

# **Worker-Communism** **Radical Conscience of** **the Left of Capital**



**In Defence of Marxism**  
**Internationalist Voice**

## **Notice to readers**

Worker-Communism Radical Conscience of the Left of Capital had previously been published in a series of articles. The collection of articles is published in the form of a book.

Internationalist Voice

May 2022

## **Homepage:**

**[www.internationalistvoice.org](http://www.internationalistvoice.org)**

## **Email:**

**[contact@internationalistvoice.org](mailto:contact@internationalistvoice.org)**

**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 defense of proletarian values and principles. Support Internationalist Voice.

## Content of tables

Introduction .....	7
Azarakhsh (“Lightning”).....	12
Sahand: sympathizer of the Alliance for struggle for Working Class Cause	15
Current three and Alliance for struggle for Working Class Cause (Arman)	19
The 1979 Revolution in Iran from the Perspective of the UCM .....	24
Sahand and the Anti-Imperialist Struggle .....	31
The petty bourgeois Khomeini .....	39
Changing the name of “Sahand” to the Unity of Communist Militants.....	45
The Marxist-Leninist ideology of the UCM .....	53
The country of the Unity of Communist Militants.....	57
The UCM and the Iranian “communist” movement .....	59
The UCM and the theocratic faction of the bourgeoisie .....	68
The Marxist conception of social revolution.....	74
The democratic revolution from the perspective of the UCM .....	83
Retaking the democratic revolution .....	98
Stealing the work of others .....	101
The Economic Theories of the UCM .....	103
The Marxist concept of super-profits .....	111
The value of labour power and the UCM.....	124
Absolute ground rent and differential rent .....	130
The Marxist concept of capital accumulation .....	133
The minimum programme of the UCM .....	140
War and the Unity of Communist Militants.....	147

The era of imperialist wars and the era of communist revolutions ..... 152

The left of capital perspective on the reasons for the formation of the imperialist war between Iran and Iraq..... 154

Turning workers into cannon fodder on the battlefield of war to defend the imperialist war..... 161

Vote for war credits..... 167

The bankruptcy of the UCM ..... 169

Worker-communism and other wars ..... 175

The Unity of Communist Militants and the coup..... 182

Rebuilding the Third Line under the Title of Revolutionary Marxism ..... 186

The formation of the only communist party of the world ..... 197

Bundism and the special rights of Komala..... 226

Marxism or narcissism ..... 233

Worker-communism and Stalinism..... 244

Worker-communism and Maoism..... 248

Worker-communism and the transition state ..... 253

Worker-communism and socialism in one country..... 265

Socialism or state capitalism ..... 286

The Place of Worker-communism in History ..... 293

Worker-communism and the Communist Left..... 308

Worker-communism and Trade Unions..... 322

Worker-communism and the National Question..... 337

Worker-communism and Independence for Kurdistan ..... 350

Worker-communism and Parliamentarism..... 354

Worker-communism and Democracy ..... 361

Background to the faction of worker-communism.....	369
What is worker-communism? .....	384
Worker-communism and workers' dilemma.....	410
Worker-communism and the acquisition of political power .....	419
Worker-communism and the ideology of the personalities.....	439
Worker-communism and relations with foreign governments .....	447
The ideology of Marxism-Hekmatism .....	453
Worker-communism and westernism.....	463
Worker-communism and the Freedom Guard.....	467
The collapse of worker-communism.....	477
Worker-communism and not being on the line .....	486
The split in the Iranian worker-communist Party .....	491
Worker-communism and the acknowledgment of failure .....	494
The practice of worker-communism is bourgeois communist by type .....	498
Subsequent crises .....	500
Last word and conclusion.....	502
Basic Positions: .....	508

## Introduction

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. The Communist parties organized in the Communist International were opposed to the Social Democratic Parties that had joined the camp of the bourgeoisie. "Council communism" was an idealistic response to the failure of the wave of world revolution. Communist Left was a reaction to the failure of the wave of world revolution in defence of Marxism and proletarian objectives. Stalinism showed the triumph of bourgeois counter-revolution over the ruins of the October Revolution. Trotskyism was also a mechanical reaction to the rise of counter-revolution, which, because of the limitations in its evolutionary process, was integrated into the left of capital. Maoism was a product of the crisis in the imperialist contra-revolution camp. Now the question is, "worker-communism" appeared as a product of which historical conditions and in response to which requirements?

Two answers have been given to these questions. We will consider both of them.

The first answer, given by bigwigs and devotees of worker-communism, is that worker-communism links back to Marx and is a continuation of Marxism. Ideologues of this tendency have tried for years to build a historical background to worker-communism and to present it as a historical movement, a theoretical system with structural integrity and providing historical continuity. The theoretical coherence of a theory is a necessary condition but is not sufficient for its accuracy. However, a theoretical system such as worker-communism which does not have internal consistency is no longer a Marxist theory but a set of positions and slogans that have been presented by the ideologues of the time;

positions whose inconsistencies and affiliation with the 'left of capital' have been made clear over the course of history. Statements such as 'historical continuity' and 'return to Marx' have been used by the leaders of this movement in order to distort history.

The second response, offered by the critics of worker-communism, states that worker-communism is without root, a personality cult and a sect like "Mojahedin" within the left movement.

It is very obvious that none of these answers are correct or convincing. Worker-communism is neither a continuing and developing process of Marx and Marxism, nor is it without roots. Worker-communism is a product of Stalinism, and emerged as a Stalinist circle. It was strongly influenced and fed by Maoism during its formation and evolution, although the founding of worker-communism stems from the crisis of the "current three" and the need to reintegrate it. Therefore, in order to defend Marxism we need to understand the formation of worker-communism; this movement should be examined in the context of the development of social events, from the sympathizing with Azarakhsh ("Lightning") to the flourishing period of this movement and then on to the demise of the parties and the small circles. If in the mid-1990s this political current was flourishing, by the end of the 1990s the current was beginning its demise, due to its internal contradictions.

Recently, the apostles of the French have been converted to the ideology of worker-communism and announced that worker-communism was first established in Iran, but will never be limited to the Middle East. As their Fuehrer declared, sooner or later the messages of the saviour of humanity will conquer the West, Europe, America etc. In their message to the first congress of the worker-communism Unity Party of Iran, these new apostles of the ideology of worker-communism said:

*"Worker-communism, as a movement of the working-class, is a world-wide product of the class struggle against capital. As a defined current, worker-communism was first established in Iran,*



*but was never intended to be “middle-eastern”, but rather to express the needs of the class itself.*

*Reading Mansoor Hekmat’s writings closely, as far as they have been translated into English and other European languages, we can see many, many examples of the fact that he always considered that, sooner or later, worker-communist parties would rise in western countries, in Europe and in America. Building such worker-communist circles in various countries in Europe is a first step towards a party.*

*It is very important to understand, and then to make known, that worker-communism is not just a specialized branch of Marxism designed for middle-eastern issues ...Now, it’s time for worker-communism to land in western countries, to be set up as a communist answer to the western working-class issues.”<sup>1</sup>*

Most religions (ideologies) were founded or created in the Middle East region. The Middle East was an establishing centre for the Abrahamic religions and dozens of minor religions. The establishment of the religion of worker-communism should also be considered in this way.

In early December 2011, just when the missionaries of worker-communism had announced the foundation of the “Centre of proletarian communism in the Arab world”, with plans for a large campaign in order to spread worker-communism across the Arabic countries, a political explosion occurred in the “Hekmatist” party, a crisis that also drew in sister parties from Iraq. What distinguishes the current crisis is its “coup” and “anti-coup” form. The party was split in two, with both sides trying to gain the upper hand in terms of leadership, facilities and ideological propaganda, all the while blaming the other for disrespecting the boundaries of political conduct. Each wants to bring the other to the

---

<sup>1</sup> Message of worker-communism Initiative (France, Belgium), to the first congress of worker-communism Unity Party, Iran, 20 February 2011

party's court for the infringement of organization and party order. Sister parties in Iraq play the role of mediator between 'coup' and 'anti-coup'. There seems to be no end to the tragedy within this ideology. We will come back to these issues later.

In order to evaluate this political current, it is important to look through its history step by step. The bare and extremely reactionary, anti-communist and bourgeois nature of this current in every part of society must be made clear. For example during its radicalism phase, it enforced its role as the Marxism of the bourgeois in all social contexts. Through the manipulation of Stalinism and Maoism, this amalgam was put forward as pure communism under the name of worker-communism.

In particular, at one point this political current tried to approach Communist Left, whilst deliberately hiding its contra-revolutionary nature. The obvious bourgeois nature of this current was criticized by the inter-nationalists, and for this reason, the Italian section of the current, under the influence of Communist Left, began to criticize the positions of the current by publishing pamphlets publicly. As a result, Hamid Taghvaei, a member of the central committee of the Communist Party of Iran began his delirium and revealed the contra-revolutionary nature of his own current under the guise of a critique of the platform of the Internationalist Communist Party. This issue has led to the movement sometimes being mistakenly attributed to Communist Left (both in Iranian and non-Iranian political circles).

It was in this context that Babak Kasrayi, an adviser to the central committee of the worker-communist party of Iran, in giving the reasons for his resignation, recently claimed worker-communism as belonging to Communist Left (which it seems was criticised by Lenin about a hundred years ago), and he says:

*"In general, ultra-leftism (beyond the leftism) is probably the greatest plague of the whole tradition of "worker-communism" in Iran and Iraq.*

*The indicator of this tendency is indifference and neglect of the traditions and struggles of the working class and the masses in general, and of their spirit and aspirations in each historical moment. Lenin, in his book 'Left-Wing' Communism: a disease of childhood', is sharply critical of this tendency. It is interesting that many of the sympathizers to the positions of Mansoor Hekmat in Europe follow exactly the same tendency of 'Communist Left' that Lenin criticises."*<sup>2</sup>

Apparently, Babak Kasrayi is one of the central committee's genius advisers who doesn't know that "*Lenin is an eatable or drinkable phenomenon!*"<sup>3</sup> An adviser to the central committee of a party should have at least a basic knowledge of the history of his political current and his party, and shouldn't need to refer to events from a hundred years ago, but rather simply to the 1980s and Hamid Taghvaei's "*Towards Socialism*" No.2. All of these issues will be revisited in our text, and in particular we will respond paragraph by paragraph to Hamid Taghvaei's delirious slander.

It is essential to note that we do not in any way criticise the political apparatus of the left of capital. The purpose of this book, rather than criticizing worker-communism, is to defend Marxism and proletarian goals and aspirations in the face of the left of capital.

---

<sup>2</sup> Resigned from membership in the worker-communist Party of Iran, Babak Kasrayi, a former adviser to the central committee, 24 March 2011

<sup>3</sup> The Führer of worker-communism, Mansoor Hekmat in his article "Goodbye, comrade" on 20 April 1999, touching precious gold as this: "Thousands honorable man rounding up to the party that they don't know Lenin is eatable or drinking phenomena and Marxists and senior workers in the party should not indicate this as their less esteem but see that their own success."

## Azarakhsh (“Lightning”)

The first political appearance of a circle that later became known as the “Marxist Circle for Worker’s Emancipation” can be traced back to students who were sympathizers of *Azarakhsh*. *Azarakhsh* was a magazine for those sympathetic to the “Marxist-Leninist Mojahedin”<sup>4</sup>, which was published abroad.

---

<sup>4</sup>Under the influence of guerrilla movements and also liberation movements such as Palestinian, Dhofar etc, two organizations started guerrilla activities in Iran in the early years of the 1970s. The first was a Stalinist current called «Organization of Iranian People's Fedayee Guerrillas». The second was a religious current called «Organization of Iranian People's Mojahedin», which was influenced by Stalinism and liberation movements. With the intensifying of Stalinist-Maoist movements and also national liberation movements which often were combined with the ideology of Stalinism, in this current Stalinism dominated Islam, which is known as a process of ideological change.

During the process of ideological change in the «Organization of Iranian People's Mojahedin» in the years 1973-1975 the vast majority of the members of the organization were converted from Islamic ideology to 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. Death squads on 6<sup>th</sup> May 1975 assassinated the Mojahedin who were not willing to convert from Islam to Stalinism in the streets of Tehran (Abozar Jomhuri), like in Hollywood movies. On October 1975 the Organization of Iranian People's Mojahedin published a book called «Declaration of ideological positions of Organization of Iranian People's Mojahedin» and announced that the ideology of the organization had been changed from Islam to «Marxism-Leninism». It is essential to note that this current later rejected the guerrilla strategy. The causes of denial of the guerrilla movement will not be discussed here.

The occurrence of the Stalinist coup in the Organization of Iranian People's Mojahedin is often related to the dictatorial character of the «Tagi Shahram», which is however a very superficial approach. The occurrence of a bloody coup,

The circle held discussions on the “Marxist-Leninist Mojahedin” and in particular the positions of Taghi Shahram on issues such as liberalism, negation of the guerrilla movement etc. With the escalation of political developments in Iran, this circle also tried to form their views about the future of Iran. The first text produced by this circle is a pamphlet a few pages long entitled “The Iranian revolution and the role of the proletariat (Theses)”, which was then distributed by the activists of *Azarakhsh*. According to Hamid Taghvaei, the current leader of the worker-communist party of Iran:

*“A group called Azarakhsh, a Marxist-Leninist current, had found us and liked our discussions. One of the leaders of this group suggested that we write down our discussions because he believed that they were different and interesting, and that it was necessary to put them on paper... They promised to publish the pamphlet (Theses) for us.”<sup>5</sup>*

Years later, Mansoor Hekmat, when he was no longer a sympathizer of the group, despite having earlier been a ‘leader’, gave a

---

such as in the Mojahedin, was a reflection of the Stalinist tradition. Furthermore «Tagi Shahram» was a “theoretical” figure and he introduced the term of «the monotheistic classless society». He had an impressive personality, and was able to influence his officer guard «Amir Hossein Ahmadin» and escape with plenty of weapons and ammunition on 5<sup>th</sup> May 1973 with other political prisoners from a prison in Sari, to then go to the central committee of the Mojahedin.

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)»

<sup>5</sup> Biography of Mansoor Hekmat written by Soheila Sharifi page 24

speech to the Marx society in London entitled the Oral histories of the Unity of Communist Militants. In his speech he states that the pamphlet, “The Iranian revolution and the role of the proletariat (Theses)” was essentially written as a critique of *Azarakhsh*:

*“At the same time a number of the split factions [of Mojahin] and current of “Tagi Shahram” and those that had been split from other groups, had established a current called Azarakhsh which had circles around the Farhad Basharat. Farhad introduced this group and its positions to us and we wrote our pamphlet “The Iranian revolution and the role of the proletariat (Theses)” basically as a critique of Azarakhsh.”*<sup>6</sup>

It seems that Mansoor Hekmat thought that everyone had lost their historical memory and that he could manipulate history as he liked. Firstly, no traces of criticism of the *Azarakhsh* or Stalinist Mujahedin exist in “The Iranian revolution and the role of the proletariat (Theses)”. Secondly, as we will see in the next section, this circle “correctly” insisted that the content of “The Iranian revolution and the role of the proletariat (Theses)” is in complete agreement with the views of the Stalinist Mojahedin. The history of this political current is full of such contradictions. We will return to the first Manifesto of this circle, “The Iranian revolution and the role of the proletariat (Theses)”, in the next sections.

---

<sup>6</sup> Mansoor Hekmat, speech in Marx society in London entitled as the oral histories of unity of communist militants, 15<sup>th</sup> May 2000

## **Sahand: sympathizer of the Alliance for struggle for Working Class Cause**

As previously described, the activists of the “Marxist Circle for Worker’s Emancipation” considered themselves to be sympathetic to the Marxist-Leninist fraction of Mojahedin, and this circle was seen as one of the circles sympathetic to the Stalinist (Marxist-Leninist) Mojahedin. Therefore, the first edition of “The Iranian revolution and the role of the proletariat (Theses)” was published together with the statement and message of the Stalinist Mojahedin (Marxist-Leninist Mojahedin) and stressed that the theme and content of the thesis of the pamphlet “The Iranian revolution and the role of the proletariat (Theses)” was in full agreement with the positions of the Marxist-Leninist faction of Mojahedin. The introduction of the pamphlet states:

*“The thesis outlined in this pamphlet, entitled ‘The Iranian revolution and the role of the proletariat (Theses)’, is in full agreement with the basis of theories announced by the Marxist-Leninist faction of the People’s Mojahedin organization of Iran in their message to all revolutionary homeland forces, revolutionary democrats, revolutionaries, communists, in a declaration addressed to the militant workers and militant communists dating from November 1978.”*

As a consequence of developments in society and the critical attitude of the Stalinist Mojahedin to the process of ideological change (the conversion of Mojahedin from Islam to Stalinism) the split faction of Mojahedin divided into groups: “Alliance for struggle for Working Class Cause (Arman)” and “Battle of the emancipation of the working class (Nabard)” and also an organization called “Organization of the Struggle on the Path to the Emancipation of the Working class (Peykar)”. The

“Marxist Circle for Worker's Emancipation” considered themselves as sympathetic to the group “Alliance for struggle for Working Class Cause (Arman)”. The circle’s activists did not have any plans to operate independently and they agreed to be absorbed into this group. As Mansoor Hekmat said:

*“We started our job as the nucleus that would be taken in by the other organizations, we did not plan ahead.”<sup>7</sup>*

Mansoor Hekmat referred to this issue again during the congress of the Unity of Communist Militants, but with one difference, as he was in the process of standing for the leadership position at the time. He stated that “Arman” would first accept the political positions of “Sahand” and then “Sahand” would join “Arman”!

*“At that point, from an organizational point of view, we had anticipated the course of action for “Sahand”. “Sahand” was a sympathizer of the “Alliance for struggle for Working Class Cause (Arman)” and its action plan from an organizational perspective was first to present its positions, which “(Arman)” would then accept [and then] “Sahand” would join “(Arman)”.”<sup>8</sup>*

Soheila Sharifi, a current member of the central committee of the worker-communist party of Iran emphasizes this again on page 29 of her book, a biography of Mansoor Hekmat, quoting him as saying:

---

<sup>7</sup> Mansoor Hekmat, speech in Marx society in London entitled as the oral histories of unity of communist militants, 15<sup>th</sup> May 2000

<sup>8</sup> Report by Mansoor Hekmat of the central committee of the Unity of Communist Militants (UCM) to the first congress of the UCM, “*Toward Socialism*” No: 5 pages 8 and 9



*“‘Sahand’ never had any intention of organizing and establishing a communist organization. They had no practice plans to recruit members or to organise their supporters. The main purpose, from the perspective of the Zhoobin [Mansoor Hekmat] and Hamid [Taghvai], was to strengthen the certain followers of the communist movement in Iran with their arguments, in the hope that these followers would be attracted by their discussions, which provided the basis for their work. They hoped then to gradually organize the activists of ‘Sahand’.”*

One question put forward is why the former “Marxist Circle for Worker’s Emancipation” (later “Sahand”) became sympathizers of the “Alliance for struggle for Working Class Cause (Arman)” and not of “Nabard” or “Peykar”? In his speech entitled the Oral History of the Unity of Communist Militants (UCM) at the Marx society in London on the 15th of May 2000, Mansoor Hekmat explained the renaming of the “Marxist Circle for Worker’s Emancipation” to the “Sahand sympathizer to the Alliance for struggle for Working Class Cause” thus:

*“But why was “Sahand” sympathetic to the ‘Alliance for struggle for Working Class Cause’?*

*If you look at the end of the second edition of the pamphlet “The Iranian revolution and the role of the proletariat (Theses)”, we first published it in November 1978 and signed it as a freedom circle in A4 format, without any supplement, and put it up in the Polytechnic university and the university of Tehran. Because we did not have any claim, we wanted to establish a group. We sat and considered all of the currents and organizations, which current was close to us and which considered the bourgeoisie as non-progressive? The only current that held this belief was the current of “Tagi Shaharam” and his comrades...”Arman” was the current*

*that tried to continue the tradition of “Tagi Shaharam” and his political positions.*

*For this reason our sympathies were drawn to them, as we thought that they were the main branch of the left, even though “Arman” was made up of 20 people and at that point we were 6. Two or three months later “Arman”’s numbers increased to 21 people and ours to 60, but we were still their sympathizers. The first time I saw “Massoud Yacoby”, he asked me “Why are you our sympathizers, because everyone asks us ‘who are they?’, and we answer, these are the people who support us!*

*In a sense, we remained sympathetic to them until the problem of the “Unity Conference for the emancipation of the working class” came up. And this highlights how we started our work without a plan, without an evaluation of the economy and society and, more than anything else, without any claim. In the early days, we would ask anyone we met how to establish a group.*

*As Jawad Gaedy was the deputy of the split faction of Mojahin, we thought that he must have extensive experience of organisation. Therefore we took him to our house, drew all the curtains and asked him “Dear Ahamad! (as his organizational name was Ahamad), how do we go about establishing an organization? He told us that if anyone know how to do so, we would not be in this situation!”*

## **Current three and Alliance for struggle for Working Class Cause (Arman)**

After political events in Iran in 1979, the term “current three” was often applied to the Stalinist currents that were influenced by Maoism. Their ideas were close to the positions of the likes of “Enver Hoxha” and the Party of Labour of Albania. These included currents such as “Peykar”, “Razmandegan”, “Arman”, “Nabard”, “Vahdate Englabi” and others. The first important activity of “current three” was holding the “Unity conference for the emancipation of the working class”, whose only real result was the establishment of the “Revolutionary unity for the emancipation of the working class” by some of the small circles who participated in it, based on a charter. Currents that represented the “current three” had the following characteristics in common:

- Rejection of the Soviet Union as a socialist camp and applying social-imperialism thesis to it (Thesis of Mao Tse-Don)
- Severe borders with the Tudeh party of Iran, as in Khrushchev’s revisionism.
- Boundaries with the theory of “Three world”, as in Chinese revisionism.
- Evaluation of the ruling mode of production of Iran’s capitalism (dependent capitalism)
- Rejection of guerrilla strategy

The Revolutionary Organization of the Toilers of Iranian Kurdistan (Komala), which was formed as a Maoist current, became Stalinist during its evolutionary process, but still retained some Maoist influences. Therefore, this current was considered to be among the “current three”. We will review this issue in the next sections. The “League of Iranian Communists” was not classified as “current three” as it assessed Iran as semi-feudal and semi-colonial, and did not have an interpretation of the

theory of “three worlds”. It was therefore out of the process of “unity conference for the emancipation of the working class” and was famous as a Maoist current.

