camps, and viewing their work as "social work." Such movements or circles, apart from their different versions and different dialects, except for creating confusion in the political milieu, are unable to help promote the class struggle of workers and cannot provide an alternative to the abolition of wage labour as well as the brutality of capitalism.

From the Marxist perspective, due to its internal contradictions, the capitalist society cannot be a permanent and eternal production system, so the only solution is the communist revolution by the proletariat, which leads to the dictatorship of the proletariat. After the victory of the working class, wage slavery still exists, the mode of production is still capitalist, the society is class-based, and there is a special type of "state" in the society. But at the same time, the socialization of the means of production and society's institutions starts step by step. While socialization is gradually progressing, at the same time, the non-social sector is slowly decreasing and as a result, the state is getting smaller every day. When the whole society becomes socialized, then the state has deteriorated and we enter a socialist society.

After the capitalist system, we will see only one type of mode of production, the socialist one. In socialism, the mode of production is socialist, as in a communist society. The socialist mode of production means that there is no class and therefore there is no class struggle, and as a result there cannot be a state. In the early stages of communism (socialism), society still has the effects of capitalism and the distinction between manual and intellectual work has not completely disappeared. In the early stage of communism (socialism) society relations are "fair"; if you don't work, you receive nothing. This is what Marx called "bourgeois rights" in a communist (socialist) society. Therefore, the motto of the first stage of the communist (socialist) society is, "*To each according to his work*" in terms of the material blessings of the society. "Socialist" justice is in contradiction to the concept of communism in a communist society. Therefore, in a communist society, equal rights must be transformed into unequal ones, so that a communist concept can be found and the slogan "*from each according to his ability and to each according to his needs*" makes sense.

### The Marxist Concept of Exploitation

In a capitalist society, labour power is a commodity and the value of this commodity in the capitalist society, like any other commodity, is to be determined by the amount of necessary social labour for its reproduction. In other words, the value of labour power at any point in time or location (country specific) will be different. In the metropolitan capitalist countries, the reproduction of this commodity is more expensive and its value is high, hence its maintenance is more important. However, in the capitalist periphery, the cost of reproducing this commodity is low and its care and maintenance are not of considerable importance.

Although they are more wealthy, the reason that workers in the capitalist metropoles have a smaller share of gross domestic product and are enduring greater exploitation is that in metropolitan capital the high proportion of the organic composition of capital is the result of high labour productivity. Despite having very low living standards, workers in the periphery of capital have a greater proportion of the social, gross domestic product and, also, fewer metropolitan workers are exploited. It should be noted that the working class share of gross domestic product (the value produced in society) varies inversely with the rate of exploitation. The average ratio of the organic proportion of metropolitan capital to peripheral capital is about three times. Something that cannot play an important role in labour productivity is the price of labour in a capitalist society. In other words, labour rights do not play a decisive role in labour productivity, that is:

- the modern, sophisticated computerization of constant capital that is used in production processes (the high organic composition of capital);
- the extent of expertise and skills of the workforce; and
- the special privileges that, despite the equality of the organic composition of capital and the skilled labour force, result in a production process with higher labour productivity.

Because the industry uses more machinery and advanced techniques, this results in increasing the organic composition of capital to compensate for the losses that are due to expensive labour. However, this high organic composition results in more labour power and greater productivity, followed by a reduction in labour power that will eventually be a consequence. The massive army of the unemployed will be affected by the exchange of labour supply and demand, which will make the actual purchasing power of the labour force cheaper (purchasing power).

# The organic composition of capital \_\_\_\_\_\_ Constant Capital \_\_\_\_\_\_ Variable Capital

Yet, by reducing the variable capital, the source of surplus value also becomes more limited. However, capital attempts to compensate by reducing the rate of profit and increasing the productivity of labour. The centralization of the means of production and placing constant capital in the hands of a few capitalists leads to absorbing advanced technology in the production process and, hence, increasing productivity. Reducing the rate of profit in major industries and dismissing the labour power are the effects of this approach.

From 1770 to 1840, that is, over 70 years, when technology was still advancing at a slow rate compared to today, labour productivity increased by approximately 2,700 per cent. Marx explains the results of his investigation as follows:

"In 1770 the population of the United Kingdom of Great Britain was 15 million, and the productive population was 3 million. The scientific power of production equalled a population of about 12 million individuals more. Therefore there were, altogether, 15 million of productive forces. Thus the productive power was to the population as 1 is to 1; and the scientific power was to the manual power as 4 is to 1.

In 1840 the population did not exceed 30 million: the productive population was 6 million. But the scientific power amounted to 650 million; that is, it was to the whole population as 21 is to 1, and to manual power as 108 is to 1.

In English society the working day thus acquired in 70 years a surplus of 2,700 percent productivity; that is, in 1840 it produced 27 times as much as in 1770."<sup>249</sup>

With these explanations, the following question is raised: how familiar is this trend with Marxist economic topics that its leader teaches the workers about *Capital* (Rereading Marx's *Capital*)? This movement writes as follows:

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>249</sup> The Poverty of Philosophy – Marx – page 44

"To have a low organic composition of social capital, compared to the monopoly capital of imperialist societies, is another distinction between Iran's capitalism and similar societies. A lower organic composition of capital, in turn, implies a wider exploitation of labour, and the production of higher rates of profit. The lower level of organic composition, in the sense of a higher relative amount of variable capital, in total social capital and to put it more simply, is the exploitation of a larger number of workers, by a certain amount of capital, and necessarily the production of more surplus value compared to the monopoly capital of the 'metropolitan' society. Iran's social capital, on the one hand, exploits a much cheaper labour force and on the other hand, in proportion to its constant part, it exploits a larger number of workers."<sup>250</sup>

This trend, like other leftists, talks about "imperialist societies," that is, countries like America, Britain, France, Germany, etc., which are imperialistic, in which the characteristic of imperialism is determined by the domineering and tyrannical character of such countries, not by the development of capitalism. That capitalism became the dominant global mode of production, and that imperialism is a phase of capitalist life and includes all capitalist states, is meaningless for this movement. The fact that no capitalist state can continue its existence outside of this stage, i.e., the age of imperialism, is incomprehensible to this trend. In other words, they don't accept that small gangsters like Iran, Iraq, Pakistan, etc., and big ones like America, Britain and France are all imperialists. This movement does

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>250</sup> The Face of Socialism, No. 1 – page 83.

all of this, while on the same issue of imperialism it seizes every opportunity and throws mud at Lenin.

"The production of higher rates of profit" is one of the innovations of this trend and has nothing to do with Marxism and Marx's teachings. Apparently, it was difficult for "The Master of *Capital*" to understand the most basic Marxist topics. For the information of the leader of this movement, who teaches the lesson of capitalism, profits are not produced, but it is surplus value that is produced. Only when the produced surplus value is distributed among the capitalists does the surplus value take the form of profit. Profit is distributed, not produced.

Contrary to this nonsense, this trend wants to insinuate that the labour power in peripheral capitalism is exploited more than metropolitan capitalism because it is cheap, while the rate of exploitation in the Marxist sense, as we saw above, in the peripheral countries is lower than metropolitan capitalism. All the anti-capitalist rhetoric of such movements is intended to dress up their antidictatorship and leftism as anti-capitalist.

Commenting that "a lower organic composition of capital, in turn, implies a wider exploitation of labour" is absolutely wrong and has nothing to do with Marxism. The rate of exploitation is calculated through the following formula.



If we assume that the surplus value is constant in the above formula, the variable capital is inversely proportional to the rate of

exploitation, in other words, in such a case, however low the amount of variable capital is, the rate of exploitation will be increased in the same proportion, or the higher the amount of variable capital, the lower the rate of exploitation. Now, if by increasing the organic ratio of and increasing labour productivity, we capital succeed in simultaneously reducing the variable capital and increasing the amount of surplus value, then the rate of exploitation by two variables will increase. This is the same issue that happened to Apple. According to research conducted by the Continental Social Research Institute,<sup>251</sup> the rate of exploitation of the makers of Apple's iPhones in the 21st century is approximately 2,458 per cent, which is 25 times more than British textile workers during Marx's time. The results of this research can be generalized to other industries or more research can be used to prove its validity.

Let's go back to the lower level of the alleged organic composition of this movement, which apparently causes the exploitation of a larger number of workers by a certain amount of capital, and necessarily produces more surplus value compared to the monopoly capital of the metropolitan society.

It is an undeniable fact that labour is the source of value in society, and it is also a fact that the accumulated capital in the US is unmatched by any other country. Then the following question arises: if we don't want to fall into leftist theories, is the working class of the US able to produce all this accumulated capital despite the high productivity of labour and the organic composition of capital?