“Sahand”, as a sympathizer to the “Alliance for struggle for Working Class Cause” was also considered as a part of “current three”. But “Sahand”’s view of matters was that “current three” represented the mainstream of the communist movement and that “Arman” represented the left wing of “current three”. So they considered themselves as belonging to the left-wing of “current three” (Stalinism). According to Mansoor Hekmat:

*“We were close to “current three” and especially to the left wing of it. According to the available documents written about this current, we assessed “Arman” as representing the left wing. So, we as a circle first saw “current three” as the mainstream of the communist movement. We evaluated the left wing of it, the vanguard wing - the faction that had a more decisive position on the direction revolution and counterrevolution should take. Our idea was that “Sahand” would join this context of action as an intellectual current.”<sup>9</sup>*

Since “Sahand” thought of themselves as belonging to the left-wing of “current three”, they therefore considered it their duty to fight against “populism”, which was the main and most important deviation in the “communist” movement. “Sahand” was the symbol of the struggle against “populism” within the Stalinist movement. In its first congress after being renamed Unity of Communist Militants (UCM), after several years of fighting against “populism”, it concluded that there should be a struggle against populism in the ranks of UCM itself. Mansoor Hekmat, shortly

---

<sup>9</sup> Report by Mansoor Hekmat of the central committee of the UCM to the first congress of the UCM, “*Toward Socialism*” No: 5 page 9

after the first and only congress of UCM, highlighted “the deepest expression of the main characteristic of the populist style of work”. Majid Husseini, one of the former leaders of the worker-communist party of Iran (former member of the political bureau) said after the first congress of UCM:

*“In the first congress of UCM, the first confrontation of worker-communism with the radical left and its periodic allies occurred between Mansoor Hekmat and Hamid Taghvai in the controversy surrounding populism with regards to communist work style... “being the deputy of the masses in the matter of revolution” was the formula that Hamid Taghvai considered as his main criticism of the populist style of work, a formula that Mansoor Hekmat called “the deepest expression of the main characteristic of the populist style of work...””.*<sup>10</sup>

It is important to note that “Sahand” evaluated the Stalinist movement as a Communist Movement. The Communist explanation of the Stalinist movement will be discussed later. A few years later, in his report to the central committee of the UCM at their first congress, Mansoor Hekmat claimed that UCM had **deeply** criticized the “current three”, and said:

*“From the beginning, Sahand condemned populism as a major and important deviation from the communist movement. But the important thing was that we thought that the fight against populism in the “current three” wouldn’t be so hard - we thought that the spectrum of “current three” would welcome our position, and that it would take the task of advancing these views into its own hands.*

---

<sup>10</sup> Evaluation of battles and branches of the worker-communism in Iran, part 3, Majid Hosseini, 18<sup>th</sup> January 2008

*As I said, we did not see the huge gap between us and “current three”, and I can see now that this idea was mistaken. Our existence as the Unity of Communist Militants with the characteristics that define us, and the duties the group assumed so as to be able to distinguish itself clearly from and be deeply critical of the “current three”, has not always been so clearly defined. The Unity of Communist Militants was the product of an evolutionary process.”<sup>11</sup>*

The fact is that this ‘deep criticism’ of “current three” by the Unity of Communist Militants is nothing more than nonsense. When and where were the basic principles of “current three” criticized deeply? Not only have the basic principles of “current three” never been criticized by “Sahand” but since “Sahand” considered themselves as belonging to “current three” and because they were still a far cry from being the “Marx of the epoch” and “theoretician of the century”, they also tried to learn from the theories and experiences of the experienced currents of “current three”. “Sahand” then clearly stated that they had learned much from the valuable research of its Stalinist comrades, Razmandegan, and would even recommend it to others:

*“Primarily in a philosophical context, as we have done less work in this field, we can also benefit from the valuable text “Debate on the theory and practice” of our comrades Razmandegan...(M.L.) in the publication “The road of socialism” as it solicits a deep and explicit reaction to this aspect of the deviations of the Communist Movement.*

---

<sup>11</sup> Report by Mansoor Hekamt of the central committee of the UCM to the first congress of the UCM, *Toward Socialism* No: 5 page 10

*We recommend this article to comrades and sympathizers, regardless of some of the lack of clarity and problems that we have with it.*"<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> Three sources and three components of populism socialism of Iran by Mansoor Hekmat

## **The 1979 Revolution in Iran from the Perspective of the UCM**

During the developments of 1979 and beyond, the Unity of Communist Militants (UCM) believed that a revolution was underway in Iran. With the exception of the different inner tendencies, namely the political currents entitled “worker-communism”, this belief has been repeated by the heirs of the UCM at various social events. If we put to one side the hyperbole of the heirs of the UCM, the UCM did not play a role in the development of social events during those years and, as such, the other political trends on the left of capital did not affect social developments. However, a review of the ideas and theories of the UCM with respect to the concept of social revolution makes visible the anti-communist, reactionary and bourgeois nature of this political current.

As a first step, we will briefly examine the language of the UCM and its theoretical leader, Mansoor Hekmat, in an attempt to see what revolution was going on in society and, following victory, what social system was intended to replace the capitalist mode of production and how this political current was seeking to respond to what elements in society. One fundamental phrase that was used by the radical phrase tendencies of the left of capital, for example, by Peykar, Razmandegan, etc, referred to these events as an uprising, not a revolution.

The UCM considered the economic crisis of 1976 as the context for the formation of the revolution of 1979 and evaluated the nature of the revolution as a democratic revolution. The aim of the revolution would also be to uproot exploitation and imperialist reaction and it was said:

*“With the uprising that occurred in February 1979, the first stages of the present democratic revolution of Iran which was initially formed in the context of the economic crisis in the midst of 1976*



*tore down the regime of the monarchy, which was the direct defender of exploitation and imperialist reaction in Iran.”*<sup>13</sup>

For the moment, we leave to one side the issue of how an economic crisis, in the era of imperialism and also within an isolated state, led to the revolution. We will return to the issue of the anti-Marxist thesis of “socialism in one country” later. We will now continue to discuss the UCM revolution. The UCM state that during the anti-imperialist and monarchy movement during the revolution of 1979, the leadership was in the hands of the reactionary and counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie,. Furthermore, this always takes the name of the petty-bourgeois leadership. This movement overshadowed the developments of 1977-1978, as well as the revolutionary movement of the proletariat and, in the process, replaced the monarchist bourgeoisie with the Islamic bourgeoisie.

We will return to the Kautskyistisk understanding of the UCM and the concept of imperialism in the next part of the discussion: “imperialist super-profits”. First, we will consider Mansoor Hekmat and his anti-imperialist emotions, especially his anti-American fever, which was too high in regard to the nature of the anti-imperialist revolution of 1979.

*“One of the manifest aspects of our revolution has been its open anti-imperialist character. Imperialism in general and U.S imperialism, as the dominant imperialism on the politics and economy of Iran, in particular, has been a target of the Iranian revolutionary proletariat’s protest.”*<sup>14</sup>

Since the UCM and Mr Hekmat were unknown in the political milieu of 1977-1979, the fiery anti-imperialist and anti-American of the UCM and its leader could not have played a role in Iran. However, as a

---

<sup>13</sup> Programme of the UCM, page 11.

<sup>14</sup>Two Factions within the Bourgeois-imperialist Counter-revolution, Part 3.

political current, no matter how weak, the UCM was looking for answers to the question of how the anti-imperialist revolution (namely the revolution that was underway) and the class struggle were represented in this movement. In this regard, Mansoor Hekmat said:

“We are specifically seeking answers to questions that the class struggle and the current revolution put forward to us.”<sup>15</sup>

The main question for Mansoor Hekmat was how and in what way to accomplish the achievements of the anti-imperialist revolution. The consolidation of the new order under the guise of defending the gains of the revolution against imperialism, is not limited to this current and all currents of the left of capital played a significant role in the consolidation of the new order and the stability of the Islamic bourgeoisie, but with a radical phrase and revolutionary titles. We have previously examined this issue in detail.<sup>16</sup>

We have also clearly seen in the previous sections that according to the UCM, in 1979, other classes, not merely the working class, were demanding revolutionary developments in the anti-imperialist revolution. One of these classes, the ‘petty-bourgeoisie’ and Khomeini’s ‘petty-bourgeois leadership’, has been evaluated. With regard to the role of the anti-imperialist revolution, Khomeini believed that the UCM and Mansour Hekmat had stated:

*“Khomeini, who owes his respectability among the masses not to Islamic jurisprudence but to his active presence in anti-monarchist struggles, himself only adores establishing Velayat-e-Faghih*

---

<sup>15</sup> The Myth of the National and Progressive Bourgeoisie.

<sup>16</sup>For more information about the role of the left of capital in the consolidation of the leadership of the clergy, refer to the article, Developments of 1979, a View of the Positions of the Left of Capital and Internationalists, published on the website of *Internationalist Voice*.

*[Guardianship of the Islamic Jurists] and attaining a privileged position for the clergy in the hierarchy of power.*”<sup>17</sup>

Unlike the political folly of those on the left of capital, which had transformed a criminal, such as Khomeini, into an anti-imperialist militant and created respect for him among the masses, in February 1979, the internationalists declared that Khomeini was no more progressive than the Queen of England or the first emperor, Bokassa. Indeed, carrying out an anti-imperialist revolution requires that the working class be exposed as a black army rather than as a social class following the demands of another social class, namely the bourgeois class. The UCM also wanted to mobilize the working class to establish a new order and wage slavery, dominated by the new bourgeoisie under the guise of defending the gains of the revolution and defeating the counter-revolution (i.e., a bourgeoisie that had lost power); as Hekmat stated:

*“To mobilize workers and the broad masses of working people to defend the gains of the revolution and to decisively defeat counter-revolution.”*<sup>18</sup>

Let us identify Hekmat’s perceptions in harvesting the gains of the revolution and how he wanted to mobilize the working class. The UCM, like other currents of the left of capital believed that Iran was dependent on capitalism and they sought to achieve independence from capitalism. This would mean that their country would acquire independence and overthrow imperialist domination. Their country would achieve freedom. Mansoor Hekmat, unaffected by this, presented his demands:

---

<sup>17</sup>Two Factions within the Bourgeois-imperialist Counter-revolution, Part 2.

<sup>18</sup> The preface to the pamphlet on unemployed workers (April 1979) is in the Ministry of Labour.

*“For the real struggle against imperialism, to supply real bread, independence, and freedom, it should be the Provisional Government supporting workers, not workers supporting the Provisional Government.”<sup>19</sup>*

With the stability of the Islamic bourgeoisie, which was accompanied by the suppression of the working class struggle, the class struggle took the form of self-defence. Under these circumstances, in February 1979, the UCM believed that although the revolution has lost its momentum and the ability to move forward, it was still unbeaten.

*“But if the Revolution has not managed to solve its basic problem, the problem of taking power has not lost its inner boiling and ability to move. In other words, if the revolution did not succeed, it is not a failure.”<sup>20</sup>*

The essential question for the UCM was how to revive the momentum and the revolutionary potential when paralysis had taken effect. Mansoor Hekmat was concerned with the question of how to restore happiness to the revolutionary movement of the working classes (yes, revolutionary classes from the perspective of the UCM). He stated his concerns thus:

*“Now the main question is that if from the point of view of objective and economic conditions and the roots of the revolutionary movement of the toiler classes, the heart of revolution is still*

---

<sup>19</sup> As above.

<sup>20</sup> The introduction to the pamphlet on the prospects of adversity and the new advancement of revolution thesis is concerned with the political importance of the economic crisis.

*beating, how can we explain the paralysis of the limbs of revolution, namely, abandon the bulk of the workers and the toilers who are directly struggling for political power as explained directly and what should we do at this given point to draw them into the struggle?”<sup>21</sup>*

We have seen in the previous discussions that the UCM evaluated the petty-bourgeois revolutionary class and thought that Khomeini, the leader of the petty-bourgeoisie believed that other revolutionary classes pursued the objectives of the revolution. The UCM continued its exploration with the aim of uncovering those dimensions and, with the help of other revolutionary classes and the quasi-Maoists (multi-classes), it would advance the revolution, as stated below:

*“Cognition of these main fronts of the revolution - by the communists, and their active participation in the struggle of the revolutionary classes and especially the working class, in the areas will inevitably follow.”<sup>22</sup>*

Apparently, the menial Maoists’ praise and compliments for the UCM from the “revolutionary classes” never ends! It is important to note that the victory of the anti-imperialist revolution or, to put it more clearly, the triumph of this revolution, led to this kind of social system. The UCM stated:

*“We must stress that the slogan of the establishment of the people's democratic republic which includes, in the most resolute and*

---

<sup>21</sup> The introduction to the pamphlet on the prospects of adversity and the new advancement of revolution thesis is concerned with the political importance of the economic crisis.

<sup>22</sup> As above

*comprehensive form, the conditions necessary for the preservation and defence of the gains of the revolution, is the fighting slogan at the present stage.*"<sup>23</sup>

We noticed very quickly that from the perspective of the UCM a revolution was underway in Iran. This revolution was anti-imperialist and the nature of the anti-imperialist struggle was also a democratic revolution that, on the day after the victory, would result in the establishment of a democratic social system; this would be the Democratic People's Republic.

Prior to reviewing and analysing the nature of the anti-imperialist revolution of the UCM and the social system that the victory of their anti-imperialist revolution of the UCM would bring, namely, a social system called the Democratic People's Republic, we describe our understanding and vision of the concept of a social revolution. Our approach is distinct from the Marxist understanding of the concept of social revolution and its material force in different social systems. A new dialectical social system that would replace the old social system is also investigated.

---

<sup>23</sup> The Iranian revolution and the role of the proletariat

## Sahand and the Anti-Imperialist Struggle

*“Victory to the Anti-Imperialist struggle of the people of Iran!”*

The above slogan is the final slogan of the pamphlet “The Iranian revolution and the role of the proletariat (Theses)” written by the “Marxist Circle for Worker's Emancipation” in December 1978.

Before reviewing the content of this slogan and the pamphlets of the early circle, or “Sahand” as it would come to be known, it is better to see how Mansoor Hekmat reacted to the eventual translation of the texts of UCM to foreign languages. He knew that the republishing, or worse, translation of the texts and pamphlets neither benefited himself nor his current, because these booklets have an extremely nationalistic perspective nor offer an extremely reaction-ary concept of the proletariat and communism. He was, therefore, opposed to the translation, and he believed that these works should be left untouched. In a letter dated 7th of June 1988, Mansoor Hekmat writes to his brother Khosrow Davar (Shahin Razani, who later became one of the leaders of the communist party of Iran) about the translation of the texts of UCM to foreign languages:

*“A direct translation of any of our texts is not suitable for public release... The right way to proceed is by releasing these articles to foreign readers in a series of reviews (evaluations).*

*Some direct quotes, in addition to explanations from the editor in amidst the text, and footnotes that can explain the issues of the time should be included...I don't agree with the direct translation of the works of UCM without commentary and summary... Furthermore, our articles were not written for the European environment. Our*

*discussions have been prepared for the level of understanding of the left movement of Iran.*”<sup>24</sup>

However, Khosrow Davar (Shahin Razani), the brother of Mansoor Hekmat, one of the three main participators of the Unity of Communist Militants and the current manager of Mansoor Hekmat’s website, had another idea about the content of these articles. He recommended replacing certain words with new concepts in order to understand their meaning. In other words, they should be interpreted. Furthermore, he believes that these articles should be written in **gold**, and so on Mansoor Hekmat’s website it says:

*“These articles are masterpieces of the communist literature of our epoch, and reading and re-reading them is strongly recommend to all. Indeed, editing and beautifying (replacing words with others) [the texts], do not do them justice, they should be written in gold. If you read “humanism” instead of “people orientation” and “humanism” instead of “populism” you will get a feeling of the texts as they were first intended to be read.”*

In his report to the first congress of the UCM, Mansoor Hekmat stated that “Sahand” had condemned “populism” as a major and main deviation of the communist movement:

*“From the beginning “Sahand” condemned populism as a major and important deviation of the communist movement.”*

---

<sup>24</sup> Handwritings of Mansoor Hekamt, published on the website of the Mansoor Hekmat Foundation.



The basic question that immediately springs to the mind of every person seeking the truth is this: whose slogan is “Victory to the Anti-Imperialist struggle of the people of Iran!”? Where exactly had “Sahand” criticized “populism”? Most currents of “current three”, including “Alliance for struggle for Working Class Cause”, the group that “Sahand” was sympathetic to, considered themselves militants of the Emancipation of the Working class , not “the people of Iran”. None of them had “people” or “Iran” in their name. It would seem that “Sahand” was even more backward than the group that they sympathised with.

Another interesting point is that the term “people” was not just used by the radical phrase part of the left of capital, but also even by black currents of the capital entitled “The muslim people”. For example, the student section of the party of Islamic Republic of Iran finished its statement about the Iranian student day, on 7th December 1979 with the following slogan:

*“Power to the Islamic and anti-imperialist struggles of the Muslim people of Iran!”*

Simply remove the words ‘Islamic’ and ‘Muslim’ from the slogan of the party of Islamic Republic of Iran, and it could be Sahand’s slogan. They are exactly the same. One current represented the religious current of the bourgeoisie and the other represented the secular faction of the bourgeoisie.

All the currents of the left of capital in 1979, including “current three”, believed that an anti-imperialist revolution in Iran had taken place and was still ongoing. In this context, the left of capital played an active role in the consolidation of the leadership of the clergy, and of course an anti-imperialist clergy!<sup>25</sup> The logical consequence of the anti-imperialist

---

<sup>25</sup> For more information about the role of the left of capital in the consolidation of the leadership of the clergy, refer to the article «Developments of 1979, a view of

revolution could be nothing other than a democratic revolution. “Marxist Circle for Worker's Emancipation “was also no exception, so in the pamphlet “The Iranian revolution and the role of the proletariat (Theses)” they stressed “The present revolution in Iran, despite the domination of capital, is a democratic revolution precisely because of its anti-imperialist character.”

Before continuing the discussion, a brief explanation of the concept of imperialism, anti-imperialist struggle and “social revolution” is necessary.

The left of capital has a concept more like the Kautskist understanding of imperialism and believes that imperialism is a major economic, military and repressive power such as the United States. Contrarily, the Marxist definition of imperialism is based on an understanding of world capitalism's descent into decadence. Imperialism is a way of life in the capitalist system during the period of decadence. Imperialism is not a specific policy carried out by any particular State, and can only exist on an international scale. We believe that in the decline period of capitalism, in the era of imperialism, all states regardless of their size, large or small, regardless of their military and economic power, from the larger gangsters like America and Great Britain to the smaller ones like Iran and Pakistan, are imperialists.<sup>26</sup>

In the era of social revolution and the epoch of proletarian revolution, “Communist Revolution” is possible as a wave of world revolution, as in the revolutionary period of 1917-1924. The condition for the continuation of the successful revolution is victorious revolution in other countries and its expansion towards world revolution, otherwise despite the memorable sacrifices and zeal such as in the “October Revolution”, the successful

---

the positions of the left of capital and internationalists» published on the website of Internationalist Voice.

<sup>26</sup> About the concept of imperialism in the era of capitalist decline, refer to the second and third part of the article, “Nationalism is a deadly poison for the class struggle” published on the website of Internationalist Voice.

revolution will be surrounded by world capitalism and its triumph will decline.

With these descriptions, we return to our main content.

Two years after the events of 1979, the anti-imperialist and in particular anti-American sentiment of the UCM was still very strong. They bemoaned the proletariat who had not understood that in order for the Shah not to simply be replaced by the Americans, the anti-imperialist and democratic struggle and subservience to the “petty bourgeois leadership” in order to that after the downfall of Shah (king) it would not be America’s turn. We will now read the speech of Mansoor Hekmat, and someone who earned the title of “The epoch’s Marx”:

*“One of the manifest aspects of our revolution has been its open anti-imperialist character. Imperialism in general and U.S imperialism, as the dominant imperialism on the politics and economy of Iran, in particular, has been a target of the Iranian revolutionary proletariat's protest. The boycott of oil to South Africa and Israel by the militant workers of the oil industry in the months prior to the Uprising, is [itself] expressive of the awareness of the Iranian revolutionary proletariat of global roots and foundations of exploitation and repression in Iran. Although the Iranian proletariat has to this very date been unable to fully understand the inevitable and fundamental link between imperialism and dictatorship, and hence the essential tie between the anti-imperialist struggle and the struggle for democracy, the anti-imperialist and particularly the anti-U.S. orientation of the Iranian workers and toilers have made, and is making, the restoration of the pre-revolutionary situation quite difficult for the wounded bourgeoisie of Iran.... They have by no means attempted*

*nor let it become America's turn after the Shah, this being from the viewpoint of the monopoly bourgeoisie a giant stride "forward".*"<sup>27</sup>

We believe that anti-imperialist struggle in the epoch of decadent capitalism means an anti-capitalist struggle around the world, including in our own country and own bourgeoisie, to destroy the capitalist system through World Revolution.

It is interesting that the UCM admits to moribund of capitalism but believes that in the epoch of decadence of capitalism, it is toilers struggling against imperialism rather than the working class struggling against capitalism.

*"The epoch of moribund capitalism and the epoch of revolutionary struggle of toiling masses of the world against imperialism."*<sup>28</sup>

*"The escalation of the storm of anti-imperialist revolutions in the dominated countries and the increasing growth of Marxism-Leninism in these countries, have, inevitably, directed the attention of bourgeois economic science, which is the theoretical summation and generalisation of the interests of capital, towards the economic "ills" and "problems" of the "non-developed" countries."*<sup>29</sup>

Imperialism, in the decadence period of capitalism, is related to the redistribution of the global market and this includes all the countries in the world. In such circumstances the imperialist countries, whether they be big gangsters like America and Great Britain or small gangsters like Iran and Pakistan, are trying to undermine each other and take over the others' markets. It is a fact that small gangsters like Iran take a lower proportion of surplus value as compared to the big gangsters like the USA, but it is the same surplus value, namely the blood of the proletariat, that is sucked

---

<sup>27</sup>Two Factions within the Bourgeois-Imperialist Counter-Revolution, part 3

<sup>28</sup>Two Factions within the Bourgeois-Imperialist Counter-Revolution, part 2

<sup>29</sup>The Myth of the National and Progressive Bourgeoisie

by a small gangster (small imperialist). In such circumstances “Sahand” called for an intensifying of the anti-imperialist struggle, and was not happy that the process and leadership of the democratic and anti-imperialist struggle was in the hands of the “petty bourgeoisie”. They wanted to create a revolutionary anti-imperialist front in order to gain full power over the democratic and anti-imperialist struggle.

*“Substituting the policy of class collaboration for the endeavour to form, in practice, a revolutionary anti-imperialist front, is not effective enough in exposing the liberal bourgeoisie and the conservative section of the petty bourgeoisie, and consequently abandoning the political leadership of the democratic struggles into the hands of the petty bourgeoisie, the liberal bourgeoisie, etc, are all, from the theoretical aspect, reflections of the immense gulf which separates "revolutionary" theory in Iran from the teachings of Marx and Lenin on the criticism of the economy of capitalism and its highest stage, imperialism.”<sup>30</sup>*

Unity of Communist Militants, through the intensity of the quest for democracy and the anti-imperialist struggle, sees itself as a lawyer for the proletariat, and states that the proletariat supports any democratic and anti-imperialist movement that stands against the existing order in a revolutionary manner. We have repeatedly emphasized the techniques used by the left of capital to sterilize and overshadow the anti-capitalist struggles. The efforts of the left of capital in atomizing the proletariat and their integration in the struggle for democracy is not limited to the traditional wing of the left of capital; even the most radical phrase sections of the left of capital have adhered to this tradition, including the UCM.

---

<sup>30</sup> The Myth of the National and Progressive Bourgeoisie

*“So we’ll announce that the revolutionary proletariat supports any democratic anti-imperialist movement that in a revolutionary manner struggles against the existing system.”<sup>31</sup>*

The founding of the, as they saw it, ‘only communist party in the world’, namely the “[anti] communist party of Iran” by the UCM and Komala in the liberated areas, following the style and ideology of Maoism, did not prevent the prior UCM and the next [anti] communist party of Iran from abandoning the anti-imperialist struggles. However it was stated that the minimum program of the proletariat is an anti-imperialist program too:

*“So the minimum program of the proletariat economically and politically is an anti-imperialist program.”<sup>32</sup>*

---

<sup>31</sup> Program of the unity of communist militants

<sup>32</sup> Program of the communist party of Iran

## The petty bourgeois Khomeini

During the anti-capitalist struggles of 1979, in the guise of anti-imperialist struggle, the left of capital played an important role in the consolidation of the leadership of the clergy, of course an anti-imperialist clergy, and consequently played an active role in bringing the struggles of the working class to a dead-end. This time the “Marxist Circle for Worker's Emancipation” (or later “Sahand”) could not play any role but their position was consistent with the other currents of the left of capital. According to the beliefs of this circle at the time, other classes, not simply the working class, were demanding revolutionary developments in society. They named the other classes as the following:

- Peasants.
- The disintegrating urban petty bourgeoisie.
- ...

Since our “theoreticians” were too ashamed to clearly set the “national bourgeoisie” as a class apart, they represented it with three separate points instead. We can look at parts of the first manifesto namely the pamphlet “The Iranian revolution and the role of the proletariat (Theses)” (for which the author later earned the title “The Marx of the epoch”):

*“On the other hand, the same ruling imperialist relation has provided the objective conditions for the existence of other revolutionary classes (peasants, urban petty-bourgeoisie in disintegration,...) who have interests in the overthrow of imperialism and the elimination of its intense exploitation and fierce dictatorship, and who resort to revolutionary methods of struggle against the existing system. Hence the working class is not the only class demanding revolutionary changes in the present*

*revolution of Iran...Therefore the revolution in Iran is democratic since the ruling imperialist system in the dominated Iran has given a democratic content to the Iranian revolution, from the point of view of the objective conditions (intense economic exploitation and violent political repression of the working class and other toiling classes: peasants, urban petty-bourgeoisie...) and also from the point of view of the subjective conditions (the presence of classes alongside the working class - mainly the peasants - prepared, as a result of the objective conditions of their social existence, to accept revolutionary methods of struggle against the existing system)."*<sup>33</sup>

So the four-class theory of the "Marxist Circle for Worker's Emancipation" was completed and the circle announced its manifesto as Maoist theory (four-class). We can continue our research into the texts of this circle in order to find more information about the revolutionary class of "petty bourgeois" which was important in helping eliminate the extreme exploitation of the proletariat, and we will review who the "petty bourgeois class" was made up of.

*"The conciliatory petty-bourgeois leadership whose revolutionism was to become void of any kind of content with the downfall of the monarchical regime...This political force could only be the petty-bourgeois current which had, until the compromise, the leadership of the movement in its hand, namely the clergy with Ayatollah Khomeini at its head; a force which completely took hold of the bridle of the petty-bourgeoisie and in particular its traditional section."*<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup> The Iranian revolution and the role of the proletariat (Theses)

<sup>34</sup>Two Factions within the Bourgeois-Imperialist Counter-Revolution, part 1



The clergy, regardless of their religion (Islam, Christianity, etc), are, as a part of ideologues of the class system, similar to the journalists whose task it is to engineer public opinion as a part of the capitalist superstructure. Our theoretician complains that the clergy, just like a part of the superstructure of the capitalist state, think only of power, and not of their responsibility to the “revolutionary petty-bourgeois class”.

*“Khomeini, who owes his respectability among the masses not to Islamic jurisprudence but to his active presence in anti-monarchist struggles, himself only adores establishing Velayat-e-Faghih [Guardianship of the Islamic Jurists] and attaining a privileged position for the clergy in the hierarchy of power.”<sup>35</sup>*

The UCM denigrated the leader of Iranian bourgeoisie, Khomeini, and also the clergy of the petty bourgeoisie, but at the same time they believed that the petty bourgeoisie was a revolutionary class. The logical consequence of this reasoning would be that the leader of the bourgeoisie and a criminal such as Khomeini was a revolutionary. At the same time, in February 1979, Internationalists began to analyze the situation, relying on Communist positions and Internationalist perspectives. Unlike the political folly of the left of capital that created a “petty bourgeois leader” from a reactionary like Khomeini, made the clergy anti-imperialist and then declared the same “petty bourgeois” class a revolutionary class, the internationalists declared in February 1979 that Khomeini was no more progressive than the Queen of England or the first emperor Bokassa.<sup>36</sup>

The suppression of any kind of social protest, and especially the oppression of the anti-capitalist struggle of the proletariat and the brutal massacres around the country, especially in Kurdistan, did not prevent the

---

<sup>35</sup>Two Factions within the Bourgeois-Imperialist Counter-Revolution, part 2

<sup>36</sup> Look at article, Developments of 1979, a view of the positions of the left of capital and internationalists and even the statement of the International Communist Current (1979) published on the website of Internationalist Voice.

UCM from regarding Khomeini's social position as having become 'petty bourgeois', and they even regarded him as the "leader of the petty bourgeoisie".

*"Therefore monopoly capital and the petty-bourgeois leadership both took a new step forward in the same direction... Right here we must emphasize that the extent to which the clergy and in particular Ayatollah Khomeini himself are aware of their instrumental role in the service of the suppression of the revolution and re-establishment of the indisputable sway of monopoly capital, is by no means a determining factor."*<sup>37</sup>

The UCM obstinately insisted on a "petty bourgeois leadership", whilst at the same time pointing to the bourgeois state. The UCM apparently believed that the bourgeoisie of Iran was contra-revolutionary and was not capable of leading itself, thus the counter revolution bourgeoisie appealed to the petty bourgeoisie, a revolutionary class, to lead the bourgeois class. How a revolutionary class (the petty bourgeoisie from the perspective of the UCM) could lead the counter revolutionary bourgeois, with their different class demands, is a mystery. Mansoor Hekmat states:

*"It is clear that such was the stagnation of the revolutionary struggles of toilers, that they were not only unable to realize their economic and political demands, but were also now looking to the petty-bourgeois leadership and the government of the bourgeoisie in the hopes that they would fulfil their demands."*<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> Two Factions within the Bourgeois-Imperialist Counter-Revolution, part one

<sup>38</sup> Prospects of adversity and new advancement of revolution thesis about the political importance of the economic crisis.

Something that was mere mystery for us in the world of UCM could however become reality. As the new era bourgeoisie was unable to lead its own class movement, the UCM believed that with the influence of petty bourgeois leadership, the state machine, having broken down because of the people's protests prior to 1979, could be made to move forward again.

*“But with the arrival of the new era, although temporary, the bourgeoisie politicians, thanks to the influence and domination of the revolutionary movement led by the petty bourgeoisie, were able to achieve something that the state machine of the King (Shah) had been unable to do, even with all the resources at its disposal.”<sup>39</sup>*

Repression became more widespread, and only two months remained until the bloodiest massacres in the modern history of Iran. The bourgeoisie villains declared that there were to be no ‘wounded’, and that the soldiers should just ‘kill in the street’. In such circumstances, in April 1981, the UCM had the only communist program in the world still obstinately calling for a “petty-bourgeois leadership”. We can take a look at a paragraph from this program:

*“The current democratic revolution in Iran was formed in the context of the economic crisis of 1976. In the first stages of the February revolt, the monarchic regime, the defender of exploitation and reactionary imperialism, was taken down. Subsequently, mainly because of the lack of independent ranks of the proletariat and the lack of leadership provided by the socialist proletariat in the revolutionary movement, the leadership of the movement became available to petty-bourgeois and liberal bourgeois forces which, before the rise, were demanding the protection of the*

---

<sup>39</sup> Introduction of the pamphlet of Prospects of adversity and new advancement of revolution thesis about the political importance of the economic crisis.

*bourgeois state machine from the impacts of the revolution and the maintaining of the base rule of the capital of Iran.”*

Unlike the demagoguery of the left of capital, from pro-USSR to the radical phrase such as the UCM, the internationalists announced that the proletariat must maintain its class independence and should not involve itself in the people's movements. In the same February, Internationalists announced that the only revolution on the agenda, both in peripheral countries including Iran and metropolis countries, was Communist Revolution.<sup>40</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup> Introduction of the pamphlet of Prospects of adversity and new advancement of revolution thesis about the political importance of the economic crisis.

## **Changing the name of “Sahand” to the Unity of Communist Militants**

As previously stated, the Marxist Circle for Worker’s Emancipation (Sahand) expected that the “Alliance for struggle for Working Class Cause (Arman)” would accept their basic positions before absorbing the group, and would then end up supporting “Sahand”’s issues. But the “Alliance for struggle for Working Class Cause (Arman)” was itself in crisis. In the fall of 1979, following the second general meeting of the “Alliance for struggle for Working Class Cause (Arman)”, half of the group’s members split from the “Alliance for struggle for Working Class Cause (Arman)” in protest against its intellectual positions. The split members consisted mostly of members that were active in factories and the nuclear industry. The split faction of “Arman” then began discussions with the “Revolutionary Organization of the Toilers of Iranian Kurdistan” (Komala) and the “Organization of Struggle on the Path to the Emancipation of the Working class” (Peykar). Since the split faction considered some of Komala’s positions as economistic, and therefore criticized them, they then, with eight basic positions, joined the “Organization of Struggle on the Path to the Emancipation of the Working class” in July 1980 (Peykar).

The crisis, inability and lack of perspective of the “Alliance for struggle for Working Class Cause (Arman)”, and its eventual collapse, in some ways disillusioned “Sahand” and practically put the circle’s independent activity on the agenda.

Therefore, “Sahand” ended its sympathy with the “Alliance for struggle for Working Class Cause (Arman)” in December 1979, and formed itself as a group under the name of the Unity of communist militants (UCM). But “Sahand” stressed that “this name change in itself does not in any way indicate a change in the mutual relations between the

two groups.”<sup>41</sup> The UCM then tried to use its independent identity to enter the political milieu of Iran in order to influence “the current three”.

Independent organizations need to have experience of organization whether physically or historically. ‘Physically’ means that the activists have a record and experience of organization, and ‘historically’ means that they would benefit from the currents’ historical experiences of organization, which have taken the form of historical memory, something the activists of Sahand’s newly established group were lacking. Mansoor Hekmat said:

*“We were very inexperienced and did not know how to organize our activities.”*<sup>42</sup>

Hamid Taghvaei (current Secretary of the Central Committee of the worker-communist party of Iran), despite his short period in prison and support of Maoism before going to England at the time of the Shah, has a similar understanding to Mansoor Hekmat’s, and acknowledges not only that no united and coherent theory had been observed in their organizational work, but also that current events had carried them forward.

*“Our organization was formed in the Iranian revolution, and in the Iranian revolution recognized itself and, like a duckling that is born in water and initially only knows the water and when its leg reaches to the land, will adapt itself to the land conditions and so grow up, we imagined that our communist organization would*

---

<sup>41</sup> Explanation about the change of name in the introduction of the pamphlet of Prospects of adversity and new advancement of revolution thesis about the political importance of the economic crisis.

<sup>42</sup> Biography of Mansoor Hekmat written by Soheila Sharifi page 31

*grow in this way. From this point no united and coherent theory has been observed in our organizational work.”*<sup>43</sup>

We leave for the time being the duckling which regards itself as ‘grown up’ and imitating not a duck, but a “goose”, which will be assessed in the discussions related to the Communist Left. But when they were promoted to the “leaders of the proletariat”, another explanation of social events must be presented, it would seem that history should be rewritten and the “Unity of communist militants” should be carried to the centre of social events. No longer ‘a sympathizer of one of the groups of “current three”’, in other words sympathizing with the “Alliance for struggle for Working Class Cause”, the UCM became the vanguard of the revolution of 1979. Mansoor Hekmat later said:

*“The flag of the 1979 revolution was the flag that “Unity of communist militants” raised, in order that it was the policy, which was in the heart of revolution.”*<sup>44</sup>

Seemingly “The Marx of epoch” has forgotten that at that time he was extremely inexperienced and did not know how to organize activities, and therefore had been a sympathizer of the “Alliance for struggle for Working Class Cause”. Exaggerating” as a form of cultural development whose ridiculous ridiculous form is a reflection of the political superstructure of capitalist decline and especially in the decline of periphery capitalism, was also a part of the political culture of this current.

Many years later Majid Hosseini, a former leader of Komala and worker-communism who had grown up with the Stalinist-Maoist

---

<sup>43</sup> *Toward Socialism* No: 5 pages 30

<sup>44</sup> Mansoor Hekmat, speech in Marx society in London entitled as the oral histories of unity of communist militants, 15<sup>th</sup> May 2000

traditions, talking utter nonsense, rewrote the history of events. He changes white to black, black to white and openly lies to create a radical history for the “Unity of communist militants”.

*“Generally it can be said that the crisis of bourgeois communism, the social, political and intellectual developments of 1979 and especially the political interference factor of the Unity of communist militants turned the left of Iran and its culture upside down. The facade of communism became visible, the left was radicalized, and largely [left] painted itself in the political colour of the UCM. Since then this left considered the economy of China and USSR as capitalist, didn’t accept any camp and turned to the Marxist workers and worker socialism, caring about the daily struggle of the workers and, using the communist current, tried to dig out the flag of communism from under the rubble of bourgeois and reformism petty-bourgeois and transfer it to the worker and worker-communism current.”<sup>45</sup>*

It is unclear how many within the Iranian political milieu knew the UCM before 1980. However this former “leader” publicly but very clumsy attempted to falsify the facts. Which “political interference factor” of the UCM turned the left of Iran and its culture upside down!? With the grocer-like culture of the “communist” party of Iran?<sup>46</sup> In what way did

---

<sup>45</sup> Evaluation of battles and branches of the worker-communism in Iran, part 3, Majid Hosseini, 18<sup>th</sup> January 2008

<sup>46</sup> The majority of the left of capital namely the majority faction of Fadaeiyan and Tudeh party of Iran became an appendage of the Intelligence Service and promoted the culture of betrayal. The radical phrase faction of Fadaeiyan in the region under the rule of the «Patriotic Union of Kurdistan of Iraq» and in the village «Gapylon» began to massacre each other and invented the incident of 26 January 1986 and continued the cultural bludgeon. Your grocer type culture was not less than the others. When «the leaders of proletariat» were yet sympathizers



the façade of communism became visible? With the multi-class and Maoist theory of UCM? The UCM, with its petty-bourgeois evaluation of the leader of the Iranian bourgeoisie and executioner Khomeini, radicalized the left of Iran!? Apparently, the former leader of the proletariat is also suffering from early on-set Alzheimers, and states that the “Unity of communist militants” radicalized the political milieu of Iran and as a result the left considered the economy of the Soviet Union as capitalist and accepted no camps. The Stalinist faction of Mojahedin, of which the “Marxist Circle for Worker’s Emancipation” was a sympathizer, considered the economy of the Soviet Union as capitalist and addressed the USSR government as Social-imperialist.

Apart from the Tudeh party of Iran that dominated Stalinism due to its closed relationship with the Soviet Union and its propaganda machine, the phrase radical part of the left of capital at that time, namely the Fadaei current and the Stalinist Mujahedin, did not even theoretically dominate the political apparatus of the left of capital (Stalinism). Ideal

---

and learned of the valuable and philosophical article of the organization of Combatants (Razmandegan), but when members of the same Razmandegan went under the knife and wanted Komala’s help, Komala, which could have helped, refused and referred to the smugglers. The communicator of Komala, which was critical to this policy, in a part of his letter to the Razmandegan wrote as following:

*“Comrades say that it is possible by traffickers and by other means to go abroad or to Kurdistan to get out. But it costs about 60 thousands Tomans for everyone. I do not have you or not. I’m really sorry, and some times I’ve mentioned to comrades that it does not matter about party politics and things. These people are under the razor. [Islamic Republic] want to kill these for the revolutionary crime. What do you do! May or may not help. We can. I’m really critical of this policy. Again I say and do not know [Komala will] accept or not.”*

From the documents of relations of «Komala» with «Razmandegan»

orientation, justice, national independence, democracy and economic development would make up their positions. Such positions would lose their attractiveness in the radical phrase part of the left of capital.

Inconsistencies and confusion about set positions that sometimes did not have the least appearance of coherence put another alternative to the radical phrase part of the capital on the agenda. In such a context, some people who were educated and trained abroad, familiar with foreign languages and research methods, attempted to publish some pamphlets. In such circum-stances these pamphlets found an audience in the Stalinist phrase radical part of the political milieu. Let's first look at the Marx of the epoch's graceful declaration on the matter.

*"The era leading up to June 1981 is, for the "Unity of communist militants", a sweet time which saw their conversion from a very small circle to an organization whose effects were seen in all aspects of the left of society. The interest shown the group was general, and it wasn't until the 20th of June (1981), two years later, that the Communist Party of Iran would hold a very powerful position. In my opinion, in that case the Communist Party of Iran would be formed around the "Unity of communist militants". But this process was interrupted ....You know [Unity of communist militants] became one of the largest organizations within the left of Iran."*<sup>47</sup>

Mr. Hekmat admitted years later that the Iranian Communist Party was not established from a strong position, in other words, the former partner of Mr. Hekmat was not a serious and reliable partner. Of course this is humiliating for Komala who had offered manpower and the necessary facilities in order to form the group called the "Communist

---

<sup>47</sup> Mansoor Hekmat, speech in Marx society in London entitled as the oral histories of unity of communist militants, 15<sup>th</sup> May 2000

Party of Iran”. However we can see that the “Unity of communist militants” even gave Komala bribes to establish the “Communist party of Iran”.

Another important issue is the extraordinary exaggeration of the “leader of the proletariat”, in saying that the “Unity of communist militants” became one of the largest organizations of the left in Iran. Before the establishment of the Communist Party of Iran, the UCM was almost unknown in the Iranian political milieu. It was only known of by some leftist intellectual circles and some leftist currents. The fact of being anonymous was also one of the reasons that the UCM had minimal impact in comparison with the other left currents. The existence of the liberated areas in Kurdistan led to a strengthening of the UCM’s position. A large part of leftist activists wishing to escape the brutal repression of the bourgeoisie inevitably took refuge in this gathering, the logical result of it being the tragic fate of these activists, keeping aloof from any political activity and distrusting any organized political work.

However, since the UCM succeeded in being promoted from a circle of few people to one of the main actors in establishing the party called the “Communist Party of Iran”, they were overwhelmed with joy and even openly expressed their happiness. Mansoor Hekmat, with joy and pride, believed that their future world power, within four years of the Congress of the UCM (i.e. in 1986) was at that time inconceivable. At that point he believed that the Communist Party of Iran would be on the avant-garde of the formation of a new international. We will return to this issue later. Mansoor Hekmat said:

*“As of now, four years after our birth as a circle, we have been met with the great facts that the extent of our international existence and global power in the next four years would not even fit in our imagination today.”*<sup>48</sup>

---

<sup>48</sup> Mansoor Hekmat, the opening speech at the congress of the UCM.

Finally, in 1983 the group of the UCM dissolved itself, in an announcement issued from a tent in the village of “Mesh Gape” in Kurdistan. In the announcement it was stated that because the goal of the group was the formation of the Communist Party of Iran, which had been achieved, the group had therefore fulfilled its purpose and could dissolve itself.<sup>49</sup>

---

<sup>49</sup> Mansoor Hekmat, speech in Marx society in London entitled as the oral histories of UCM, 15<sup>th</sup> May 2000

## The Marxist-Leninist ideology of the UCM

After Lenin's death, the counter-revolution and its culmination, in order to advance his positions and in order to vacate the revolutionary positions of Lenin, Stalin attempted to produce an ideology, a religion of Lenin's revolutionary theories. With the production and reproduction of the ideology of Marxism-Leninism (Stalinism's nickname), Stalinism with Marxism-Leninism (Stalinism) went to war against Lenin. The UCM, being a Marxist-Leninist group, believed that the ideology of Marxism-Leninism was the most consistent revolutionary ideology in the current epoch. Mansoor Hekmat said:

*“Marxism-Leninism as a revolutionary ideology of the proletariat in the present epoch is unquestionably the most coherent and the most consistent revolutionary ideology of our age. The Communist movement, at least according to its general definition, has formed and forms the most active part of the revolutionary struggle of the twentieth century.”*<sup>50</sup>

In particular, it should be emphasized that the class consciousness of the proletariat and Marxism are not ideologies; there are two important criteria for the distinction between ideology and proletarian class consciousness. First, the proletariat does not have any economic power and does not have any need for the deployment of a new type of exploitation, and therefore cannot form an ideological superstructure, because, in all ideologies, people and their circumstances appear upside-down. Marx describes this very well in his work, the German Ideology, and writes on page 19:

---

<sup>50</sup>Two Factions within the Bourgeois-Imperialist Counter-Revolution, part one

*“If in all ideology men and their circumstances appear upside-down as in a **camera obscura**, this phenomenon arises just as much from their historical life-process as the inversion of objects on the retina does from their physical life-process.”*

Another important consideration is that ideology is contrary to the class consciousness that evolves in a collective process and is collective; ideology evolves individually and is individual. To be more precise, we should explain that unlike an ideology, the class consciousness of the proletariat is not personal and does not develop individually but rather is a social and historical phenomenon.

The ideas of Lenin and Rosa Luxemburg continued as part of the historical experiences and training of the proletariat, in their historical memory in the form of deep-rooted class consciousness. However, from the early 1930s onwards the dimension of the class consciousness which is the extensive form of class consciousness and determines the balance of forces between the social classes (the proletariat and the bourgeoisie depending on the conditions at a specified time), actually turned against them, the Stalinists against Lenin and the councilists against Rosa Luxemburg.

After this the manifestation of Marxism was first seen in the Communist Left of Germany-Holland and then in the Italian Communist Left. For nearly half a century, currents arose from the Italian Communist Left in absolute isolation, to defend Marxism in the period of black counter-revolution. It was only after the proletariat's historic return in the late 1960s that internationalist currents could come out of absolute isolation.

With this description it must be acknowledged that the UCM did at least in one case have a correct perception of their Stalinism (Marxism-Leninism) as an ideology, but their ideology did not or doesn't have any authenticity with Marxism or the class consciousness of the proletariat. On the other hand, Stalinism not only carried out most of the

revolutionary struggles of the twentieth century but also played an important role in suppressing revolutionary struggle.

Since the UCM was a Stalinist group (Marxist-Leninist), it was not satisfied with the scattered spectrum of Stalinists and attempted to converge the Marxist-Leninists (Stalinists) in order to promote the Stalinist movement. They believed that it was necessary to find the practical needs of the struggle and the next step beyond, and insisted that the youth communist movement should deeply question their sectarian and petty-bourgeois traditions and find the practical need of the struggle, in other words the practical unification of Marxist-Leninists (Stalinists). The UCM wrote:

*“Finally it is in such circumstances that the practical needs of struggle, in particular the practical unity of Marxist-Leninists, call for an agreement on tactics and the principles of the program, and a deep questioning of the sectarian and petty-bourgeois traditions of our youth communist movement.”*<sup>51</sup>

A characteristic of Stalinism is its particular ideological view of the historical events that have a special place and play a special role in this ideology's personality. Historical context and the intervention force of society, namely the proletariat, will be obedient to the ideological character, which becomes even more ridiculous with the death of the characters (individuality), for example with the death of Stalin in Russia and the death of Mao in China. Stalinists are convinced that after Stalin's death, Khrushchev's rise was a betrayal of Marxism-Leninism in Russia. Therefore they called Khrushchev's revisionism not a bourgeois ideology but rather a bourgeois distortion of Marxism - Leninism and wrote:

---

<sup>51</sup> The present situation, prospects and tasks of the communists, the statement of the UCM, dated 18 June 1981.

*“Revisionism ... basically means deviating from the principles of revolutionary theory and the program of Marxism - Leninism, and is a bourgeois distortion .... Today, revisionism on the international level, mainly in the forms of modern revisionism (Khrushchevism), revisionism of “Third World”, “Euro-communism” and Trotskyism, continues its treachery against the working class”<sup>52</sup>.*

It is interesting that after the formation of the Communist Party of Iran, this current considers itself as the only communist current. The other currents of the left of Capital and especially other Stalinists, who once struggled for the practical unity of the UCM, were placed in the camp of the bourgeoisie. Now the criterion for belonging to the proletariat was the accumulation of a part of the left of capital, a mixture of Stalinism and Maoism under the name of the Iranian Communist Party.

---

<sup>52</sup> The Program of Communist Party of Iran



## **The country of the Unity of Communist Militants**

After the formation of the “Worker-communist party of Iran”, the ideologists of this current tried to ‘dress up’ the new party with “internationalist” terms. Nationalist explanations of historical events were heavy in their radical phrase outlook and hindered its progress.