It is undeniable that the capital accumulated in the United States is not only obtained from the exploitation of the American working class, but because of monopolies, a large part of the surplus value

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>251</sup> Institute for Social Research.

produced by workers in other countries also flows to the US. The amount of Indian labour is several times that of American labour and is much cheaper. Meanwhile, the gross domestic product (GDP) of America is 7.5 times that of India.

Because, according to the leftists, America is domineering, and India is probably not, to continue our analysis of "the lower organic composition of capital, in turn, implies the wider exploitation of labour power," we choose two countries that are non-dominant from the point of view of leftists, but imperialist from our perspective, that is, Saudi Arabia and Pakistan.

According to the statistics of the World Bank for 2022,<sup>252</sup> the workforce of Saudi Arabia was approximately 15,913,000 and the workforce of Pakistan 78,909,000. Since the word "total" is mentioned in the statistics, it is likely that migrant or guest labour is included in the statistics of Saudi Arabia. Again, according to the statistics of the World Bank for 2022,<sup>253</sup> the GDP of Saudi Arabia was equal to 1,208 billion US dollars and the GDP of Pakistan to 376 billion US dollars.

Pakistan's workforce in 2022 was approximately five times that of Saudi Arabia's, and according to the arguments of this trend, Pakistan's GDP should be five times that of Saudi Arabia's GDP. But, contrary to the expectation of this trend, Saudi Arabia's GDP in the same year was approximately 3.2 times that of Pakistan's GDP. All the justification of such movements, that they are anti-capitalist and against wage slavery, is just a cover for democratic struggles and leftism. Collect your mess. End your incoherent and nonsensical speech.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>252</sup> The World Bank.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>253</sup> "Gross Domestic Product 2022," World Bank.

If we leave aside the nonsense of such movements, how can the above issue be explained from a Marxist point of view? The first factor is that the greater the organic composition of capital, the bigger the labour productivity and the higher the rate of exploitation of the working class. The reason why the Saudi workforce is one fifth of Pakistan's workforce, but produces approximately 3.2 times the value, can be explained by this issue. The second factor is the issue of monopolies and, as a result, the acquisition of superprofits.<sup>254</sup> The Saudi Arabian Oil Group earns superprofits due to its monopoly on oil pricing. In other words, the Saudi Arabian Oil Group appropriates not only the surplus value produced by the working class of Saudi Arabia, but part of the surplus value produced by the workers of other countries as well, including when it takes over imperialist countries. Yes, from a Marxist perspective, the Saudi oil company, for example, even exploits German workers. It is to maintain this monopoly that Bin Salman does not answer Joe Biden's call to increase oil production. Iran was also able to obtain superprofits when its oil was not sanctioned and did not have to be sold below the market price, during both the time of the monarchy and the Islamic bourgeoisie.

We observed the irrelevance of this tendency in relation to the exploitation of workers and the contribution of the working class to the gross national product (the value produced in society). Another important question that is raised is, what is the most fundamental economic transformation of the socialist society, according to this

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>254</sup> In order to reveal the bourgeois nature of worker-communism, the issues regarding the monopolies and acquisition of superprofits, and consequently the exploitation of the working class of the metropolitan countries by the monopolies of the peripheral countries, have been discussed in detail in the book *Worker-Communism, Radical Conscience of the Left of Capital.* 

movement? Please remember this **most fundamental** word. This faction, which has discussed the economic topic in relation to the socialist economy, writes as follows in the section related to the "socialist distribution of the product of labour":

"Equal distribution of all necessities of life, public services, public welfare and in short all the achievements and products of human labour, among the citizens and based on their life needs, is the most fundamental axis of the socialist transformation of the economy in the society."<sup>255</sup>

Firstly, the "equal distribution" of the products of human labour among citizens is irrelevant to Marx's socialism. This opinion is more a reflection of early socialists or Proudhon, as a product of the era when the working class, as a social class, had not yet appeared in social developments, or an anarchist attitude that cannot be part of the theory of workers' liberation.