We can turn to the early pamphlets of the UCM such as “Two Factions within the Bourgeois-Imperialist Counter-Revolution”, “The Myth of the National and Progressive Bourgeoisie”, “The Iranian Revolution and the role of the Proletariat (Theses)”, “Prospect of adversity and advancement of a new revolution – thesis about the Political Importance of the economic crisis” etc and see:

“The active participation of the revolutionary proletariat and its communist vanguard in our country”, “At the present era and in our country”, “Our country's communist movement”, “Organizations, groups and revolutionary elements of our country”, “Working people of our country”, “The revolutionary movement of forces in our country”, “The role of the liberal bourgeoisie in our country”, “The ruling mode of production in our country”, “General framework of liberalism in our country”, “Growth and development of class struggle in our country”, “Advancement of the revolutionary movement of our country”, “Working people of our country” etc.

The extremely nationalistic explanations and disgusting repeating of “our country” in the literature of this current on the one hand indicates the origin of this current as seeking independence and on the other hand expresses the bourgeoisie's inability to provide an alternative in their quest for independence with their ideology. The peripheral independence-seeking bourgeoisie were forced to take on Marxism in order to fulfil their goal, and raised the flag of the country's independence with the combination of Stalinist and Maoist ideology.

If in the 1970s independence was represented by the most radical phrase tendencies of the left of capital, in the early 1980s this duty was assigned to the traditional (non-radical) part of the left of capital. Independence was no longer a symbol of radicalism that could gather to itself the critical force in society. The internationalist orientations, although very vague, were being raised in particular. Issues were to be changed in such a way that the radical phrase faction of the left of capital, with the term “International”, went to war against internationalist goals. It is in such circumstances that the Worker-communist Party of Iran named its publications, radio, TV etc ‘International’. The fact is that Worker-communism is one of the currents that has played the most significant role in dragging the term ‘International’ through the mud. The performance and position of this national leftist group are obvious in every part of society.

## **The UCM and the Iranian “communist” movement**

We have explained that after the first Iranian Communist Party, led by Avtis Mikaelian (Sultanzadeh), the history of the left of Iran has been the history of the left of capital. The first Communist Party of Iran, under the influence of the October Revolution, was founded in 1920 and was a member of the Comintern. Of course, in the above description two concepts should be distinguished from each other: the evaluation of the first Communist Party of Iran as a Communist Party, and the emphasis on the leadership of Avtis Mikaelian (Sultanzadeh). The first concept, the evaluation of the first Communist Party of Iran as revolutionary, is a logical result of the belief that all parties in the early 1920s who were members of the Communist International (Comintern), were revolutionary. Therefore the first Communist Party of Iran was a communist current, as it was one of the constituent parties of the Comintern that was obedient to the program of the Communist International and attempted to fulfill their duty in the realization of the Communist program. In other words, not only the first Communist Party of Iran, but all members of the Communist International in the early decades of the twentieth century were Communist parties, regardless of their strengths and weaknesses.

The role of Avtis Mikaelian (Sultanzadeh) as a great revolutionary became clear through his membership to the left wing of the Communist International. Certainly, Avtis Mikaelian like any other revolutionary was the product of the specific social conditions of his epoch and we should not regard this great revolutionary in a religious light; however his service to the Communist movement is unforgettable. The documents of the first Congress and the political policy of the Communist Party of Iran were based on the ideas of Sultanzadeh, since he was elected as its first secretary.

Unlike the National leftists of today Sultanzadeh was an internationalist and believed in World Revolution. 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.”*

A few months after the first congress of the “Communist party of Iran” in early 1920, in a coup attempt by the Bolsheviks, 12 of the 15 members of the central committee elected by the first congress of the party, including Avatis Sultanzadeh, were dismissed from the leadership of the party. The reason for this was the non-progressive evaluation of the national bourgeoisie in Iran by Avatis Sultanzadeh, because he believed that direct communist struggle and attempts towards World Revolution should be the main priority. This opinion was not supported by the Political Bureau of the Caucasus and Azerbaijani Bolshevik; they had illusions about the progressive role of the national bourgeoisie. Sultanzadeh seriously opposed this policy of the Caucasian and Azerbaijani Bolsheviks and through the texts exposed the destructive consequences that this policy would have in the Iranian Political milieu and the class movement of the proletariat.

Considering the valuable role of Sultanzadeh in the Bolshevik Party and the October Revolution, in January 1922 he was again accepted as a delegate of the Communist Party of Iran in the Comintern.

After this date, the history of the Left of Iran was linked to the history of the left of Capital. The Tudeh Party of Iran was formed in October 1941 following the People's Front, in line with the Seventh Comintern Congress, as an anti-fascist front, with the orders of the USSR and with the approval of Britain. This party enforced the foreign policy of the USSR. Several years later, the National Front of Mossadegh<sup>53</sup> was founded in October 1949 by Pan Iranian (the Party of Iran, the Nation Party of Iran) and Mojahed Muslim Assembly (led by Shams Ganat Abadi). The failures of the Tudeh Party of Iran and its role as an appendage part of the foreign policy of the USSR led to other alternatives being formed in society. In the late 60s and early 70s a leftist movement was formed as a Nationalized Marxism that had goals such as independence, economic prosperity, social justice and so on, which was completely alien to Marxism, the theory of the emancipation of the proletariat.

For the UCM, the Left of Capital was the Communist Movement and the Stalinist counter-revolutionary currents were revolutionary organizations. The UCM knew that they neither had the necessary struggle experience nor the theoretical capacity, they were alien to the Worker movement and were also ineffective even in the events within the left of capital. Thus, with complete humility, they appealed to their comrades for help (Stalinists), who were rich in experiences in the arena of battle, in theoretical possibility and practical experiences.

---

<sup>53</sup> History of the activities of the National Front of Iran is divided into five periods. Fifth National Front has resumed activities in 1994.

*“Achieving a clear understanding of the concrete moments of the current crisis and converting this cognition into the theoretical weapon in the service of the revolutionary movement of the proletariat in Iran, requires that our country’s forces and communist organizations, especially the comrades that have wider experiences and theoretical possibilities and practice in the arena of class struggle and revolutionary struggle, should work continuously in these specific areas.*

*The importance of active and consistent work by forces and communist organizations that have the capability and experience of struggle and stronger links with the labor movement, renders the duties of communists more serious in the face of the economic crisis and the misery of the masses.”<sup>54</sup>*

The UCM, to show their sincerity and to pay tribute to their Stalinist comrades, made it clear that comrades, namely the left of capital, began from the masses and had been accompanied in all developments by the masses. The problem of the UCM was that it did not understand that the role of a revolutionary organization is not to follow the working class, but rather is the avant-garde of the working class. The UCM as a part of the left of capital however tried to play its role as a part of the superstructure of class society, as one of the political institutions of the capital. Hekmat says:

*“There is no doubt that our comrades in all these movements moved with the masses, they began from the masses and they were present in the masses.”<sup>55</sup>*

---

<sup>54</sup> Prospects of adversity and new advancement of revolution thesis about the political importance of the economic crisis.

<sup>55</sup> Introduction of the pamphlet of Prospects of adversity and new advancement of revolution thesis about the political importance of the economic crisis.

The UCM emphasized that in these pamphlets it was addressing Maoists who had evaluated the structure of Iranian society as semi-feudal semi-colonial, but stressed that there were Stalinists who were theoretically closer to the UCM, or rather that the UCM was addressing currents of the “current three”, because the UCM considered itself as part of the “current three”. They said thus:

*“We do not address, in this series of booklets, the first tendency, namely those who deny the sovereignty of capitalism on social production in Iran - supporters of semi-feudal semi-colonial. Our discussions in this series of booklets are mainly centered on the disclosure of the theoretical hybridization of the second part, at least those who are theoretically closer to us.”<sup>56</sup>*

Despite the fact that the UCM were still in their “training period”, they did however try to affect the political milieu of the left of capital that it belonged to and was not satisfied with the sectarianism within the left of capital, the willing cooperation of “communist” groups and the fear of recognizing each other’s theoretical and political achievements. Mr. Hekmakt complained:

*“We see how the Communist groups are infected with an opposition to populism, and with abundant openness welcome the unconditional support of the People's Mujahedin of Iran in the elections, agitation, etc. At the same time, even the mention of each other's name or their organs, of providing specific action plans for unity among themselves, of recognizing each other's theoretical, political and organizational achievements (makes them) afraid.”<sup>57</sup>*

---

<sup>56</sup> The Myth of the National and Progressive Bourgeoisie

<sup>57</sup> As above

The Unity of Communist Militants believed:

- A social revolution in Iran was going on or is still in the process.
- A communist movement existed or still exists in the Political Milieu of Iran.

Therefore it believed in and insisted on the practical needs of the struggle, and placed the necessity of unifying the communist movement (Stalinists) on the agenda:

*“Our victory in this determining struggle undoubtedly requires conscious and quick action in the direction of unity of the communist movement around the banner of programs and tactics of Leninism. This program currently exists. On the other hand, a revolutionary heart can make the Communist Party better and faster.”*<sup>58</sup>

As mentioned earlier, with the formation of a party under the title of the Communist Party of Iran, came the defining of all of these currents from the Communist movement camp as belonging to the camp of the bourgeoisie. Not only being communists and their theoretical achievements, but even being a political party was questioned. Mansoor Hekmat said the following in his assessment of the political party:

*“On the day following the 11th of February 1979, a great power encircled the Fadaei. For a political party, this force is a tool of involvement in the fate of power during a certain period, and should be used to either be victorious in this work and gain places in the cathedra through the new balance of forces, or lose power for a period. But Fadaei, despite its massive influence after the*

---

<sup>58</sup> The present situation, prospects and tasks of the Communists, the statement of the UCM, dated 18 June 1981.



*revolution, was without perspective and lacked the characteristics of a political party. Finally Fadaei was a burden on the national movement and main nationalist parties in the country. It did not have the horizon of a political party, nor its structure, nor its behavior or its goals.*"<sup>59</sup>

Fadaei, aware of their class interests, played an important role as a part of the political apparatus of capital in stabilizing the clergy, and of course the anti-imperialist clergy, and consequently played an important role in the stabilization of the barbarian capitalist system. They praised the anti-imperialist perception of the criminal "Khomeini" and named him as a distinguished militant and the great Shiite pontiff of the world, and called the return of a criminal such as "Khomeini to the homeland" as the great victory of the people.

The Fadaeiyan majority, with a clear political horizon and in defence of their own bourgeoisie interests, sent workers to the war front as cannon fodder, and even went to the extent of associating the blood of Fadaei and [anti] revolutionary guards (Pasdaran) with the watering of the tree of revolution. The Fadaeiyan majority, with clear political aims and following their political goals, became an appendage of the bourgeois intelligence agency. Fadaei, as the former UCM and the current "worker-communism", was aware, as a political entity of capital, of their class interests and knew their goals well. But these interests and these objectives were nothing but the interests of the bourgeois class.

We have provided explanations and quotes based on the UCM's emphasis on the need for unity within the communist movement and communist forces ("Communists" as seen by the UCM of course). But after being upgraded to the "leaders of the proletariat" suddenly Mr. Mansoor Hekmat goes too far. He forgets the time when they were supporters of a leftist group. He denies the movement that he called the

---

<sup>59</sup> Party and Society: from pressure group to the political party

Communist movement, but also claims that pure Marxian communism was brought to Tehran and Iran by the UCM!

*“If UCM was something, this means that it brought one version or another of communism with it. Until the UCM entered Iranian society, communism was not a part of that society. The revolution of 1979 made it clear that communism was not a part of Iranian society, was not represented by any circles, and was impossible without the UCM. The UCM had been taught communism through the narratives of Marx and the Manifesto. The UCM came to Tehran and Iran from all of these, from within of the pages of the Communist Manifesto, from within of the pages of capital. I think the whole point of the power of the UCM was that it had come from European Communism and from European experience.”<sup>60</sup>*

First of all, the UCM did not come to Iran from European Communism and European experience, but was rooted in its support of the “Alliance for struggle for Working Class Cause (Arman)” and “current three”. We showed this clearly in part one.

Secondly, which version and what means of Communism did it bring to Iran? The four class and Maoist theory of the “Marxist Circle for Worker's Emancipation (Sahand)” or the evaluating of the leader of the bourgeoisie of Iran and a criminal such as “Khomeini” as “petty bourgeois”? Or their reactionary theory namely the “Imperialist super profits” in dependent capitalism?

Thirdly, how the UCM was taught the communism of Marx' narrative and the Communist Manifesto, whilst also appealing to experienced Stalinists for help, writing:

---

<sup>60</sup> Mansoor Hekmat, speech in Marx society in London entitled as the oral histories of UCM, 15<sup>th</sup> May 2000

*“Especially the comrades that have wider experience and theoretical possibilities and practice in the arena of class struggle and revolutionary struggle should continuously work in these areas.”*

Fourthly, which political directions did the 1979 revolution give out, thanks to the UCM? Mr. Hekmat is quite simply deluded. How could the name of the UCM be considered among the intellectuals, just after the struggle of the workers had been brought to the altar by the left of capital in 1979 -1980! Not only the “Marxist Circle for Worker's Emancipation” (which later formed “Sahand” and then metamorphosed into the UCM) but also the group that this circle was a sympathizer of, the “Alliance for struggle for Working Class Cause (Arman)” were not in the slightest involved in the political milieu. Arman itself had been affected by crisis at that time.

## **The UCM and the theocratic faction of the bourgeoisie**

The Islamic Republic of Iran was a powerless product of the worlds' bourgeoisie to provide an alternative to the national capital, in order to set up a capitalist system after the Shah's regime. The Islamic Republic was born with a congenital paradox. Capitalism needs stability to assure accumulation of capital. Within Islamic capitalism, there have been always two visions or trends in approaching this goal.

The problem is not unique to Iran, and it can clearly be seen in America, Europe and other countries that also indicate the desires and solutions of different factions of the bourgeoisie regarding the developments of society. In Iran in 1979-1980 the theocratic faction was represented by the Islamic Republic Party and the liberal factions were represented first by "Mehdi Bazargan" and then by "Bani Sadr".

At this time a large part of the Stalinists (Majority faction of Fadaeiyan and the Tudeh Party) defended and supported the theocratic faction of the bourgeois that followed the direction of the foreign policy of the USSR. Maoists (League of Iranian Communists) also supported the liberal faction of the bourgeois, namely "Bani-Sadr". What was the position of the "Unity of communist militants" as a radical phrase part of the left of capital in this context? Mr. Hekmat explains as such:

*"The Islamic Republic Party is not seeking to establish anyone's 'ideal Islamic Society', rather it is in pursuit of making use of the counter-revolutionary characteristics and ideals of the petty-bourgeoisie which is today defined and understood in the context of Islam by the likes of Khomeini. It is thus evident that by the termination of the role of the petty-bourgeois masses as the mere numbers in the counter-revolutionary program of imperialism, the Islamic Republic Party's interest in Islam and Khomeini, too, will*

*come to an end, and then the Islamic Republic Party itself will reach the end of its term as the “Islamic Republican Party”.*<sup>61</sup>

Firstly, the nature of a political party cannot be determined by a combination of individual party members alone, but also by its program, objectives and performance. This should be known by the “leaders of the proletariat”. Such an outlook at best can be a sociological outlook on historical events. Secondly, the UCM obstinately tried to assess the faction of the bourgeoisie, namely the theocratic fraction of bourgeoisie, as petty-bourgeois. Thirdly, not only did the interest of the Islamic Republic Party in Islam and Khomeini not come to an end, but also the Islamic Republic Party became the founder and elector of the “Supreme Leader”, of which the first was Khomeini himself.

The UCM questioned the Islamic Republic Party’s position as a Party and believed that the “Islamic Republic Party” did not defend either the interests of a certain class or those of a certain social layer. But at the same time it stressed that imperialism had established the “Islamic Republic Party” for the petty bourgeoisie. Apparently, imperialism was more interested in the petty bourgeoisie of Iran than the bourgeoisie, and instead of the bourgeoisie, established a party for the petty bourgeoisie! Leftists such as the UCM have a concept similar to the Kautskist understanding of imperialism and believe that imperialism is a major economic, military and repressive power such as the United States, Japan, and Great Britain etc. The result of this understanding and definition would be that the working class was mobilized behind the poor imperialism. Imperialism is not a specific policy carried out by any particular State, and can only exist on an international scale and is a way of life in the capitalist system during the period of decadence. Mansoor Hekmat wrote:

---

<sup>61</sup>Two Factions within the Bourgeois-Imperialist Counter-Revolution, part 2

*"We regarded this instrumental character as the essence of the Islamic Republic Party and as its 'raison d'être'. Furthermore, we essentially questioned it as 'being a Party' in the classical sense as a current formed in the process of defending the interests of a particular class or stratum, relies upon a particular class, and places before itself a program for the realization of the goals and interests of this class. We regarded the Islamic Republic Party as a mixture of the most suspicious circles on the one hand, and religious petty-bourgeois circles on the other, which, by active use of Islam and of Khomeini himself, and [due to] the misconceptions of a broad mass of toiling people about the latter, was at least in the beginning capable of attracting and making use of the confused masses of poor city-dwellers in achieving its reactionary goals. To say that the Islamic Republic Party is a 'party established for the [Iranian] petty-bourgeoisie by imperialism' could be an exaggeration but nevertheless an expressive summary of our viewpoint as regards this reactionary current."*<sup>62</sup>

First we will look at the party that imperialism created for the petty bourgeoisie of Iran. During the developments of 1979, on the 20th of March 1979, five spirituals with the names "Beheshti", "Mousavi Ardebili", "Rafsanjani", "Ali Khamenei" and "Bahonar" established a party which was called the "Islamic Republic Party", with "Beheshti" as its general secretary. All these along with other members of the Central Council of the Islamic Republic Party, including the "Mir-Hossein Mousavi", have played or continue to play key roles in leading the bourgeoisie of Iran. "Ali Khamenei" is the current supreme leader. The Islamic Republic Party, or according to the UCM the party that imperialism created for the petty bourgeoisie of Iran, was dissolved by Khomeini due to internal disputes in June 1987.

---

<sup>62</sup>Two Factions within the Bourgeois-Imperialist Counter-Revolution, part 3

All governments that have come to power after the first administration have had some roots in the Islamic Republic Party. According to the arguments of the UCM, after the first administration and from the government of “Bahonar” onwards, the party of the petty bourgeoisie and, as a result, the petty-bourgeoisie itself, has been governing in Iran and “Beheshti”, “Mousavi Ardebili”, “Rafsanjani”, “Ali Khamenei”, “Bahonar” etc were also petty bourgeoisie. It is unknown where the Iranian bourgeoisie was thought to be hiding, perhaps it never existed at all!

The UCM continues its unfounded and baseless speech:

*“It is obvious that Islam and Khomeini will gain no more from the long-term policy of the monopolies and the present IRP's activities than what they used to receive under the Shah; for neither Islam nor Khomeini can be the constituent elements of the monopolies' governmental superstructure in Iran.”<sup>63</sup>*

The UCM believed that neither Islam nor Khomeini could be the constituent elements of the monopolies' governmental superstructures in Iran! But they did not specify whether Islam and Khomeini could be the superstructure of a government other than that of the monopolies? Islam, as a certain type of ideology, has been the superstructure of the capitalist state of Iran over the past 30 years. Was “National Socialism” a superstructure of capitalism in the late 1930s and early 1940s in Germany or not? Why can “National Socialism” be a superstructure of state in Germany, but Islam cannot in Iran? Is it not true that both are a certain type of ideology?

The UCM were preparing the scene for the last act of the play by the counter-revolution which, if realized, would prepare for the

---

<sup>63</sup>Two Factions within the Bourgeois-Imperialist Counter-Revolution, part 2

establishment of a monopoly bourgeoisie dictatorship in Republic form (but non-Islamic) in Iran.

*“If these counter-revolutionary developments are brought forth; ...then the scene will be set for the last act of the play by the counter-revolution - the establishment of the monopoly bourgeoisie's dictatorship. This is a dictatorship which will be neither liberal nor will it be fond of the clergy and the theocracy; a dictatorship which will promise employment, housing, water and electricity, and prevention and cure of the basic diseases; a dictatorship which will swear to [restore] "Iran's glory", "modernism" and "order"; a dictatorship which will condemn "anarchy" and stand for organized and centralized suppression; and in short, a dictatorship which will be the soul of the **Aryamehrian** reaction reincarnated in the body of a republic a non-Islamic one of course.”*<sup>64</sup>

These contra revolutionary developments were carried out. The heirs of the UCM must respond to the question of whether the dictatorship of monopoly bourgeois actually came to be? Unlike the delirium of the UCM, history has proven that the established dictatorship not only showed good will towards the clergy and theocracy but also even institutionalized the theocracy and produced a certain kind of ideology known as “revolutionary Islam” and even tried and is still trying to spread this ideology to other countries under the title of “Islamic Revolution”. History proved again the baseless nature of the positions of the UCM. The UCM believed that the establishment of a dictatorship in Iran would bring about a non-Islamic republic. Unlike the baseless analysis and unfounded positions of the UCM, the established dictatorship in Iran became an ideological dictatorship, of the type of the Islamic Republic, whose

---

<sup>64</sup> Two Factions within the Bourgeois-Imperialist Counter-Revolution, part 3



supreme leader is the shadow of God on Earth and wields power beyond any governmental agency.

The UCM believed that in the absence of active involvement of the military, the Islamic Republic would not be capable of a wide and long-term repression. These words were said by Mr. Hekmat only two days before the most brutal massacres in Iran's modern history. The army played no role in the general massacre but nonetheless the bourgeoisie succeeded in organizing the most prolonged and brutal massacre with its octopus-like suppression machine. Mr. Hekmat claimed:

*"The Islamic Republic Party cannot convert the military into an active tool in its current offensive policy. The [Islamic Republic] Party tries to keep the army at least neutral in the existing competitions. In the absence of active involvement of the military, the regime will not have the possibility for a wide and long-term repression."*<sup>65</sup>

---

<sup>65</sup> The present situation, prospects and tasks of the Communists, the statement of the UCM, dated 18 June 1981.

## **The Marxist conception of social revolution**

Since the emergence of social classes and the exploitation of man by man, this exploitation has taken on a systematic form and one class has received all the benefits of material production. This exploitation has provided the contexts for the formation of uprisings, rebellion, riots and even revolutions. However the material conditions for social protest, revolt and rebellion are very different from the material conditions of social revolution. If the material conditions are sufficient for social protests but the subjective conditions are inadequate, or the protesters do not have a horizon or perspective for their protest, society will explode and protests will be more likely to take the form of a rebellion, an uprising or even revolt.

The social revolution is a process whereby the relations of production and, consequently, a new set of social relations of production will replace the old social relations. It is an undeniable fact that “the history of all hitherto societies is the history of class struggle.” However, historically, this does not mean that the battle with the rulers of class societies has always resulted in a social revolution and the transformation of the relations of production.

Before slavery relations of production replaced feudal relations of production, the history of slavery was rife with rebellions; the most famous being the slave uprising led by Spartacus. The living conditions of slaves and the oppression they faced formed the basis for the slaves’ protests. In 73 BC Spartacus began to lead the protests. During the revolt of Spartacus, many slaves were freed and joined the ranks of the rebels. The slaves led by Spartacus resisted the army of Rome for several years. Finally, despite sacrifices and heroic resistance, the Roman army crushed Spartacus’ revolt in 71 BC and the captured slaves were crucified.

The slaves that revolted were not proposing an alternative to the system of slavery; they wanted to be released and to return to their

homeland. Slaves never had the possibility of a feudal system and they neither wanted nor could have been promoted to the ruling class but they dreamed about a free life without their chains.

This also holds true for the feudal system (the serf or vassal system). Several riots and rebellions have been recorded during the era of the feudal system (serf system). Peasants or serfs were no longer slaves. They had authority over their own lives but were dependent on the land. If the owner of the land changed, they were actually passed on to the new owner. One of the most famous peasant revolts was Pugachev's Rebellion, which occurred between 1773 and 1775 in the Russian Empire.<sup>66</sup>

The peasants (serfs) never revolted against the aims or demands of the capitalist system. At best, their horizons were a piece of land and relative justice. The exploited peasants (serfs) did not create new relations of production; no bourgeois revolution converted the peasant class or even the farmers into the ruling class and would not have been able to do so. In other words, the peasant class did not become the capitalist class but the capitalist relations of production gradually grew in the womb of the feudal system and the new class, namely the capitalist class, was not replaced by the peasant class or even the farmers but was replaced by the master class.

Two social classes emerged from within the feudal system, namely, the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, and both classes were then transformed into the main classes of society. In fact, the growth of these

---

<sup>66</sup> Yemelyan Pugachov was not a peasant but was an army officer and lived in prosperity. During his missions, and by observing the living conditions of peasants and the oppression that was inflicted on them, he supported the peasants and led their uprising and protests. Many lords escaped and the military units of the Russian Empire were crushed. Pugachov tried to initiate a reform in the region he dominated. He announced the abolition of serfdom and military service was also abolished, while taxation was eliminated. Eventually, Pugachov's uprising was crushed and he was arrested and taken to Moscow where he was brutally executed.

classes in society would end the rule of feudalism. In other words, the concept of capitalist relations emerged and began to grow from within feudal relations. Workshops, factories and other industries were not created by the feudal class but by the capitalists and within the feudal system.

The gradual growth of capitalist productive relations within the feudal system has created the heterogeneity of the superstructure of society, namely, political power in the infrastructure of society that has provided the grounds for the formation of bourgeois revolutions. “Liberty, equality, fraternity” was the slogan and symbol of the French Revolution. This slogan was not the slogan of the peasants or the farmers but was the slogan of a growing class that represented the new productive relations that were developing from within the feudal system, namely, the bourgeois class, which at that time was the revolutionary class. The new relations of production (the capitalist relations of production) that became dominant in society needed its citizens to have freedom and equality: “the law is the same for all” in society.

The Iranian Constitutional Revolution, which was influenced by the French Revolution, had two main demands a “parliament” and a “constitution”- and had freedom and justice as its main slogan. The Constitutional Revolution represented a bourgeois-democratic revolution in Iran that was delayed due to the restrictions that were the result of being a peripheral country. Finally, after years of effort, the Constitutional Revolution achieved victory in 1906 and this led to the formation of the National Assembly and the adoption of the first constitution of Iran.<sup>67</sup>

---

<sup>67</sup> The political and economic development of capitalism, in other words, the expansion of capitalism into new areas and its conquering of those new areas, did not exclude Iran. Iranian economic trade expansion with Turkey, India, Russia, etc., wanted to bring about necessary changes to the infrastructure and superstructure of society. Iran was one of the main markets for Russian goods; Russia needed to penetrate its goods into the most remote villages of Iran. This

Throughout human history, only one social class has arisen that, according to its material conditions, has been capable of offering an alternative to the system that exploits it. This is the proletariat class and its alternative system of communism. 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*

---

required roads, which Russia played an important role in building and expanding. Great Britain reduced the influence of Russia and, in line with the area of its influence in Iran, established and expanded the telegraph network. In 1870, Iran was actually covered by both the post and the telegraph.

With the changes that occurred in the infrastructure of Iran, its major cities became economic centres and trade grew. Workshops and small factories were created in different industries. As a consequence, awareness developed of topics such as law, equal rights, nationality, independent sovereignty, etc. The Eighth Principle of Amendment to the Constitution states: “The country's citizens are equal before the law state.” In such circumstances, the bourgeois-democratic revolution of Iran (the Constitutional Revolution) was formed to demand a constitution that would limit the powers of the king and would transfer power to parliament.

*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>68</sup>*

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 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 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.

---

<sup>68</sup> The German Ideology- Karl Marx

The socialist relations of production are only possible on a global scale and cannot form islands of socialism within capitalism. Engels clearly emphasized this issue in the *Principles of Communism* where, in asking and answering the question about the global nature and form of the communist revolution, he emphasized:

*“Will it be possible for this revolution to take place in one country alone?”*

*No. By creating the world market, big industry has already brought all the peoples of the Earth, and especially the civilized peoples, into such close relation with one another that none is independent of what happens to the others. ...It is a universal revolution and will, accordingly, have a universal range.”*<sup>69</sup>

No social system has disintegrated during its period of prosperity. It is only after a period of decline that the old social system is replaced by a higher social system. This is also true in the case of the capitalist system. The history of the capitalist mode of production can be divided into two periods. The first period occurs when the bourgeoisie plays a revolutionary role and the relations of production provide the possibility for the growth of the productive forces. The second period occurs when capitalism enters into its period of decline. The bourgeois class is an anti-revolutionary and reactionary class and capitalist relations are obstacles to the development of the productive forces. In the era of capitalist decadence, capitalist relations of production become the chains and shackles that feed on the productive forces. It is only at this stage that the material conditions will be provided for a social revolution and, in the current era, for a communist revolution.

More than a hundred years ago, Lenin offered a clear picture of the rise of capitalism and the role of the bourgeoisie and he named the

---

<sup>69</sup> The Principles of Communism

different historical periods of capitalism. With the beginning of the imperialist World War of 1914, the bourgeoisie lost its progressive role and took a reactionary and counter-revolutionary role. In other words, capitalism entered into its period of decline and Lenin noted the following:

*“The usual division into historical epochs, so often cited in Marxist literature and so many times repeated by Kautsky and adopted in Potresov’s article, is the following: (1) 1789-1871; (2) 1871-1914; (3) 1914 - ? Here, of course, as everywhere in Nature and society, the lines of division are conventional and variable, relative, not absolute. We take the most outstanding and striking historical events only approximately, as milestones in important historical movements. The first epoch from the Great French Revolution to the Franco-Prussian war is one of the rise of the bourgeoisie, of its triumph, of the bourgeoisie on the upgrade, an epoch of bourgeois-democratic movements in general and of bourgeois-national movements in particular, an epoch of the rapid breakdown of the obsolete feudal-absolutist institutions. The second epoch is that of the full domination and decline of the bourgeoisie, one of transition from its progressive character towards reactionary and even ultra-reactionary finance capital. This is an epoch in which a new class - present-day democracy- is preparing and slowly mustering its forces. The third epoch, which has just set in, places the bourgeoisie in the same ‘position’ as that in which the feudal lords found themselves during the first epoch. This is the epoch of imperialism and imperialist upheavals, as well as of upheavals stemming from the nature of imperialism. “<sup>70</sup>*

---

<sup>70</sup> Under a false Flag – Lenin



This issue indicates that in the period when the capitalist system was growing, the material conditions for a communist revolution did not yet exist. Yet, the era of the communist revolution had begun. The Paris Commune occurred when the worldwide capitalist system had not yet entered its period of decline. Internationalists divide the capitalist system into two periods. The first period is from 1600 to 1914, when capitalism was in its progressive mode. The period of decline began in 1914. The Paris Commune, which was established in the cradle of bourgeois civilization, was destroyed by civilized barbarians. If it had not been destroyed, its development towards a global communist system would not have been possible at that point. Engels explains this well:

*“Everywhere that revolution was the work of the working class; it was the latter that built the barricades and paid with its lifeblood. Only the Paris workers, in overthrowing the government, had the very definite intention of overthrowing the bourgeois regime. But conscious though they were of the fatal antagonism existing between their own class and the bourgeoisie, still, neither the economic progress of the country nor the intellectual development of the mass of French workers had as yet reached the stage which would have made a social reconstruction possible. In the final analysis, therefore, the fruits of the revolution were reaped by the capitalist class.”*<sup>71</sup>

As mentioned above, the outbreak of the First World War showed that capitalism was entering into its period of decline and capitalism was in the era of imperialism. We believe that in the decline period of capitalism, in the era of imperialism, all states, regardless of their size, large or small, regardless of their military and economic power, from the

---

<sup>71</sup> *Manifesto of the Communist Party* -The 1893 Italian Edition

more significant gangsters, such as the US and Great Britain, to the smaller ones, such as Iran and Pakistan, are imperialists.

In other words, with the arrival of the era of the decline of capitalism and imperialism, the era of communist revolution began. This means that the revolution that is on the agenda in all countries, whether a capitalist metropolitan or a capitalist periphery country, is the communist revolution. The communist revolution is valid in Great Britain, Germany, etc., as well as in the most peripheral capitalist countries, such as Afghanistan. Certainly, the communist revolution in a capitalist peripheral country will be part of the world revolution, not an entirely distinct and isolated phenomenon and, on the other hand, being part of the world revolution it will need help from the international proletariat. This is definitely a great responsibility that sits heavily on the shoulders of the proletariat of the metropolitan countries. Without the help of the proletariat of the metropolitan countries, all aspects of the communist revolutionary process will not proceed in peripheral countries.

It is also essential that the social revolution (communist revolution) is not limited to the few days during which the revolution takes place but that the whole process of revolution needs to be considered. For example, the October Revolution achieved the goals of a process that had taken many years and, finally, on 25 October 1917, during an armed uprising, the Russian proletariat took political power.

## **The democratic revolution from the perspective of the UCM**

We have clearly explained our understanding and perceptions of the contexts of the formation and creation of social revolutions and, in the current era, of the communist revolution. Let us see how the positions and objectives of the Unity of Communist Militants are alien to Marxism, how as a political current of the left of capital, its theories and positions have effectively been in the service of the sterilization of the class struggle. Again, we return to the final slogan of the first manifesto of the Circle of Sahand, and, subsequently, the Union of Communist Militants:

*“For a people’s democratic republic<sup>72</sup>!”*

The UCM demanded the establishment of the Democratic People’s Republic. The question that certainly arises is why the UCM definitely did not want a dictatorship of the proletariat, such as in the Soviet Republic, but demanded a Democratic People’s Republic. It is here that the Maoism of the UCM manifests itself. Since the UCM shared Mao’s understanding and belief in the concept of revolution and, again, as Mao believed, that the revolutionary classes, four classes (namely, the working class, the peasantry, the petty bourgeoisie and three separate points, since our “theoreticians” were too ashamed to clearly set the “national bourgeoisie” as a class apart, so they represented it with three separate points instead), would demand democratic change in society, we must also consider the interests of the other classes. In other words, the working class, simply in terms of its numbers, must be in the service of the objectives of the other classes. Hekmat wrote:

---

<sup>72</sup> The Iranian revolution and the role of the proletariat (Theses)

*“The same ruling imperialist relation has provided the objective conditions for the existence of other revolutionary classes (peasants, urban petty-bourgeoisie under disintegration,...) who have interests in the overthrow of imperialism and the elimination of its intense exploitation and fierce dictatorship, and who resort to revolutionary methods of struggle against the existing system. Hence the working class is not the only class demanding revolutionary changes in the present revolution of Iran.*

*Therefore the revolution in Iran is democratic since the ruling imperialist system in the dominated Iran, has given a democratic content to the Iranian revolution, from the point of view of the objective conditions (intense economic exploitation and violent political repression of the working class and other toiling classes: peasants, urban petty-bourgeoisie...) and also from the point of view of the subjective conditions (the presence of classes alongside the working class - mainly the peasants - prepared, as a result of the objective conditions of their social existence, to accept revolutionary methods of struggle against the existing system). ”<sup>73</sup>*

It is important to note that despite the fact that the struggle of the working class is fundamental, even with their belief in the UCM, the communist revolution (social revolution) was not possible because it also looked at the nature of the anti-imperialist revolution. With regard to the disciples of Kautsky, the UCM activists inability to understand the Marxist concept of imperialism is not a result of their misconceptions but is due to the fact that they belong to the left of capital; for them, imperialism is a tyrannical power and force, and the antagonism between labour and capital should be dominated and overshadowed by the anti-imperialist struggle:

---

<sup>73</sup> The Iranian revolution and the role of the proletariat (Theses)

*“The present revolution in Iran, despite the domination of capital, is a democratic revolution precisely because of its anti-imperialist character... For this reason, although the main struggle is between the working class and the bourgeoisie of Iran, the revolution in Iran is not immediately a socialist, but a democratic revolution.”*<sup>74</sup>

Next, let us consider for a moment, just for a moment, that the Iranian proletariat had been listening to the commands of the UCM and that a black army, which was following the demands of the other social classes, had delivered the victory of the democratic revolution to the UCM. This class would not be telling itself that prior to the democratic revolution the social system was capitalist and based on wage slavery and after the democratic revolution the social system would still be capitalist and we must continue to be wage slaves. What effect will this revolution have on our wage slavery?

*“The capitalism of Iran, precisely because it is still present the day after the victory of the democratic revolution, relies on the exploitation of imperialist capitalism and cannot be consistent with the economic demands of the proletariat, and that its axis is going beyond the possibilities of the bourgeoisie in such countries.”*<sup>75</sup>

Of course, with the UCM winning the democratic revolution, some conditions and reservations were made, namely, the formation of the desired party of the UCM. At the same time, it was stressed that the proletariat was not allowed (“cannot”) to directly undertake a socialist revolution but would also have to satisfy the minimum programme. The Communist Party of Iran made the UCM programme its own and this was

---

<sup>74</sup> As source 73

<sup>75</sup> *Toward Socialism* No: 5 - First Period

supposed to be the only communist party in the world, as we can read below:

*“We announce that the necessary condition for the victory of the democratic revolution of Iran is the formation of the Communist Party and providing it is led by the proletariat in the ranks of the revolutionary movement ... In such circumstances the class-conscious proletariat and its Communist Party cannot handle an immediate socialist revolution.... the political and economic context of the democratic revolution is to achieve the minimum program of the proletariat.”<sup>76</sup>*

The UCM took whatever it needed to save capitalism from a range of proletarian attacks and ranted that the objective and subjective conditions for a socialist revolution were not available. However, the capitalist relations of production do not provide the objective conditions for a socialist revolution. Yet, after the constitutional revolution (bourgeois-democratic revolution), Iranian society was not capitalist. The UCM raised its Maoist argument that the class composition of the motive forces of the revolution and the classes that were looking for a revolutionary way to achieve their democratic demands limits the revolution within the democratic framework. According to the UCM, the proletariat must create the revolution for the benefit of other revolutionary classes.

*“We believe that the current revolution, because of the objective and subjective conditions, cannot be an immediate socialist revolution. The on-going revolution cannot have the immediate destruction of capitalism on its agenda. The class composition of the driving forces of our revolution are, on the one hand, the*

---

<sup>76</sup> Program of the communist party of Iran

*existence of non-proletarian classes and layers alongside the proletariat-which in a revolutionary manner struggle to achieve democratic aspirations-and, on the other hand, being unprepared for the necessary subjective conditions for the mobilization of the proletariat limits the Iranian Revolution to a democratic framework.”<sup>77</sup>*

Let us consider the demagoguery and populism of the UCM, namely, the necessary unpreparedness of the objective and subjective conditions for socialist revolution and the overshadowing of proletarian struggles in the interests of other classes. This was discussed by one of Hekmat’s later disciples, Mahmoud Ghazvini. Apparently, this senior cadre of worker-communism had forgotten the evolutionary process of his ideology (worker-communism) and, in relation to the unpreparedness of the objective and subjective conditions noted in the previous quotation, he accidentally disclosed the situation of worker-communism, as seen below:

*“The difference between the revolutionary populism of 1979 with the vulgar socialism of Hamid Taghvai is that the populism of the year 1979 does not show that the objective and subjective conditions for socialism are ready and that is why it gives up its socialist agenda and struggle for the immediate establishment of socialism and engages in a democratic revolution and creates a revolution for the other classes.”<sup>78</sup>*

The question that arises here is what areas of formation exist in the democratic revolution thesis and in what circumstances and in response to

---

<sup>77</sup> Program of the communist party of Iran

<sup>78</sup> The populism of Hamid Taghvai and the Charter of Overthrow of the worker-communist party-Hekmatist (Mahmoud Ghazvini).

which problems in the labour movement have they been proposed? The roots of the democratic revolution thesis should be examined for information about the revolution of 1848 in Germany and the revolution of 1905 in Russia. Marx and the Communist League believed that the German bourgeoisie had gained power in 1848 and established a bourgeois republic. Marx and the Communist League also hoped that, in turn, this Republic would relatively quickly lead to a proletarian revolution. However, the surrender of the German liberal bourgeoisie to the Prussian government caused Marx to reconsider this scenario. In fact, the *Address to the Central Committee of the Communist League* (March 1850) incorporated Marx and Engels' analysis of the new conditions. The idea of the democratic revolution was that through a continuous or uninterrupted revolution the proletariat would carry out the tasks of the bourgeoisie as well as its own tasks. This democratic revolution is in fact a dual power situation between the workers and the petty-bourgeoisie and was considered to be a step towards a proletarian dictatorship. Before the end of 1850, Marx and Engels had abandoned the theory of democratic revolution and had concluded that any hope of a proletarian revolution following the bourgeois revolution of 1850 was too optimistic. Indeed, in 1895, at the beginning of the class struggle in France, Engels wrote:

*"History has shown that we, and all who thought like us, were wrong. It has made it plain that the condition of economic development on the continent at that time was not yet ripe enough by far for the abolition of capitalist production; it has proved this by the economic revolution which since 1848 has transformed the whole continent."*

The second case was the Russian Revolution of 1905 and the tactics set out in Lenin's *Two Tactics of Social Democracy in the Democratic Revolution*. Lenin was trying to grasp the heterogeneous development of Russia where 10 million workers were being exploited in large companies



by world capital but power was still held by a reactionary semi-feudal regime. Due to the obeisance of the liberal bourgeoisie in respect of the Tsar's promises in 1905 and the obeisance of the Mensheviks, Lenin was obliged to offer an alternative to the new conditions. He concluded that the proletariat should start a "revolutionary dictatorship of the workers and poor peasants" and should also carry out the tasks of the bourgeois.

Lenin was against the tsarist autocracy but not against imperialist dictatorship and when capitalism had not yet entered into the period of decline and Russian society was in transition to capitalism, he raised the solution of a "dictatorship of the workers and poor peasants". Lenin was never against the dictatorship of capitalist rule but was unable to offer the alternative of another bourgeois republic or even a Democratic People's Republic.

Like Marx and Engels, Lenin addressed the analyses of the conditions and developed much of his views in light of the experience of the labour movement. If Marx and Engels' *Address to the Communist League* presented new prospects, Lenin's *April Theses* presented an evolution in terms of new social conditions, both in the theories of Lenin and in the workers' movement.

What was the background to Lenin's *April Theses*? The programme of the old Bolsheviks was outdated and capitalism had entered into its period of decline, the era of proletarian revolution and the imperialist wars. The Bolsheviks had to offer an alternative programme and solutions for the new terms and conditions. Unfortunately, the majority of the Bolsheviks, especially the old Bolsheviks, were unable to understand the new situation, especially the development of capitalism, and were still immersed in the past. Only a tiny minority of the Bolsheviks, led by Lenin, were able to meet the new requirements. It was in this context that Lenin's *April Theses* was formed and this replaced the programme of the old Bolsheviks. However, the programme met with strong opposition among the old Bolsheviks who were represented by Kamenev and, therefore, it failed by 12 votes to two. However, the Bolsheviks eventually

abandoned their integrated support for the interim government and prepared for Soviet power. The second thesis of Lenin's *April Theses* raised the idea of councils as the political power of the proletariat. As a consequence, the Bolsheviks used the slogan, "all power to the Soviets".

During the revolutionary wave that occurred between 1917 and 1922, the Russian proletarian revolution triumphed in a country where the division of the population between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie had not been achieved on a large scale, such as in Great Britain, Germany, France and so on, but had not even reached a relative level, such as the level in Iran in 1978. In many parts of Russia, particularly in the eastern area, capitalism did not exist at all or it had spread very little. Prior to 1917, the Russian proletarian population amounted to fewer than 10 million people as much of the population had been killed in the imperialist war, the First World War. This can be compared to the social conditions of Iran in 1979. When the Russian proletarian revolution took place, the rural population totalled about 103 million, while the urban population was only about 22 million.

From these explanations, it can be noted that the social conditions of Iran, namely, the rate of development and the spread of capitalism in Iran in 1979, were greater than those in Russia in 1917. However, this cannot provide a reason to justify the need for a democratic revolution. So, how should we examine the background of the democratic revolution of the UCM?

As a result of their Maoist thinking (multi-classes), in 1979 the UCM believed that other revolutionary classes were demanding revolutionary developments and that it was, therefore, important to take into consideration the wishes and interests of other revolutionary classes.

The UCM insisted that the victory of the "democratic" revolution would not violate the basis of the bourgeoisie's private ownership of the means of production, namely, exchange, commodity production and the buying and selling of the labour force. Therefore, capitalism would remain in place. There was no news about the destruction of capitalism! The

democratic revolution does not fear the national bourgeoisie, nor is it intended to replace capitalism with another mode of production. It is only intended to create the terms and conditions for the bourgeoisie. The UCM explained the content of its democratic revolution as follows:

*“The content of the victory of the democratic revolution is creating the most appropriate political and economic conditions for the development of the class struggle, which from the view of the proletariat, first of all, is being expressed in the most compact form of the minimum demands. From economic perspectives, the realization of these demands does not exist at all, which means the destruction of capitalism, it does not mean establishing ‘another’ mode of production, but merely a pattern that the proletariat imposes on the bourgeois economy and the restrictions that govern the operation of this system...the intervention of the revolutionary proletariat in determining the length of the working day, the minimum wage, vacation time, health and insurance, how to manage the industry, the livelihood of the unemployed, as well as the position of the non-proletarian working class, does not violate the basis of private ownership of the bourgeois and the means of production, exchange, commodity production and buying and selling of labour force, but undoubtedly affects the limits and restrictions of the conditions of profitability and capital accumulation.”*<sup>79</sup>

The UCM stated that the victory of the democratic revolution would not violate the buying and selling of labour. In other words, the workforce will continue to work as before but with conditions and restrictions.

---

<sup>79</sup> Program of the communist party of Iran

As the left faction of capital, the UCM provided a “guarantee” for the right-wing faction of capital that the day after the victory of the democratic revolution it would retain the capitalist mode of production. The activists of the UCM won the honour of being the experts of capital that would take action in respect of its long-term goals and would provide practical solutions for managing and organizing the sale of labour power in accord with the social conditions and the needs of capital.

The day after the victory of the democratic revolution and the establishment of the People's Democratic Republic of the UCM, labour power becomes a form of commodity (according to the UCM, the day after the victory of the democratic revolution society will still be capitalist and based on imperialist exploitation) and, in a capitalist society, the value of this commodity is determined, like any other commodity, by the amount of necessary labour spent on its reproduction. In the peripheral capitalist countries, the average value of labour power is lower than the average value of labour power in the metropolitan capitalist countries and, consequently, the average yield and the average life expectancy of labour power is low in peripheral capitalist countries. The left of capital, especially in the peripheral capitalist countries, always accuses the right of capital of being narrow-minded and recommends the long-term interests of capital while efficiently maintaining labour power in their interests. This part of the task of the UCM was to be undertaken by the institutions of capital, such as trade unions, particularly in the metropolitan capitalist countries, to diffuse the anger and protests of the workers by channelling their protests. Capital may even be required to take “radical” action, such as strikes. If such actions are necessary, this will raise the value of labour power. However, all anti-labour measures, the actual reduction of the value of labour power, layoffs and other anti-labour actions have always already been agreed with the unions.