Secondly, as we explained in the previous chapter, in the early stage of communism (socialism) society relations are "fair"; if you don't work, you receive nothing. This is what Marx called "bourgeois rights" in a communist (socialist) society. Therefore, the motto of the first stage of the communist (socialist) society is, "To each according to his work" in terms of the material blessings of the society. "Socialist" justice is in contradiction to the concept of communism in a communist society. Therefore, in a communist society, equal rights must be transformed into unequal ones, so that a communist concept can be found and the slogan "from each according to his ability and to each according to his needs" makes sense.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>255</sup> The Face of Socialism – No. 1 – page 68.

Thirdly, **the most fundamental economic transformation of socialism is the elimination of wage labour**. In other words, social work replaces wage slavery, and as a result, surplus value is no longer produced in that society, and there is no sign of capital accumulation.

According to our investigations and explanations, this trend does not have the necessary knowledge and qualifications to reread Marx's *Capital*. It does not belong to the class struggle of the workers. All philosophers have interpreted the world, but the issue is changing it. Paydar also appeared in the role of a philosopher and tried to interpret Marx's *Capital*, but Marx was trying to change the world throughout his proud life.

The main reason why today's workers do not show much desire to read Marxist works is the historical failure of the working class. Translation issues and the difficulty of some classic Marxist works are secondary problems. With the emergence of class struggle, Marxist texts will once again be attractive to workers. Marxist texts and Marxist theory are not for boasting and expressing grace, but for class battles, and it is during the class struggle that Marx's teachings can gain meaning and be effective in battles.

### The Communist Left, the Only Horizon

Marxism expressed the maturity of the emergence of the working class as a social class in the development of society; rather than riots or insurrections, it offered a political programme and a call for social revolution, as its historical mission, in order to end the capitalist system by its replacement with the "dictatorship of the proletariat", followed by the move to a classless communist society.

Unlike the First International, the parties organized in the Second International were founded on the basis of Marxism and under the title of social democratic parties. Since capitalism had not yet entered the era of decline (the age of imperialism), the communist revolution was not yet on the agenda of the proletariat, so the struggle for reforms and improving the living conditions of the working class was an important part of the duties of the social democratic parties. With the rise of reformism, within the social democratic parties, the left wing of social democracy was formed in defence of Marxism, whose most well-known figures include Lenin in Russia, Luxemburg in Germany, Pannekoek in the Netherlands and Bordiga in Italy.

When capitalism entered its decadent era, with the First World War one of its clear signs, the age of imperialist wars and communist revolutions began. The First World War caused the overwhelming majority of social democratic parties to betray the positions of the working class and make the workers cannon fodder in the imperialist war and, as a result, join the camp of capitalism forever. Only the Bolsheviks and very small minorities in other countries remained loyal to proletarian positions during the First World War. The Zimmerwald Conference in 1915 represented the first international reaction of the labour movement against the capitalist desire to participate in a world war, which was formed as a response to the slaughter and brutality of World War I. It was here that the seed of the Third International was planted. Because of this, Zimmerwald became part of the communist left's legacy. In Zimmerwald, 38 delegates from 11 neutral and belligerent countries gathered to demonstrate their international solidarity. But the participants in the conference, as their resolutions showed, were less united in their goals.

Zimmerwald's left wing included a small minority that had gathered around Lenin and now stood for the first time as a defender of international socialism that was not only Russian. Accordingly, at the Zimmerwald Conference, Lenin's defeatist position was taken against all warring governments and different nations were asked to "turn the imperialist war into a civil war". The necessity of forming a new international organization was also announced.

The communist current within social democracy not only raised the banner of proletarian internationalism, but also opened up the horizon of the wave of world revolution by leading labour protests and strikes as well as uprisings. The glorious October Revolution won in Russia and the revolution was taking place in other countries including Germany.

Although the necessity for an international organization had been raised since 1915, unfortunately, no serious action had been taken to establish one. Finally, in 1919, the communists broke away from the radical faction of social democracy and formed the inaugural congress of the Communist International with the aim of destroying capitalism and establishing an international workers' dictatorship (through workers' councils). The parties organized in the Communist International called themselves communists to distinguish themselves from the Social Democrats.

The rise of the wave of world revolution led to the ascent of the communist left. Although it had an internationalist attitude and a global approach, nevertheless, in countries where the Marxist tradition was strong, that is, in Russia, Germany, the Netherlands, Italy and Britain, the communist left was more prominent than in other countries.