The image that the UCM, with all its demagoguery, offered for the day after the victory of the democratic revolution was not convincing, even as a story for primary school children. The workers would raise their

demands in a manner that denies the brutal exploitation of the bourgeoisie. The workers would not demand anything from the bourgeoisie; otherwise, the bourgeoisie would have pitied and forgiven them. Gasconade provides a “moral” identity for social capital:

*“The demands of the revolutionary proletariat must be addressed in such a way that forecloses the possibilities of this brutal exploitation of the bourgeoisie. The economic demands of the proletariat, which primarily determine the value of labour power in the capitalist economy, interferes with the political leverage of the high and low levels.”*<sup>80</sup>

If, in the imagined world of the UCM, all capitalists were like Bill Gates, i.e., “philanthropic”, perhaps it would no longer be necessary to politically lever society. Bill Gates, the founder and principal shareholder of Microsoft, has spent about \$30 billion on charity in the service of education, health, providing free internet in public libraries and so on. Mr Gates also recommends that other capitalists should do similar charity work. The propaganda institutions and the journalists of capital all retain their power despite the humane characteristics of Bill Gates who writes: “Philanthropy is very important to Gates”. However, at the same time, Microsoft lays off 18,000 of its employees.<sup>81</sup> For the 18,000 people, life became bleak and 18,000 families were ruined. Nevertheless, for Mr Gates, humanitarianism is of the utmost importance.

However, on the day after the victory of the democratic revolution, when Iranian capitalism would be based on imperialist exploitation, Mansoor Hekmat would interfere or create problems for the process of capital accumulation. Such a thing would only be possible in the scientific world of the UCM.

---

<sup>80</sup> Program of the communist party of Iran

<sup>81</sup><http://www.geekwire.com/2014/breaking-microsoft-cutting-18000-jobs-next-year-14-workforce>

*“The capitalism of Iran in practice will not be able to accumulate profits within such ‘imposed’ constraints and conditions.... The superstructure of society on the ‘following’ day of victory of the democratic revolution (‘Democratic People’s Republic’ or in the case of other political states, which represent the rule of the revolutionary proletariat and its democratic allies) on the one hand is at odds with the practical needs of capital accumulation in Iran....The revolutionary proletariat will, can and should not place the burden of the consequences of the crisis on the shoulders of the working people but rather the bourgeoisie.”*<sup>82</sup>

Even more ridiculous, because of such constraints and conditions the accumulation of capital would not be possible. Capitalism is the relations of production and capital is social capital. Capital does not know anything-not God, not religion, not politics, not ethics, not conditions-but the blood of the workers (surplus value) that must be injected into the process for capital to be accumulated. Capital is like the vampire, Dracula, who will only drink fresh blood-the blood of the workers (new surplus value). Capital can survive in the short-term without new blood (new surplus value) and without the accumulation of capital but, in the long-term, this creates serious problems in the process of accumulation and raises serious risks, examples of which are World War I, II and others.

As long as capitalism is the basis of the dominant mode of economic-social formations in the world, wherever a revolution undermines or crushes the relations of production, capital will seek to revive this relationship. To what extent this will be successful depends on whether the world revolution is extended.

The UCM demagoguery did not place the burden of the crisis on the shoulders of the toiling masses but on the shoulders of the bourgeoisie.

---

<sup>82</sup> Program of the communist party of Iran

This would be achieved through their People's Democratic Republic in which capitalism would continue on the basis of imperialist exploitation. In the historical analysis of his famous book, *Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, Engels stated:

*"The state is, therefore, by no means a power forced on society from without; just as little is it 'the reality of the ethical idea', 'the image and reality of reason', as Hegel maintains. Rather, it is a product of society at a certain stage of development; it is the admission that this society has become entangled in an insoluble contradiction with itself, that it has split into irreconcilable antagonisms which it is powerless to dispel. But in order that these antagonisms, these classes with conflicting economic interests, might not consume themselves and society in fruitless struggle, it became necessary to have a power, seemingly standing above society, that would alleviate the conflict and keep it within the bounds of 'order'; and this power, arisen out of society but placing itself above it, and alienating itself more and more from it, is the state."*

About a hundred years ago, in 1920, the first Communist Party of Iran, unlike the left of capital, 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.”*

At numerous times and on different occasions, the leaders of the UCM falsely stated that their ideology and their position on capitalism in Iran came from Europe and from Marx. It would have been more logical if they had said that their ideology and their position was based on Maoist and Stalinist literature that had been tinkered with and reassembled by the UCM. Why did they give the wrong source for their descent? As long as the working class, as a social class, refuses to stop performing its historical mission as the gravedigger of capitalism, it will be a platform for obtaining power from the left wing of capital. This issue is more naked and visible in the capitalist metropolises than in the capitalist peripheries. Engels explained the problem as follows:

*“As long as the oppressed class – in our case, therefore, the proletariat – is not yet ripe for its self-liberation, so long will it, in its majority, recognize the existing order of society as the only*



*possible one and remain politically the tail of the capitalist class, its extreme left wing.*"<sup>83</sup>

---

<sup>83</sup> *Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State* - Engels

## Retaking the democratic revolution

Marxism is not a religion and Marxist theories are not divine revelations. Marxism is the theory of the emancipation of the proletariat. Marxists use the experiences of the labour movement to analyse the social conditions and to provide their theories on the development of the class struggle.

With the developments and changes in society and with the lessons of past experience, there can be a political tendency to criticize an earlier position, theory or theories and to replace an old position or theory with a new theory. This process is quite logical and principled.

In their *Address to the Communist League*, Marx and Engels reconsidered the democratic revolution and the communist revolution. Engels boldly wrote that “history has shown that we, and all who thought like us, were wrong”. In his *April Theses*, Lenin reconsidered the democratic revolution and provided a thesis for a socialist revolution and, in conjunction with this change, he explained that “Our theory was not a dogma.” On the one hand, this indicates a tendency of loyalty to the principles that it believes in and, on the other hand, it shows the seriousness of the tendency.

The basic question is whether UCM, which had now formed the only communist party in the world, had dealt with this issue. In concrete terms, we ask, what was the fate of the democratic revolution, as discussed in the previous pages, and what was the fate of the heirs of the UCM who now formed the only communist party in the world?

The only communist party of the world, with its theoretical leader, Mansoor Hekmat, very easily and simply repudiated everything and with a lack of principles completely denied that they believed in the democratic revolution. Further, they told outright lies, stating that they believed that the socialist revolution was the only possible and necessary social revolution in Iran:

*“With all the places that a victorious democratic revolution - based on our assessment of the likely course of events - has in our current strategy, never considered and does not consider the coming revolution in Iran necessarily and by definition, a ‘democratic’ revolution. While the communist party replaced ‘democratic’ revolution instead, it is a hypocritical claim. The revolutionary Marxism of Iran from the beginning and always, which in accordance with proof and in dispute with the populist movements, that only the social revolution (in the sense that Marx uses) necessary and possible in Iran is a socialist revolution and has underlined that only socialism is responsive to the broad masses of chaotic situations in capitalist society.”<sup>84</sup> [Emphasis in the original]*

This liar has a short memory. Mahmoud Ghazvini, a former member of the Central Committee of the worker-communist party of Iran, a former member of the Central Committee of the Hekmatist Party and one of the disciples of Mansoor Hekmat, forgot that the leader had lied and had repudiated everything and he unintentionally revealed the lies of his leader in his explanation of the reasons for the retaking of the democratic revolution and the acceptance of the socialist revolution, as shown below:

*“We eliminated the Revolutionary Democratic Republic from our programme not because the methodology and the theory behind it were wrong because Mansoor Hekmat and we together all began to believe in the socialist revolution and accepted positions of communist unity. We eliminated the Democratic Republic from our programme because of the image it presented and there was a*

---

<sup>84</sup> *Toward Socialism* No: 1 - second Period

*sense that we were supporting the revolutionary democratic republic or a stage in the revolution. With the elimination of the programme, a methodology that has been defended in the anatomy of left liberalism is in place... We eliminated the Revolutionary Democratic Republic from our programme; rather we do not believe in the methodology of participating in the above for the advance of revolution in the revolutionary period. Not because of the current movement that is in front of our eyes but because we don't have any plans or ideas. We, with the methodology of Lenin and Hekmat, go to scout out the current movement that is in front of our eyes now.*'<sup>85</sup>

The history of this tendency is lacking in principles. The UCM removed the idea of a democratic revolution from its programme because it would have provided the image of a revolutionary democratic republic. Was the democratic revolution supposed to provide an image of a communist society? Apparently, in its lack of principles, the UCM also tried to grapple with Lenin!

---

<sup>85</sup> The populism of Hamid Taghvai and the Charter of Overthrow of the worker-communist party-Hekmatist (Mahmoud Ghazvini).

## Stealing the work of others

It is common knowledge among the political milieu of the left that Mansoor Hekmat, with his abilities and knowledge of foreign languages, had studied the work and articles of left-wing authors and then represented their theories and views as his own achievements. It is usually argued that the original authors were not familiar with the Persian language and were, therefore, unaware that their ideas had been plagiarized by Mansoor Hekmat. However, there is at least one private complainant.

Years ago, one of the tendencies of the left of capital, the Communist Unity<sup>86</sup>, claimed that the pamphlet, *The Myth of the National Bourgeoisie*, published by the UCM and written by Mansoor Hekmat, had been taken from the Communist Unity. It is important to note that the lack of an explicit and public denial from the heirs of the UCM and from Mansoor Hekmat himself, is a serious issue. Such was the claim of the Communist Unity:

*“Years ago, before the comrades of the UCM managed to explore the myth of the national and progressive bourgeoisie and publish a brochure with this name in May 1979, our comrades in internal discussions with the Organization of Iranian People’s Fedai Guerrillas (1974) were preparing ‘a research project on the national bourgeoisie of Iran’. This entry was released, later in 1977, as an adjunct to the pamphlet ‘political, economic crisis of regime and the role of the Left’. And comrades of the ‘Unity of*

---

<sup>86</sup> Communist Unity was one of the currents of the left of capital that was shattered in 1991. In contrast to other tendencies on the left of capital and within the framework of the left of capital, the Communist Unity had minimum harmony in its theoretical position.

*communist militants', two years later, have adapted the thesis of the document- without mentioning the source."*<sup>87</sup>

---

<sup>87</sup> 'Communist party of Iran' or 'Communist party' of UCM? page 138

## The Economic Theories of the UCM

Mansoor Hekmat, whose disciples gave the title, “Marx of the epoch”, developed all of the economic theories of the Unity of Communist Militants (UCM). Mansoor Hekmat completed a degree in economics in Iran and went to England to complete his higher education. He was obtaining a doctorate in economics in relation to the developments of 1978 and then returned to Iran. In explaining his decision to study economics, he wrote to his father:

*“I thought if I become an engineer, maximum I could make beautiful homes for some people, but if I become an economist and write a purely economic theory I may save the world from hunger.”<sup>88</sup>*

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. Pure economic theory cannot save the world from hunger, war and, in a word, modern savagery but the social class, the working class, and the solution of the communist revolution will not only save the working class but also the entire human race from the barbarism of capitalism. Thousands of experts and bourgeois theoreticians, like Mansoor Hekmat, have, for decades, tried to offer a less troublesome solution to the crisis of capitalism but capitalism has finally shown its ugly face by choosing its solution, namely, war.

Due to its historical limitations, the peripheral capitalist bourgeoisie has failed to accomplish its historic tasks to become like the capitalist metropolis, the left of capital in peripheral capitalism can easily hide its

---

<sup>88</sup> *Biography of Mansoor Hekmat*, page 16

demands and wishes in the guise of Marxist. On the one hand, accomplishing the bourgeois-democratic tasks and, on the other hand, low economic growth, have been concerns for the left of capital in capital's peripheral regions. In such contexts, the wishes and desires of the peripheral bourgeoisie, such as economic growth, technological development, raising living standards and dozens of other demands, are expressed by the left of capital. In Iran, the bourgeois-democratic revolution (the Constitutional Revolution) carried out some of these tasks and prepared the groundwork for economic growth. However, the low rate of economic growth in the age of the bourgeois-democratic revolution that appeared shortly after the era of capitalist decline, the era of imperialism, has prevented the bourgeoisie from playing a progressive role in the growth of economics and politics in society.

As the former class system, the history of the capitalist mode of production can be divided into two periods. The first period is that of the growth of capitalism when the bourgeoisie played a progressive role in the development of the productive forces and when the relations of production were in line with the development of the productive forces. The second period, the period of capitalist decadence, was the period when the bourgeoisie lost its progressive role and evolved into a reactionary class and the capitalist relations of production have been chained to the hands and feet of the productive forces. It is important to note that with the arrival of the era of capitalist decline, the growth of the productive forces has not stopped but, rather, has become destructive.

With the arrival of capitalism in the era of imperialism, the era of revolution or imperialist wars began. We will discuss the issue of war and the position of the UCM in the next part and the theory of capitalist decadence in further articles.

With these explanations, we will first draw from the language of the UCM and its theoretical leader, Mansoor Hekmat, to try, very briefly, to consider the economic issues of the UCM and to see how these ideas were in line with the continuation of wage slavery. One of the fundamental



issues of the UCM has been imperialist super-profits in the dominated countries. The fundamental core of the theory of the imperialist super-profits of the UCM is that in the era of imperialism, imperialist countries export capital to the dominated countries that have cheap labour, in other words, countries where the workers' wages are low. In such countries, they issue capital to gain extra super-profits or, in the language of the UCM, to obtain benefits that are greater than those derived by the monopolies that exploit the workers of the imperialist countries.

*“In the era of imperialism the export of capital in order to earn super-profits, the profits above what monopoly [capital] earn of exploitation of the workers in the imperialist countries, becomes extremely important, and all countries around the world were drawn under the yoke of capital and imperialism.”<sup>89</sup>*

According to the UCM, antagonism between labour and capital has reached its peak in developed capitalist countries. To relieve this contradiction, capitalism moves to the oppressed nations where they produce imperialist super-profits, super-profits that cannot be drawn from the shoulders of the proletariat of the metropolitan countries. The metropolitan capital then transfers the super-profits to the metropolis country and this transfer leads to the decline of the antagonism between labour and capital in the metropolitan countries. When the antagonism between labour and capital ended, the proletarian revolution actually lost its meaning or was transferred to an uncertain future. Mansoor Hekmat states the following:

*“The fundamental relations of classes in the highest stage of capitalist development is such that the contradictions between labour and capital in the advanced capitalist countries will reach*

---

<sup>89</sup> Program of communist party of Iran – page 7

*the highest levels for fertility and fierce. Capital is looking to discount these contradictory moves to outside of the borders and seeks super-profits, super-profits that cannot be pulled off the shoulders of the proletariat's own country, to lead lagging nations into the circle of the world capitalist system based on a clear division of the world between the metropolitan and dominated countries. Imperialist policy, a policy that caused this economic relationship, is the reaction and national oppression. A reaction to the face of the labour movement and the oppression of the oppressed nations that their internal economic relations are based on the production of imperialist super-profits.”*<sup>90</sup>

Another aspect of the UCM theory of imperialist super-profits in the dominated countries is that through the brutal exploitation of the working class and other working people in oppressed countries, those imperialist countries earn huge profits that are then transferred to their own country to create a labour aristocracy. We have previously noted the UCM notion of metropolitan capital and how it could reduce the antagonism between labour and capital and we now see how metropolitan capital converts workers into bourgeois workers. Mansoor Hekmat writes:

*“At the economic level, imperialism in the dominated country exerts the most extreme conditions on the working class and other toiling masses, while at the same time, imperialist countries just rely on brutal exploitation and gaining huge profits creates the material basis of the labour aristocracy, namely parts of the working class that directly and indirectly benefit from these super profits.”*<sup>91</sup>

---

<sup>90</sup> Anarcho-Pacifism – page 14

<sup>91</sup> Program of communist party of Iran – page 11

The UCM has divided capitalist countries into the imperialists and the dominated and in the oppressed countries (the dominated) the imperialist exploitation is carried out through the issuance of capital and this results in the production of imperialist super-profits in the dominated countries. These super-profits are not only conducive to the emergence of a labour aristocracy in the imperialist countries but also lead to the continuation and survival of the aristocracy.

*“The division of the countries of the world into imperialist and dominated, imperialist exploitation of the toilers of the dominated countries, imperialist super-profits of the monopolies by means of the export of capital, the emergence and continuance of labour aristocracy in the imperialist countries.”<sup>92</sup>*

We will return to all of these issues. However, it is now important to point out that, in the short term, the failure of the wave of world revolution (1917–1923) was also a failure of the class-consciousness of the proletariat. The proletariat, especially in the anti-revolutionary black period (1930–1968), was dominated by the ruling class - by Stalinist ideology in both the Eastern and the Western bloc - under the ideology of bourgeois democracy. Bourgeois democracy has become an effective weapon with which to protect capital and, as such, it acts as a poison for class-consciousness.

The formation and strengthening of the left of capital are necessary in a capitalist society and this is part of its metabolism in the era of capitalist decadence. The political apparatus of the left of capital, including the necessity for the ex-UCM and the ideology of worker-communism and/or the British Labour Party, do not represent the labour aristocracy but indicate the following.

---

<sup>92</sup> Two Factions Within the Bourgeois-Imperialist Counter-Revolution - Part II

First, a faction of the bourgeoisie will wear a left-wing cloak to fulfil its demands and express its wishes through a leftist ideology.

Second, capital can produce parties and trends that, in the short-term, might be able to limit or retain control of the struggle of the working class. It is an undeniable fact that the ruling ideas are the ideas of the ruling class and this rule will only be violated in revolutionary situations. Marx states this very clearly:

*“The class which has the means of material production at its disposal has control at the same time over the means of mental production, so that thereby, generally speaking, the ideas of those who lack the means of mental production are subject to it. ... hence among other things rule also as thinkers, as producers of ideas, and regulate the production and distribution of the ideas of their age: thus their ideas are the ruling ideas of the epoch.”*<sup>93</sup>

The UCM continues its contradictory and incoherent statements. We have already seen that in the metropolitan context, through the transfer of imperialist super-profits from the imperialist-dominated countries to the metropolitan countries, capital undermines the antagonism between labour and capital, yet now, the UCM talks about the crisis that is bringing capital to ruin.

*”Firstly, by intensifying competition, crisis provides the necessary ground-works for the internal purging and re-organisation of capital and thus the increase of its profitability, and, secondly, since capital emerges out of every crisis more centralized, the next crisis appears with greater and deeper dimensions, causes more intensified competition and its alleviation necessitates a more all-*

---

<sup>93</sup> *German Ideology* – Marx

*sided reconstruction for capital. Thus, with every crisis, capital comes one step nearer to its disintegration.”*<sup>94</sup>

According to the UCM, capital is close to collapse with every crisis. If the metabolism of the real world was in accord with the fantasies of the UCM then, instead of fighting capital, the proletariat would have waited peacefully for the final crisis and would finally have witnessed the disintegration of the capitalist mode of production. However, the functioning of the capitalist system does not accord with the fantasies of the UCM, rather, capital eventually overcomes its crises through war, something that is meaningless to the UCM. The UCM continues to talk nonsense and baloney.

Eventually, the bourgeoisie will triumph at the level of the living standards of the working class and will begin a new round of capital accumulation:

*”Either the proletariat enjoys such ideological-political-organisational strength that it draws the economic crisis of the bourgeoisie to the political arena and to a direct fight over the political power and thus it destroys for ever the bourgeois economy together with its crisis; or, the struggle becomes confined to the economic level and the bourgeoisie becomes victorious in its assault on the level of subsistence of the working class, exploitation intensifies, and the necessary conditions for the commencement of a new cycle of capital accumulation are created for the bourgeoisie.”*<sup>95</sup>

---

<sup>94</sup> A Consideration of the Marxist Theory of Crisis and Some Deductions about Dependent Capitalism.

<sup>95</sup> A Consideration of the Marxist Theory of Crisis and Some Deductions about Dependent Capitalism.

Contrary to the demagoguery of the UCM, the lowering of wages by capital will not offer a solution to the crisis. Lower wages and lower standards of living for the workers may provide a short-term solution to the accumulation of capital but it cannot ensure the accumulation of capital in the long-term. Capital, therefore, resorts to its long-term solution-warfare. On the other hand, victory in an economic struggle or even victory from a successful strike does not always result in the sense of raising real wages despite the fact that wages have risen.

Lowering the wages and living standards of workers are short-term solutions in response to the crisis of capitalism. In other words, the bourgeoisie is waiting for the right conditions to provide its final solution, namely, war. The history of capitalism has shown that the capitalist solution to the accumulation of capital is a cycle of crisis, war and reconstruction.

We realized very rapidly that from the perspective of the UCM, the antagonism between labour and capital in the advanced capitalist countries has reached its peak. To mitigate this antagonism, capital moves to the oppressed nations where they produce imperialist super-profits and then transfer those super-profits to the metropolitan countries to create a labour aristocracy.

Since the workers have achieved the status of the aristocracy and, therefore, do not seek political power, the bourgeoisie's victory is in its onslaught on the workers and a new round of capital accumulation begins. However, capital is close to collapse with every crisis.

Concurrent with the review and analysis of the economic issues of the UCM and the way in which these ideas serve the continuity and survival of wage bribery, we have to return to the Marxist explanation and definition of these concepts. However, our Marxist approach to these concepts is, nevertheless, not devoid of shortcomings and deficiencies that only be resolved by referring to the classic Marxist texts.

## The Marxist concept of super-profits

The fundamental pillar of the capitalist mode of production is that commodity production and the value of any commodity under capitalism is equal to the amount of the socially necessary labour that is carried out to produce that commodity. It should be noted that the individual value of each commodity is not equal to its social value. In determining the social value, the commodity value is equal to the average value of manufactured commodities and, in terms of the added value, this is considered to be the average of the total produced surplus value. That the individual value of a commodity does not equal its social value depends on the fact that the conditions of production are not the same and the issue of supply and demand has not been considered. From this explanation it can be assumed that the commodity value is equal to the following equation:

$$\text{Value of commodity} = \text{constant capital} + \text{variable capital} + \text{surplus value}$$

However, the goods are produced under different production conditions and, depending on the level of evolution of labour productivity in each unit of production (the factory), the amount of work carried out to produce that product can be more or less than the average work carried out.

There are three modes for the production of a commodity will be considered.

### *Case one:*

Lower cost than the average cost spent to produce the goods ➡ gains more surplus value than other capitalists ➡ the extra surplus value (or more profit) is increased and is greater than the average surplus value.

*Case two:*

The average cost spent to produce the goods ➡ gains average surplus value ➡ employer increases the average surplus value.

*Case three:*

A greater cost than the average cost spent to produce the goods ➡ gains less surplus value than other capitalists ➡ and the employer receives a lower surplus value (or a lower profit) than the average surplus value that other employers gain.

To expand on this discussion, we consider three of the classical Marxist formulas, namely, the average rate of profit, the rate of exploitation and the organic composition of capital.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{The average rate of profit} &= \frac{\text{the total surplus-value produced}}{\text{variable capital} + \text{constant capital}} \\ \\ \text{the rate of exploitation} &= \frac{\text{the total surplus-value produced}}{\text{variable capital}} \\ &= \frac{\frac{\text{variable capital}}{\text{variable capital}} + \frac{\text{constant capital}}{\text{variable capital}}}{1 + \frac{\text{constant capital}}{\text{variable capital}}} \\ \text{The organic composition of capital} &= \frac{\text{constant capital}}{\text{variable capital}} \\ \text{The rate of exploitation of capital} &= \frac{\text{the total surplus-value produced}}{\text{variable capital}} \end{aligned}$$



In the capitalism of free competition, goods were not exchanged on the basis of their social value but on the basis of the price of the products. Because the price of production in the market is nothing other than the average cost to produce each product plus the average general profit, for ease of discussion we assume a fixed price of production. In the capitalism of free competition, capital is poured into profitable areas. Hence, a great deal of capital was channelled into the profitable areas until the rate of profit in these sectors was oriented towards the global average rate of profit. Marx explained the “law of the tendency of the average rate of profit” in detail in Chapter 10, Volume III of *Capital* in a section entitled, “Align the average rate of profit through competition.”

From this explanations, three forms of capital can be assumed and the above three cases can be considered to produce a similar product. The first type of capitalist will gain more profit than the average profit. The second type of capitalist will gain profit that is equal to the average profit and the third type will gain less profit than the average profit. Certainly, with the effects of free competition, the third type of capitalist will try to compensate for the deficiency of surplus value by raising labour productivity. Now, if a section of the capitalists can gain a special position or have the power or ability to protect this particular position for themselves, then they have been able to substitute free competition with a monopoly.

In contrast to free competition, in the era of monopoly, this violates the law of the average tendency rate of profit and, consequently, the most concentrated and powerful capitalists successfully invest in some areas of manufacturing, finance and so on and they prevent the free transfer of other capitalists into these branches. It is natural for monopoly capitalists to make monopoly domination the priority for the branches that are most profitable for them. The domination of the monopoly in the extractive industries and in heavy industries leads the ratio of earned surplus value to be more than the ratio of capital already achieved. The dominance of monopolies in banking capital creates monstrous power that prevents the

free movement of capital and actually violates the law of the average tendency rate of profit.

Monopoly capital is the successor to this competition. Monopoly capital replaces free competition but with the dominance of monopolies rather than free competition and by taking over production, monopoly capitals impose monopoly prices. Monopoly profits (super-profits) will replace the average profit and super-profits overshadow the law of the average tendency rate of profit.

Monopoly capital ➡ monopoly profit

To be able to again reduce the cost of producing goods and by determining the monopoly price in the market and delivering this to the buyer, capitalists who have been able to gain a unique position and have achieved a monopoly will increase their extra surplus value (super-profits). In this case, the price of the product, not the price of production, will be the price of the monopoly.

Production price ➡ the average cost of production ➡ the average profit

Monopoly price ➡ cost of production ➡ monopoly profit

On the other hand, the monopoly pricing mechanism is one of the main channels for the transmission of the surplus value gained by non-monopoly capitals for the monopoly capitals. The process of exchanging goods between the monopoly and the non-monopoly is an unequal exchange because the prices of the goods that the non-monopoly bourgeoisie buy from the monopoly bourgeoisie are higher than their value and, on the other hand, the prices of the goods that the monopoly bourgeoisie sells to the non-monopoly bourgeoisie are lower than their value.

Of course, small and non-monopoly capitals oppose the super-profits earned by monopoly capital. As investors in these sectors, they will also have a stake in the lucrative arena and will be opposed to monopoly prices and will dream of returning to the law of the tendency of the average rate of profit. In mentioning this, it is important to note that the total profit of social capital is the constant amount, in other words, it is equivalent to the entire produced surplus value in capitalist society and the acquisition of super-profits by monopoly capital makes not the smallest change to the whole profit of social capital. Monopoly capitalists that rely on the monopoly power of capital and on their monopoly positions, can gain huge profits at a higher rate than the average, in other words, the acquisition of super-profits by the monopoly explains why other capitals gain profits that are lower than the average rate of profit.

At least for a while, monopolies try to monopolize the new techniques in order to benefit from the profits of their monopoly. The profits of monopolies are much higher than the profits of non-monopoly capital and this is the same for super-profits, regardless of whether these are super-profits in Japan, Germany, Brazil or Iran. In order to earn super-profits, most investments of the capitalist metropolises are based in the metropolitan countries, not in the periphery countries of capital. We will return to this issue.

The UCM evaluated Iran's economic system as being like the other peripheral countries of capital, the dependent capitalist system that is in service to imperialist super-profits and, as Mansoor Hekmat states below:

*"Dependent capitalism is a system that, firstly capitalism has been stationed on it and secondly, the internal market of it is in the service of imperialist super-profits."*<sup>96</sup>

---

<sup>96</sup> A Consideration of the Marxist Theory of Crisis and Some Deductions about Dependent Capitalism.

Mansoor Hekmat continues:

*"In view of the intense conditions of imperialistic exploitation of the working class, the average rate of profit of capital in the country is very high and the different strata of capital in Iran have become dependent on the imperialist system, precisely due to the high profitability resulting from the operation of the imperialist system in Iran... In this way, **the dependence of the profit making by capital** in Iran to the operation of imperialism, forms the basis of the dependence of Iranian capitalism to imperialism."*<sup>97</sup>  
[Emphasis in original]

The UCM will argue that dependent capitalism is a particular type of economic system that, because of cheap labour, is a market in the service of imperialist super-profits. First, both periphery and metropolitan capitalism are capitalists. In other words, the domestic markets of both are in the service of imperialist super-profits. Second, the power of the bourgeoisie depends on its production capacity, technological capability, amount of profitability, the extent of the availability of raw materials and, ultimately, on its influence in the world markets. In other words, a country's dependence on the world capitalist system is in reverse proportion to the power of the national bourgeoisie. There are no entirely independent nations. Both industry and domestic markets have lost the meaning of independence and have been intertwined to form a network. The most independent states, such as the US, Germany, and Japan, still have a level of dependency. The industrial giant of Europe, Germany, is unable to produce without help from other countries, for example, a car cannot be fully produced in Germany without importing some of the techniques, components, materials, etc., from other capitalist countries.

---

<sup>97</sup> The Iranian revolution and the role of the proletariat (Theses)

All of the previously mentioned attempts of the UCM regarding the dependent capitalist system and the anti-imperialist struggles are in line with the move towards “independent capitalism” and this was a dream of metropolitan capitalism. In other words, the UCM dreamed of metropolitan capitalism for Iran. Of course, this industrialization was only possible through the increased exploitation of wage slaves and was at the cost of the exploitation of the proletariat. The UCM clearly stated its dream of metropolitan capitalism in the following:

*“The sector of the production of the means of production does not develop in the country and instead, assembly industries, consumer commodities and services expand. In order to make the country dependent on its food products, imperialism specifically causes the destruction of the country's agriculture.”<sup>98</sup>*

The UCM believed that the conditions of imperialist super-profits should be reproduced in the periphery countries of capital. In other words, there must be dictators in the periphery of capital to ensure that the conditions of imperialist super-profits continue.

*“The production of imperialist super-profits in a capitalist country means that the necessary conditions for the production of super-profits (of which cheap labour and high exploitation rates are the main pillars) should arise again in every circle of reproduction of the whole social capital. In other words, the debate is not over the precedence of cheap labour in this country, but on keeping it cheap. And again, it is not about over the high rate of exploitation, but about keeping it high.”<sup>99</sup>*

---

<sup>98</sup> The Myth of the National and Progressive Bourgeoisie

<sup>99</sup> A Consideration of the Marxist Theory of Crisis and Some Deductions about Dependent Capitalism.

Our economist (Mansoor Hekmat) describes the Marxist concepts as the narrative of a faction of the bourgeois economy. First, it should be emphasized that super-profits are not produced but, rather, it is the surplus value that is produced. When the produced surplus value is distributed between capitalists it takes the form of profit. The surplus value and, in this case, the extra surplus value, takes the form of profit that can then be distributed. Super-profits are distributed, not produced.

As previously mentioned, the main factor in the earning of super-profits is the special position of monopoly capital, not the high or low exploitation rate. More importantly, when the super-profits of the monopoly capital are acquired it is not just the workers under their scope that are exploited but the workers in other areas who are exploited for the acquisition of surplus value.

Second, it should be noted that for the rate of exploitation to be high, either labour power should be cheap or the organic composition of capital should be high and it is quite logical that capital will flow towards sectors that have a less organic capital composition.

Third, as the voice of the anti-dictatorship and, consequently, the militancy of the anti-dictatorship struggle, the UCM believes that through the reproduction of the dictators, the labour force must be kept low to maintain high exploitation rates. Such confusion can fall on deaf ears in the anti-dictatorship movement and deaf ears are alien to the Marxist concepts and the anti-capitalist movement. Certainly, according to its historical and temporal needs, capital can assume a different political superstructure. Capital can even take the form of a bourgeois democracy in the periphery. It must be stressed that bourgeois democracy, whether in metropolitan capital or in periphery capital, is not a stable and constant legality. Any time that the need for capital is required, it tarnishes its principles, puts aside its embellished face and shows its ugly face. The genocide of the Parisian proletariat in the cradle of bourgeois civilization and the massacre of thousands of revolutionaries in Germany during the defeat of the German revolution are just two examples.

Of course, the UCM complained that even the most liberal bourgeoisie is not demanding independence from imperialism or for the roots of imperialist super-profits to be cut, it is, itself, seeking independence from imperialism. In the previous sections, we saw how, in the name of anti-imperialist struggles, this highlighted the most reactionary tendencies of the bourgeoisie who were dubbed as the petty-bourgeoisie and then assessed as revolutionary. Mansoor Hekmat makes such a demagoguery:

*"We must note that in the present situation of the Iranian revolution, the bourgeoisie itself, even its most liberal section (through its ideologues and political leaders) does not in the least demand independence from imperialism. Therefore at the practical level the above problem can be formulated such: the bourgeoisie of Iran **neither demands, nor is capable,** of independence from imperialism and at any rate requires the preservation of naked dictatorship."*<sup>100</sup> [Emphasis in original]

The UCM speaks about the possibility of a class struggle between oppressed countries (peripheral capitalism) and an imperialist oppressor (metropolitan capitalism) that is cruel and seeks to earn super-profits by exporting capital to countries under domination. Here, one of the basic Maoist foundations is laid bare and the Maoists make themselves visible. To the imperialist power, war must have a radical look in order that the class struggle can be easily overshadowed by the anti-imperialist struggle.

The basic questions that arises are these: What is the phenomenon of imperialism that made the UCM fervently seek independence from it? What is the Marxist concept of imperialism?

Unlike the demagoguery of the left of capital, including the UCM, imperialism represents a stage in the evolution of global capitalism,

---

<sup>100</sup> The Iranian revolution and the role of the proletariat (Theses)

particularly because in the era of capitalist decadence all countries have been integrated into the world capitalist system. In other words, the whole world has been entered into the mechanism of international capital and, because capital cannot be accumulated in absolute isolation, there is no escape for any state and, therefore, all states are obliged to integrate themselves into the global market. In the period of the decline of capitalism, in the era of imperialism, **all** states, regardless of their size, large or small, regardless of their military and economic power, are imperialist.

In the decadence period of capitalism, imperialism is related to the redistribution of the global market and this includes all the countries of the world. In such circumstances, the imperialist countries, whether they are big gangsters like the US and Great Britain or small gangsters like Iran and Pakistan, are trying to undermine each other and to take over the others' markets. It is a fact that small gangsters like Iran take a lower proportion of the surplus value compared to the big gangsters, such as the US, but it is the same surplus value, namely, the blood of the proletariat that is sucked by a small gangster (small imperialist). We have already stated that the UCM perception of the concept of imperialism is taken from a Kautskist understanding. The disciples of Kautsky point out that:

*"At the economic level, in the dominated country, imperialism imposes upon the working class and other toiling classes the most intense conditions of exploitation, and creates, in the metropol country, precisely on the basis of this process - production of super-profits - the material basis for the creation of a labour aristocracy."*<sup>101</sup>

Over a hundred years ago, Lenin unveiled the capital-friendly ideas of the disciples of Kautsky (the UCM), as can be seen below:

---

<sup>101</sup> Program of the UCM program – March 1981



*"Kautsky's reply to Cunow is as follows: imperialism is not present-day capitalism; it is only one of the forms of the policy of present-day capitalism. This policy we can and should fight, fight imperialism, annexations, etc.*

*The reply seems quite plausible, but in effect it is a more subtle and more disguised (and therefore more dangerous) advocacy of conciliation with imperialism, because a "fight" against the policy of the trusts and banks that does not affect the economic basis of the trusts and banks is mere bourgeois reformism and pacifism, the benevolent and innocent expression of pious wishes. Evasion of existing contradictions, forgetting the most important of them, instead of revealing their full depth—such is Kautsky's theory, which has nothing in common with Marxism."*<sup>102</sup>

With total hypocrisy and using absurd methods, the UCM distorted the revolutionary positions of Lenin, clearly lying and stating that the essential core of Lenin's theory of imperialism is the production of imperialist super-profits through the issuance of capital:

*"The production of imperialist super-profits through exporting capital is the base axis in the imperialism theory of Lenin."*<sup>103</sup>

The UCM evaluated the export of capital as the core of Lenin's theory of imperialism and came to the conclusion that in the metropolitan countries, capital is not able to produce super-profits and so imperialism exports capital to the dominated countries and capital is only to be export to the dominated countries. In other words, capital does not export or reduce the export of capital to countries in which the organic composition

---

<sup>102</sup> Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism -Lenin

<sup>103</sup> A Consideration of the Marxist Theory of Crisis and Some Deductions about Dependent Capitalism.

of capital is high. This is actually the same understanding as the notion that “the characteristic feature of imperialism is industrial capital”. Of course, this approach is unable to explain why, after World War II, US capital was exported to Canada, Europe and Japan, namely, to the other metropolitan countries. We will return to this issue later in the context of capital accumulation. It should be noted, however, that monopolies existed before imperialism and the phenomenon of super-profits is not peculiar to the era of imperialism. In the era of capitalist decadence, in the era of imperialism, no capital can continue its momentum without relations to the market, either in metropolitan capitalism or periphery capitalism. In the market, the rules of the capitalist system are dominant and the features of imperialism express the dominance of finance capital over other capital. In other words, in order to reject imperialist domination, the only revolutionary alternative is a world communist revolution; any other alternative would appear to be radical for the survival of capitalist barbarism. Yet, Lenin himself responded to this absurd and nonsense talk as follows:

*“The inaccuracies in Kautsky's definition are glaring. The characteristic feature of imperialism is not industrial **but** finance capital. It is not an accident that in France it was precisely the extraordinarily rapid development of **finance** capital, and the weakening of industrial capital, that from the eighties onwards gave rise to the extreme intensification of annexationist (colonial) policy. The characteristic feature of imperialism is precisely that it strives to annex **not only** agrarian territories, but even most highly industrialised regions (German appetite for Belgium; French appetite for Lorraine), because (1) the fact that the world is already partitioned obliges those contemplating a **redivision** to reach out for **every kind** of territory, and (2) an essential feature of imperialism is the rivalry between several great powers in the striving for hegemony, i.e., for the conquest of territory, not so*

*much directly for themselves as to weaken the adversary and undermine **his** hegemony. (Belgium is particularly important for Germany as a base for operations against Britain; Britain needs Baghdad as a base for operations against Germany, etc.) ”<sup>104</sup>*

---

<sup>104</sup> Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism -Lenin

## **The value of labour power and the UCM**

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 metropolises 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, it is the underlying factors that play a major 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.

For graduates of the faculty of the bourgeois economy, which also takes the title of the “Marx of the epoch”, an under-standing of the most basic Marxist concepts has, apparently, been difficult. The UCM believes that cheap labour is the source of imperialist super-profits. It states that labour power is cheap for monopoly capital and expensive for non-monopoly capital. It asserts that the high exploitation rate can be a factor in the “production of super-profits”, while the rate of exploitation in the Marxist sense, as we have seen above, is lower in the periphery of capital than in the metropole countries of capital. Mansoor Hekmat wrote:

*“The basis of capitalist production in the dominated country is the production of imperialist super-profits on the basis of the exploitation of cheap labour-power and the reproduction of its necessary economic and political conditions.”<sup>105</sup>*

While in the brick factory and in this branch monopoly, capital is very low, foreign investment is meaningless, the cheapest labour works in inhumane conditions and has a poor working environment but there are no super-profits. Many of Iran’s workers work in workshops where fewer than 10 people are under the domination of non-monopoly capital and they place their cheap labour power at the disposal of these capitalists. The value produced in these workshops is far less than the value produced in large industries yet there are no super-profits.

We return to the history of the labour movement, to England after the introduction of the Factory Act of 1833 that regulated workers’ hours

---

<sup>105</sup> A Consideration of the Marxist Theory of Crisis and Some Deductions about Dependent Capitalism.

from 5.30 am to 8.30 pm. In other words, this was a 15-hour working day and only after the struggles that occurred in Europe and the US was it reduced in 1850 to a 12-hour day, from 6 am to 6 pm.

Thus, workers sold their labour power for far less than its value. The length of the working day was so long that exploitation was carried out in its most extreme form and workers did not enjoy a minimum of human livelihood, as Marx, the great thinker of the proletariat described “A dwelling in which the population is not well-suited to human dignity”, where there is “malnutrition, disastrous conditions a lack of any health care”, namely, “where workers live in conditions that are worse than prisoners”. Yet, in all this, we can see that Marx did not talk about the production of super-profits.<sup>106</sup>

Years later, when Mansoor Hekmat’s disciples had awarded him the title of the Marx of the epoch, during a speech given to the Marx society in London, entitled “Oral History of the UCM”, he used demagoguery and preached:

*“The UCM from the standpoint of the worker criticize [capitalism] and the position was that the situation is so because the workers in these countries sell their labour power cheaper. As a result of the lack of democracy, the absence of a free press and the absence of progressive cultural relations, this framework can keep labour power cheap. If the union allowed and the political parties allowed, in a country where workers are in this situation, workers are organized and try to improve their economic situation, this will force them to increase wages and to reduce their working hours,*

---

<sup>106</sup> For further information in relation to working time, see the chapters on “The struggle for the normal working day. Compulsory limitation by law of the working time. The English Factory Acts, 1833 to 1864” from *Capital* Volume I. On the living conditions of the proletariat, see the chapters, “The badly paid strata of the British industrial class”, “The nomad population” and so on from *Capital* Volume I.

*and then the economy with this level of technology and the capital accumulation situation will not give profits.”<sup>107</sup>*

In a most horrendous way, this defender of democracy, this ideologue of the left of capital, rejected the facts. In the capitalist metropolises, the press is free to channel public opinion and those of bourgeois political parties, especially the left-wing, can easily work to manage the affairs of the capitalist system. Unions are allowed to operate in order to more easily channel the class struggle and to feed it through the legal and bourgeois ducts. Compared to the capital periphery, workers in the capitalist metropolises are more exploited and capital accumulation in the capitalist metropolises is greater than in the capitalist periphery.

The left of capital will hold onto anything to overshadow the class struggle with the struggle for democracy. The bourgeois ideologue has the dream of metropolitan capitalism.

For the graduates of the bourgeois economy school, it should be noted that a monopoly brings super-profits and, in Iran, capitals that are monopolies, rather than capitals that are non-monopolies, gain and will achieve super-profits. Despite the conditions, better working environments and relatively higher wages that it provides, the Iranian National Oil Company is a monopoly but it uses more advanced techniques to increase labour productivity (increasing the organic composition of capital) and this results in a high rate of exploitation. In other words, from the Marxist perspective, the workers of the National Oil Company who have more benefits are exploited more than the workers in the brickworks.

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

---

<sup>107</sup> Speech to Marx's society in London (known as "The Oral History of the UCM"), Mansoor Hekmat.

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).

However, the UCM continues its nonsense and states that in the absence of cheap labour power the most extensive underground mines and deposits will not be the target of capital exports.

*“The largest underground mines and reserves, in the absence of cheap labour power do not necessarily target the issuance of capital, because capital is not seeking use-value, it is seeking surplus value and it is also [seeking] a favourable rate.”<sup>108</sup>*

The living conditions of the working class in the twentieth century and the early decades of the twenty-first century-housing, food, clothing, health and general living standards - (the era of capitalist decadence) are not comparable to those of the nineteenth century (the flourishing era of capitalism) and, clearly, the standard of living has increased. In the nineteenth century, a worker worked a 16-hour day and only had one day off each week. Now a worker only works an eight-hour day and has two days off each week.

Benefits, such as the principle of profit sharing and social insurance schemes, etc., are in line with the needs of capital. Prudent capital, unlike “short-sighted” capital, considers its long-term horizon. Capital, especially the capital of a metropolis, considers its long-term goals and the availability of metropolitan labour power is a prerequisite for the production of surplus value.

---

<sup>108</sup> A Consideration of the Marxist Theory of Crisis and Some Deductions about Dependent Capitalism.



First, the bourgeois ideologues consider that this issue is what distinguishes capitalism from earlier systems of production, yet the demagoguery of the ideologues of the right and left of capital should be emphasized because, in comparison with the level of the development of productive forces, the proletariat is also poorer than it was in the past. Upgrading the living standards of the working class as a result of the class struggle has been achieved, otherwise, the bourgeois class would not have been seen as generous and gracious.

Second, the community is growing and this development has its own particular needs. If in the nineteenth century, education had not been necessary for continued livelihood, today, education is essential. If in the nineteenth century, the concept of owning a car was out of the realm of the worker, today it is a necessity to enable him to travel long distances.

## **Absolute ground rent and differential rent**

Before continuing the debate and in order to gain a better understanding, we are going to define the concepts of absolute ground rent and differential rent and we refer readers to the classic Marxist texts, particularly to Volume III of *Capital*.

### **What is absolute ground rent?**

The owner of an oil well, land or a mine, requires special profits from the producing capitalist due to his monopoly of the oil, land or mine, which leaves the capitalist with profit that is only comparable to the average profit in society. The added profit that comes from this and goes into the pocket of the owner of an oil well, mine or land is called “absolute ground-rent.”

### **What is differential rent?**

This refers to extraordinary surplus value that is in addition to the absolute ground rent awarded to the high-grade mines, high-grade oil wells, high-grade land, and so on because of their fertile or better conditions compared to the downscale oil wells, mine or land. Because the monopoly ownership of these mines, oil wells and land is in the hands of their owners, the owner is awarded a differential rent.

With these explanations in mind, we come to the new assertions of the UCM, which declare the possible loss of differential rent, whereas in the framework of the capitalist system there is no possibility of loss of differential rent. Mansoor Hekmat says:

*“In other words, the surplus-value which is obtained by the owners of the means of production in the Iranian oil industry (the oil companies and the Iranian state) is theoretically divided into two parts: 1- the profit of capital (including the surplus-profits*

*resulting from the utilisation of the cheap labour-power of the Iranian oil workers by capital) and 2- the differential rent, (the difference between the cost of production in Iran and the average cost of production in the world). The reason for the existence of the differential rent, is the very monopoly ownership of the Iranian state (or the monopoly right of extraction which is granted to the oil companies in Iran) over Iran's oil resources. (In the absence of this monopoly ownership or right of extraction, the different capitals could proceed, unhindered, to produce oil products in Iran, in which case: on the one hand, this would reduce the average cost of production of every barrel of oil in the world and, on the other hand, would lead to the increase in the production costs of every barrel of oil in Iran. Thus, the free movement of capitals in the absence of monopoly ownership and the competition of these capitals, would eliminate the existing difference between the cost of production in Iran and the average production costs in the world, and would reduce the differential rent to zero.)”<sup>109</sup>*

First, due to the monopoly prices, Iran's oil industry earns monopoly profits and, consequently, from the acquisition of super-profits (which are part of the surplus value produced around the world) it gains part of the surplus value produced by the metropolitan proletariat. This does not only occur in Iran but also in the other petroleum exporting countries, whether they are a metropolis or a periphery. Gulf sheikhs or the world's richest bourgeoisie that live in Mexico are involved in the exploitation of the international proletariat. As noted earlier, super-profits should not only be looked for in the production of surplus value but also in the distribution of surplus value between the different capitals. It should

---

<sup>109</sup> A Consideration of the Marxist Theory of Crisis and Some Deductions about Dependent Capitalism.

be emphasized that the profit of each capitalist is not equal to the surplus value produced by the workers exploited by an isolated capitalist because of the entire surplus value produced in the society. Super-profits are only embodied in the process of dividing surplus value into profit-making, each capital tries to increase its profits at the expense of lowering other capital gains. Therefore, the phenomenon of super-profits should be viewed from a single capitalist horizon.