The failure of the wave of world revolution, which began with the defeat of the German revolution and the systematic massacre of the leaders of the German working class, led to the isolation of the October Revolution. The last embers of the world revolution wave were extinguished in 1926 in Britain by the suppression of the general strike and in 1927 in the proletarian uprising in Shanghai. The isolation of the October Revolution increased the process of gradual corruption in the field of proletarian internationalism and power (soviet power) in Russia. The Bolshevik Party was increasingly integrated into the state apparatus and showed the results of its actions in the councils, factory committees, the Red Army, etc. Isolation and the consequences of the failure of the wave of world revolution followed the decline of the activity of the working masses. Accordingly, activities within the parliament, trade unions and an appeal to the "people of the East," to counter the growth of imperialism and most importantly the policy of creating a united front, were prescribed by the Comintern.

The communist left, which was formed during the rise of the world revolution and constituted the left wing of the communist movement, according to the new conditions, took on the serious task of defending the goals and ideals of the proletariat and considered itself the true defender of Marxism and its continuation. Communist left activists (internationalists) from Bulgaria to Germany, from Russia to America, from Britain to Holland, and Italy, etc., defended communist positions.

With the onset of signs of the failure of the wave of world revolution and in response to the wave of world revolution defeat, an attitude was formed within the labour movement, which became known as council communism. Unlike communist left, which arose from the height of the world revolution and expresses the strength of the proletariat, council communism was formed from the ebb and flow of the world revolution, and was an expression of the weakness of the proletariat. Nevertheless, council communism in the 1920s and 1930s, despite having an idealistic approach to the history of the proletariat as well as its confusion, remained loyal to the proletarian positions.

With the beginning of the counter-revolutionary period, the "communist" parties transformed into national parties, and this time the "communist" parties permanently joined the camp of the bourgeoisie and formed the left of the political apparatus of capital. In countries where the revolutionary movement had reached its highest point, and was now failing and retreating, such as Russia, Germany, and Italy, the communist left were most violently suppressed, exiled, or terribly isolated. The Russian communist left played an important role in defending the proletarian concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the concept of world revolution, the rejection of the united front, etc. Unfortunately, the unbridled suppression of the anti-revolution trod a generation of the communists into the soil, although they were the builders of the glorious October Revolution, creators of

unforgettable and heroic battles, and the Russian communist left could not continue on this path and become a lasting tradition.

The German and Dutch Communist Left played an important role in the early 20's against the degeneration of the Communist International, and thus became **a pole** to defend the revolutionary positions. The German and Dutch Left had a very clear idea of the unions, parliamentary, and so on. Unfortunately, after the 20's could not defend the revolutionary positions as a pole and a part of the German and Dutch Left began to develop positions that would reject the Marxist method, and **even make concessions behind**. Since then, proudly supporting Marxism and revolutionary positions against counter-revolution ended with the Italian communist left.

In the 1930s, while in exile and publishing the *Bilan* magazine, the Italian communist left faction, while adhering to the basic principles of internationalism, faced the danger of war, and took stock of the failure of the wave of world revolution and especially the Russian one. The war in Spain was a great test for the communist left, which was able to assess both fronts as imperialist, as Lenin had done in the First World War, and called the workers to class struggle. During the Second World War, the communist left was the only movement that evaluated both fronts as imperialist and emphasized the necessity of class struggle on both sides, and was persecuted by both fronts.

The beginning of the Second World War erased "council communism" from the political scene. After the end of the Second World War, currents or militants tried to organize the positions of "council communism," which were heavily influenced by anarchism, libertarianism, workerism, anti-fascism, modernism, etc. In other words, after the Second World War, "council communism"

277

metamorphosed into "councilism," which was closer to anarchism than to the original "council communism." Therefore, the Second World War represents the distinguishing point of "council communism" from "councilism."

The reviews of this book, in the light of real events, demonstrate that simply criticizing the leftists or even grasping a series of revolutionary and proletarian positions, without understanding them dialectically, will not only lead to communist positions, but also to more intellectual confusion with other rhetoric and will perform the same function as the left of capital. Even more destructively, it will become an obstacle for the militants or circles that seek communist and internationalist positions and will eventually result in the disillusionment of the militants. A mirage is not simply a trick of nature, which occurs when the human eye suffers a vision error in certain atmospheric conditions. This deception in the political milieu shows itself to be more dangerous than nature. Worker-communism, with its seemingly radical criticisms of the left, created a kind of false mirage, which disillusioned a generation of people. Now, this tendency, or different versions of it, are struggling to do the same thing on a smaller scale.