Second, when a peripheral country (such as Iran) acquires super-profits, the theory of “producing super-profits based on cheap labour power” becomes invalid and it only becomes useful for recruitment to the anti-imperialist struggle.

Third, it is only in the minds of the learned bourgeois economists that it is possible to lose differential rent within the capitalist system. In the framework of the capitalist system, there is no possible loss of differential rent.

## The Marxist concept of capital accumulation

The process of capital accumulation expresses that part of the surplus value that is produced by the working class and will not be consumed or saved by the bourgeois class but will re-enter capital through a cyclical process and, consequently, will increase the amount of circulating capital. Increasing and decreasing the production of surplus value leads to an increase and a decrease in the accumulation of capital.

The bourgeois state is in the service of capital and capital accumulation. The cost of a large part of the infrastructure of the community, the lines of communication, the training of labour power, communication, etc., is the responsibility of the bourgeois state in order to facilitate investment conditions. It also has to create the necessary conditions for the exploitation of labour power and the potential to increase profitability for capital. If the purpose of the capitalist state is **to create the necessary conditions** for capital accumulation, the aim of capital itself is not the creation of the necessary conditions but **the accumulation of capital**.

In the accumulation of capital, a temporary interruption can occur without capital experiencing a serious crisis but serious damage to capital accumulation will lead to a crisis of capitalism. This crisis is not a temporary situation that can be resolved. The crisis of capital continuously intensifies and, eventually, capital will offer its long-term solution, i.e., war.

The reconstruction of the damage caused by the First and Second World Wars led to a period of growth and prosperity during the later decades. A cycle of crisis was then repeated and the process was also repeated - war followed by reconstruction. Today, war has taken the form and followed the trend of regional wars. We will review this issue clearly in the next section (War and the UCM). The era of imperialism means that capitalism is forced to solve its long-term crisis by resort to war and the

history of capitalism has been a cycle of crisis, war and reconstruction. In times of crisis, capital has carried out the destruction of constant capital (the means of production, cities, infrastructure, factories, etc.) and even the destruction of variable capital (labour power—the massacre of workers) to confront the declining rates of profit and, thus, to provide conditions for another round of capital accumulation.

The tendency of the declining rate of profit is due to the constant changes in the organic composition of capital. In other words, to increase the organic composition of capital the constant capital should be increased or the variable capital should be reduced or the constant capital should be increased and the variable capital should be reduced.

$$\text{The organic composition of capital} = \frac{\text{constant capital}}{\text{variable capital}}$$

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.

The day after the victory of the democratic revolution, the UCM wanted to create unfavourable conditions for capital accumulation. In other words, it wanted to stir up trouble in terms of the accumulation of capital and to sink Iranian capitalism into a deep economic crisis. The proletariat, which holds political power, took advantage of the opportunity to destroy capitalism.

The Union of Communist Militants apparently tells “bedtime stories” designed for children:

*“The negation of imperialist conditions of production and exploitation by the organized power of the revolutionary proletariat and through political and legal levers, neither means the destruction of capitalism, nor is it equivalent to the establishment of ‘independent’ capitalism; but it only means that Iranian ‘dependent’ capitalism has been driven towards a deep economic crisis. Iranian capitalism, precisely because of still being, on the ‘morrow’ of the victory of the democratic revolution, capitalism based on imperialist exploitation, cannot be compatible with the economic demands of the proletariat whose cornerstone is to go beyond the bourgeoisie’s capabilities in such a country. To the extent that the revolutionary and organized proletariat becomes able to impose on the bourgeoisie the most favourable economic situation for the development of the class struggle, the bourgeoisie will be put in the most unfavourable conditions for accumulation and thus Iranian capitalism will sink into an acute and deep economic crisis.”*<sup>110</sup>

To create trouble in the process of capital accumulation and to impose class struggle for the bourgeoisie, the UCM wanted to draw capitalism into a deep economic crisis because the bourgeoisie had a clement heart and acquiesces to the demands of the proletariat. Capital is the vampire “Dracula”, who will only consume fresh blood, the blood of the workers (surplus value). Any damage to Dracula’s bloodsucking, namely, in the process of capital accumulation, will lead to more dangerous reactions. The First and Second World Wars and dozens of other regional wars were the response of Dracula to problems with the process of capital accumulation. Due to the barbarism of capital, only a world communist revolution that can be cast into the dustbin of history

---

<sup>110</sup> *Towards socialism - the first round - No. 2*

and the dirty capitalist system prohibit the issue of capital accumulation and the emancipation of humanity.

We put aside the demagoguery of the UCM and return to the real world and the barbarism of capital. It is worth mentioning that in large-scale production and industry-wide, much capital accumulation takes place and it could not take place without the existence of monopoly capital. It is only in the shadow of huge industrial monopolies that the productivity of labour increases. It should be noted that labour productivity today is achieved in different and highly advanced technological contexts. Apart from the increase in the number of workers in the non-manufacturing sector, the working class as a class, produces social welfare and continues to be exploited through wage slavery. In contrast with the metropolitan countries of capital, the level of development of the productive forces and the concentration of capital in the periphery countries of capital is lower and production is much higher within the metropolitan petty-bourgeoisie when compared to the relatively large population of the community in the country. Compared to the metropolitan petty-bourgeoisie, the production of the peripheral petty-bourgeoisie is much higher and they form a relatively large part of the population. However, in the era of the decadence of capitalism, the struggle between labour and capital means that the struggle of all the exploited against the exploiters and the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie is on a global level.

In the absence of cheap labour power, the UCM claims that the largest mines and underground reserves will not become the targets of any country seeking capital export. They assert the following:

*“The largest underground mines and reserves are, in the absence of cheap labor, the vast majority of mines and underground reserves do not necessarily target for the export of capital, because capital*



*is not seeking use-value, looking for surplus value and at a favourable rate.”*<sup>111</sup>

Unlike the demagogues and the nonsense of the UCM, the export of capital is primarily due to raw materials and underground reserves, not to cheap labour power. We examine one of the most advanced countries of the metropolitan capital, namely, the US, where there is no cheap labour power:

*“In 1970, five major American oil monopolies and members of the international oil cartel at the same time sold 50 percent of coal and 85 percent of natural gas production in America, almost half the discovery of uranium resources in the country and 75 percent of new agencies and controlled uranium enrichment. So while we see natural gas that is cheaper than coal, almost all of these resources are in the hands of a few monopolies that are in the oil cartels. It will also be responsible for the pricing of goods and will calculate prices rather than the cost of production of natural gas, but the cost of coal production is much more expensive and will be supplied and will have huge super profits...Of the total 16 billion dollars that the American monopoly invested in 1972 outside the borders of the country in the oil and gas industry only 1.9 billion of it was in the Middle East.”*<sup>112</sup>

Again, we return to the reactionary position and capital-friendly UCM in relation to the issuance of capital for the “production of imperialist super-profits” in the oppressed countries. First, it should be stressed that the export of capital has not only occurred in backward

---

<sup>111</sup> A Consideration of the Marxist Theory of Crisis and Some Deductions about Dependent Capitalism.

<sup>112</sup> Summon the Past to Justify Present, page 31

countries or dominated capitalist countries and that investment does not only take place in industrial undertakings. However, despite all of this, monopolies gain enormous super-profits and since all monopolies have monopolist principles, everywhere in the world - whether in the US, Russia or Iran - a monopoly brings super-profits.

*“A monopoly brings super-profits, the excess profit that is higher and greater than the ordinary profit of capitalism in the world.”*<sup>113</sup>

Now, by referring to the statistics we will show that, contrary to the false claim of the UCM, capital flows are exported to metropolitan countries where there is no cheap labour and not to the peripheral countries of capital where labour is cheap. We take a look at German investors in the early twentieth century:

*“Around the year 1910, of the 35 billion marks [Germany] invested, seven billion was in Asia, Africa and Australia, 10 billion in the United States and the rest, namely, 18 billion, in Europe.”*<sup>114</sup>

Labour is not cheap in Europe and the organic composition of capital is also high. The two tables below are borrowed from the booklet, *Summoned the Past to Justify Present*. We shall return to this brochure on the topic of the communist left.<sup>115</sup> The table in the next page shows the percentage of US foreign direct investment in 10 major countries. The

---

<sup>113</sup> Imperialism and the Split in Socialism, Lenin, page 8.

<sup>114</sup> *Summon the Past to Justify Present*, page 34.

<sup>115</sup> *Summon the Past to Justify Present* is a pamphlet written by two ex-activists of the Communist Party of Iran (Ashkan and Poya) that criticizes the Iranian Communist Party and Union of Communist Militants. These comrades were influenced by the positions of the Communist Left (especially the Internationalist Communist Party of Italy [Battle communist]) and began to critique the left of capital. We will discuss this issue further in the context of the communist left.

statistics show that across 20 years of investment, much of the investment has been in metropolitan countries and has increased. The table in the next page shows the ratio of US investment to total investment.

Country	Year 1957	Year 1966	Year 1977
Canada	33,7 %	30,3 %	22,3%
Great Britain	8,1 %	10,4 %	11,5%
Germany	2,3 %	3,7 %	4,1%
Swiss	0,3 %	3,7 %	4,1%
France	0,8 %	3,5 %	4,5%
Brazil	3,3 %	1,7 %	3,9%
Australia	2,3 %	3,7 %	3,8%
Belgium and Luxembourg	0,8 %	1,5 %	2,8%
Japan	0,7 %	1,4 %	2,7%
Netherlands	0,8 %	1,7 %	2,7%
Total	53,1 %	63,3 %	65,8%

The following table shows the amount of US direct investment in eight Latin American countries. The statistics show, first, that a small percentage of invested capital has been in peripheral countries and, second, that the amount of investment has fallen. The UCM theory of the capital export to countries of cheap labour power for the production of super-profits is invalid and is only useful for the disciples of the religion of Hekmat.

Country	Year 1966	Year 1977
Argentina	1,5 %	1 %
Brazil	1,7 %	3,9 %
Chile	1,5 %	1 %
Colombia	0,9 %	0,5 %
México	2,6 %	2,1 %
Panama	1,6 %	1,4 %
Peru	1,3 %	0,9 %
Venezuela	4,1 %	1,2 %
Total	15,2 %	11,1 %

## The minimum programme of the UCM

If we put aside the seemingly radical slogans and terms of the UCM, the objectives and demands of the left of capital will be clearly visible. This Republic also crystallizes itself in the “minimum programme”<sup>116</sup> of the UCM that will fulfil its demands through the constitution. The fact is that the rules and conditions of the bourgeoisie of Western Europe are more progressive than the revolutionary Republic of the UCM.<sup>117</sup> Let us see the purpose of the faction on the left of capital:

*“The revolutionary republic and the outlines of its content are to promote the goal of the revolutionary camp and to describe the claim for political and economic demands, at least in the program of the communists, as the practical content of this republic ... We communists, rely on the working and toiling masses, on their direct and armed souls, their revolutionary masses, to give them bread*

---

<sup>116</sup> The split between the minimum and the maximum programme was one of the weaknesses of the Second International. The proletariat is a global class, just as capitalism is a global system. Globalization means that the programme of the proletariat is global and internationalist. The Third International and, then, the Communist Left clearly stressed that the Communist Party only has an internationalist programme that aims to establish the communist revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Some sections of the minimum programme are as follows:

*“Universal suffrage, equal, direct and secret for all individuals older than 16 years, both men and women, the right of every person above 18 years to be elected in the organs of representation...The direct participation of people in managing the affairs of the country, the strict abolition of the election of governors, burgomasters, districts, prefects by government, the selectivity of the authorities at all levels by the people and revocable whenever the majority of the electorate will not have their ...”*

*and freedom to their own power, in the form of a certain revolutionary republic, with a clear constitution (the minimum part Communists program). ”<sup>118</sup>*

Now the UCM evaluates itself as the proletariat and raises its demands using the language of the proletariat. Its minimum programme, which is aimed at limiting the class struggle of the proletariat and serving the continuation of wage slavery, is called the programme of the conscious proletariat. Yet the UCM is aware of its class interests as part of the left-wing of capital. The left of capital explains:

*“Today, the proletariat of Iran has a programme. The minimum part of programme, the conscious proletariat, has answered the above questions. ”<sup>119</sup>*

Finally, after preparing and organizing their opinion, the UCM produced its main statement. This is transforming the UCM into an alternative that will lead to a new wave of mass democratic struggle that will overshadow the class struggle, a known approach within the left of capital. The UCM was dreaming of taking up this leadership and stated the following:

*“The minimum programme of communists, which must plan and formulate the content of the victory of the democratic revolution in the form of certain economic and political demands, is the clear image that communists must draw from the present revolution and its purposes for the masses...the conversion of communists to an alternative to lead a new wave of mass democratic struggles is not*

---

<sup>118</sup> The Current Situation, its Prospects and the Tasks of the Communists, Statement of the UCM.

<sup>119</sup> *Communist Worker* - organ of the UCM, Issue 3

*possible without providing consistent and extensive advertisements of the minimum programme and its demands.”*<sup>120</sup>

Although this appears to indicate the confusion of the authors of the “programme of the proletariat”, in fact, in order to make it easier to create a demagogy, the programme of the UCM, the left of capital, has been trying to use radical language to formulate words that describe a contradictory concept. Let us take a look at the jumbled “programme of the proletariat”, which, at that time, was the “only” communist party of the world:

*“The political themed minimum proletarian programme breaks down the bureaucratic-military state apparatus of the bourgeoisie and the establishment of a democratic government which means exercising the will and sovereignty of workers and toilers. This government will be the guarantor of an extensive democracy in which the class struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie can expand and evolve in its most free, clearest and broadest form.”*<sup>121</sup>

This political tendency has played the most important role in slashing the values, terms, ideals and goals of communism and internationalism. Although, they had not fewer demagogues than the other tendencies of the left of capital, but also more.

First, in the capitalist system, breaking down the bourgeois state machine is only possible through a communist revolution because all factions of the bourgeoisie are reactionary and want to maintain the system and its state machinery. The only revolutionary class is the working class who want to break down the state machine and establish the

---

<sup>120</sup> Two Factions Within the Bourgeois-Imperialist Counter-Revolution - Part III

<sup>121</sup> Program of communist party of Iran – page 15

dictatorship of the proletariat, not a bourgeois democracy that is a naked dictatorship and an unrestrained market.

Second, “the will and sovereignty of the workers” is only possible through the dictatorship of the proletariat, namely, through the councils of workers, not through democratic governance that is a kind of will and sovereignty of capital.

Third, any state essentially means the dictatorship of one class over another. The dictatorship of the proletariat through its councils indicates the dictatorship of the working class. The most democratic bourgeois state represents the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie against the working class.

Fourth, how can a democratic government (the dictatorship of capital), which is the will and the rule of capital, be the guarantor of an extensive democracy in which the class struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie can expand and evolve in its most free, clearest and broadest form? So, what happened to the concept of the antagonistic conflict between labour and capital?

As stated earlier, the political content of the minimum programme of the left of capital (the UCM) appears to indicate the confusion of the authors of the programme but, in reality, they have tried to describe wage slavery using radical words, namely, democratic rule (bourgeois democracy). In the context of economics, the left of capital states its goals more clearly as “the practical negation of the rule of imperialism” and, of course, in addition, the workers have also been promised relative prosperity.

*“... The economic content of the minimum programme of the proletariat constitutes the practical negation of the rule of imperialism and proletarian living and the working conditions and masses of working and poor people’s living conditions, the welfare of workers and toilers and removing economic barriers, and the development of the class struggle. Realization of this matter in addition to increasing the power of the working class in the*

*struggle for definitive liberation will facilitate the joining of non-proletarian working people in this struggle...*<sup>122</sup>

The UCM scenario is not even possible in Hollywood movies, although, apparently, it has been possible to manifest itself in the advertising, agitation and positions of the UCM. More delicate and radical words are given to the demagoguery:

*“The negation of imperialist conditions of production and exploitation by the organized power of the revolutionary proletariat and through political and legal levers, neither means the destruction of capitalism, nor is it equivalent to the establishment of ‘independent’ capitalism; but it only means that Iranian ‘dependent’ capitalism has been driven towards a deep economic crisis. Iranian capitalism, precisely because of still being, on the ‘morrow’ of the victory of the democratic revolution, capitalism based on imperialist exploitation, cannot be compatible with the economic demands of the proletariat whose corner-stone is to go beyond the bourgeoisie’s capabilities in such a country. To the extent that the revolutionary and organized proletariat becomes able to impose on the bourgeoisie the most favourable economic situation for the development of the class struggle, the bourgeoisie will be put in the most unfavourable conditions for accumulation and thus Iranian capitalism will sink into an acute and deep economic crisis.”*<sup>123</sup>

The UCM, which now describes itself as proletariat, believes that a minimum programme is possible and that this would follow the victory of

---

<sup>122</sup> *Program of communist party of Iran – page 15*

<sup>123</sup> *Towards socialism - the first round - No. 2*



the democratic revolution. Yet, it denies that imperialist domination and capitalism would be retained. Since imperialist domination has gone and a popular government has come into force, the constitution is on the side of the people and the labour law is in favour of the workers. As a result, on the one hand, the intensity of exploitation is reduced as workers have a 40-hour week (although unemployment insurance and the price of labour rises) and, on the other hand, it converts the dictatorship into a democracy.

Labour power was cheap in Iran (as, of course, it is in any other dominated country that agrees with the UCM) and there were high exploitation rates as capital was exported to Iran (as is the case of any dominated country). With the negation of imperialist domination, capital will not be funnelled to Iran, labour will be sold for a high price and, consequently, the rate of exploitation will be reduced and, therefore, imperialist super-profits will not be produced. Unlike the demagoguery of the UCM, Marx has shown that capital “is ultimately a productive relationship”, i.e., a productive relationship that regularizes the relationship between humans and the classes that are involved in it, not between countries.

Using a democratic government is not the most appropriate way to develop the class struggle and to create the most assertive antagonism between the social classes - the working class and the bourgeois class - that would provide the necessary conditions for the continuation and expansion of the class struggle. It is the class struggle that, in its expansion, makes it possible to gain a class awareness of the necessity for a social revolution, the communist revolution. Unlike the left-wing of capital, Marx teaches this:

*“In the development of productive forces there comes a stage when productive forces and means of intercourse are brought into being, which, under the existing relationships, only cause mischief, and are no longer productive but destructive forces (machinery and money); and connected with this a class is called forth, which has*

*to bear all the burdens of society without enjoying its advantages, which, ousted from society, is forced into the most decided antagonism to all other classes; a class which forms the majority of all members of society, and from which emanates the consciousness of the necessity of a fundamental revolution, the communist consciousness, which may, of course, arise among the other classes too through the contemplation of the situation of this class.*"<sup>124</sup>

When the working class became a class in itself and a conscious class, at that time it considered that its historic mission was to take action on the abolition of the wage slavery system, the establishment of the classless society and the liberation of all mankind from the evils of capitalism.

In the era of capitalist decadence, the bourgeoisie became an economic and political ruling class in all countries. The growth of the national bourgeoisie is only possible within the framework of capitalist decadence and within the era of imperialism. The bourgeoisie is a reactionary class, the antagonism between labour and capital has been mastered, capitalist relations are reactionary and the only revolutionary alternative is to crush the political and economic relations of capitalism through a communist revolution and to attempt the establishment of socialist relations. Each alternative, whatever its name, is merely retaining the barbaric capitalist system and it is reactionary. Certainly, the building of socialism in the peripheral countries (because of the low concentration of production and capital as well as the level of development of the productive forces) will be more difficult than in the metropolitan countries and this indicates a major task of the proletariat and the responsibility of the proletariat in metropolitan countries.

---

<sup>124</sup> *German Ideology* -The Necessity of the Communist Revolution

## War and the Unity of Communist Militants

War, and taking a position on war, determines a political stance and, more importantly, the class attachment of a political tendency (i.e., belonging to the working class or the bourgeois class). In the upside-down world of capitalism, war and internationalism are touchstones that show how or where the working class or the bourgeois class stand on a political issue. During World War I, the majority of the members of the Social Democratic Party betrayed the proletarian position, joined the capital and labour factions and turned themselves into cannon fodder, while only a handful of Bolsheviks and minorities in European countries remained loyal to the proletarian position. Following the degeneration of the Comintern and the parties organized within it in the early 1930s and during World War II, the workers became cannon fodder in the name of communism. Only internationalist communists (the Communist Left), in absolute isolation, remained loyal to the proletarian positions and described the war as an imperialist war and harassed by both the allies and the axis<sup>125</sup>.

The question that arises here is this: what was the position of the Unity of Communist Militants (UCM) regarding the Iran-Iraq war? Further, how have the heirs of the UCM (the worker-communism) viewed this issue?

The UCM's reactionary position toward the Iran-Iraq war has always been a problem for the worker-communism. The ideologues of worker-communism have generally tried to avoid discussing or addressing this issue. If they have been forced to refer to it, they generally lie and attempt to provide a revolutionary explanatory. One of the disciples who tried to explain the UCM revolutionary position on the Iran-Iraq war is Majid Hosseini. He turns black into white, clearly lying to bring honour to

---

<sup>125</sup> For more information on this case, refer to the articles, Left Communists and World War II, from the Communist Left

the UCM. Mr Majid Hosseini does not care one iota about the lies he is telling but it is important to note that through the lies, deception and hypocrisy he presents a revolutionary image for Mansoor Hekmat. Majid Hosseini's eulogies about the UCM and about Mansoor Hekmat himself are associated with the eulogies of Fakhreddin Hejazi.<sup>126</sup> He says:

*"The Communist policy of the UCM towards the Iran-Iraq war in the writings of...the Islamic Republic and victimization fantasies... Prevented the illusions to the Islamic Republic and saved lives of thousands of left activists that were to be sacrificed in the Iran-Iraq war. The existence of this organization was an anchor for left activists and vagrant of collapsed organizations and individuals left out of the other currents."*<sup>127</sup>

First, contrary to the lies of people such as Goebbels, at the time of the Iran-Iraq War in September 1980, Mr Majid Hosseini, claimed that the UCM was only an anonymous circle and could not prevent thousands of left activists from being sacrificed in the war. Second, the bourgeois politics of the UCM was to participate in the war in order to "defend the revolution", in other words, this required turning workers into cannon fodder for the war. However, thousands of people could not accept the reactionary and counter-revolutionary calling of the UCM. Even if a worker falls for the UCM explanation of the war, the UCM's hands are still stained with the blood of the proletariat.

In her eulogy on the "revolutionary" position of the UCM toward the Iran-Iraq war, another disciple of the religion of the Worker-

---

<sup>126</sup> In one of his famous eulogies for the criminal Khomeini, Fakhreddin Hejazi referred to Khomeini as the David of the time and the Solomon of the epoch, which is comparable to the "Marx of the epoch", the title that Hekmat's disciples use for him.

<sup>127</sup> Evaluation of battles and branches of the worker-communism in Iran, part 3, Majid Hosseini

communism, Ms Soraya Shahabi, placed herself on the line. Apparently, for her, there is no such concept as the historical memory and it is possible that the style of the Stalinist tradition has nurtured and rewritten historical memory. On 6 June 2015, during her speech in London on the occasion of the “Week of Hekmat”, entitled “Mansoor Hekmat and the Iran-Iraq war”, she preached nonsense in her defence of “The Achievements of the 1979 Revolution”:

*“At the time of the Iran-Iraq war, in a situation where the of the communist movement in Iran was dizzy, what kind of war is and how it is and is to be resolved, this clear communist line [the line of UCM] from the most basic level of analysis and explanation, until the last tactical ring defines a proletarian policy ... Hekmat was theoretician and practising of it...Maintaining and restoring relations of production that have been molested by the