The leftists who, except for their different versions or languages, appear in the form of metamorphosed councilism, or even call themselves councilists, are not only a reference for the struggles of the working class, and no more than a mirage, but they also fuel the intellectual turmoil in the working class, and cause the disillusionment of the militants in the political milieu. Such movements sterilize the struggle of the workers and, most importantly, distance the working class from its historical task, the world communist revolution. Contrary to councilist movements, apart from their differing versions, or their different languages, the communist left has always been loyal to proletarian positions and goals, despite the ambiguities, confusions and even mistakes it has made throughout its proud history and as a compass, it has shown the way in class battles and has been a reference for the struggles of the working class. The communist left has been the true continuation of Marxism in the last hundred years and has become part of the historical memory of the proletariat.

If we put aside the leftism appearing in the role of metamorphosed councilism, councilism itself is an expression of the weakness of the proletariat, not its strength. The fact is that there is a very important commonality between councilism and social democracy. The **movement** means everything and the **goal** of world communist revolution means nothing. The communist left has produced rich and valuable documents and texts, especially in the English, Italian and French languages. We encourage all militants and circles that consider themselves to belong to councilism, whatever its versions or dialects, to engage in discussions with the communist left currents in different countries.

As noted, councilism is nothing more than a mirage. Instead of being part of a nationalist movement, acting as part of the left of capital or creating confusion and intellectual confusion with anti-capitalist rhetoric within the working class, whose results are not the emancipation of wage slaves, but the continuation of the brutality of capitalism, enter into a discussion and even controversy with the communist left movements. Instead of leading to political disillusionment, become part of the rising internationalist struggle and help the advancement of the communist left, so that you can be in the service of promoting the class struggle, on an internationalist scale, with active and internationalist involvement in the class struggle. Be diligent in the formation of the internationalist and International Communist Party, because without this there is no possibility of the world communist revolution. All these efforts are in line with the historical task of the working class. If the working class does not fulfil its historical mandate, i.e., overthrowing capitalism through the world communist revolution, the destruction of humanity is certain.

#### **Internationalist Voice**

February 2024

# **Basic Positions:**

- The First World War was an indication that the capitalism had been a decadent social system. It also proved that there were only two alternatives to this system: communist revolution or the destruction of humanity.
- In our epoch, the working class is the only revolutionary class. Furthermore, only this social class can deliver the communist revolution and end the barbarity of capitalism.
- Once capitalism entered its decadent period, unions all over the world were transformed into organs of the capital system. In turn, the main tasks of unions were to control the working class and mislead them about its class struggle.
- In the epoch of decadent capitalism, participating in the parliamentary circus and elections only strengthens the illusion of democracy. Capitalist democracy and capitalist dictatorship are two sides of the same coin, namely, the barbarity of capitalism.
- All national movements are counterrevolutionary, against the working class and the class struggle. Wars of national liberation are pawns in imperialist conflict.
- The reason for the failure of the October Revolution was the failure of the revolutionary wave, particularly the failure of the German Revolution, which resulted in the isolation of October Revolution and afterwards its degeneration.

- All left parties are reactionary: Stalinists, Maoists, Trotskyists and official anarchists etc. represent the political apparatus of capital.
- The regimes that arose in the USSR, Eastern Europe, China, Cuba etc., while being called "socialist" or "communist", only offered a particularly brutal and barbaric form of capitalism: state capitalism.
- The revolutionary organization constitutes the avant-garde of the proletariat and is an active factor in the development and generalization of class consciousness. Revolutionary organizations may only take the form of revolutionary minorities, whose task neither is to organize the working class nor take power in its stead, without being a political leadership, or a political compass, where revolutionary organizations' political clarity and influence on the working fundamental classes are the elements for the implementation of a communist revolution.

#### **Political belongings:**

The current status, positions, views and activities of the proletarian political tendencies are the product of past experiences of the working class and the effectiveness of the lessons that political organizations of the working class have learned during the history of the proletariat. Therefore, Internationalist Voice can trace its own roots and origins back to the Communist League, the First International, the left wing of both the Second International and the Third International, and the fractions that defended proletarian and communist positions against the degenerating Third International, which was represented by Dutch-German fractions, and **particularly Italian Fraction of the Communist Left** and the defence of Communist Left traditions.

## Already published books and booklets!

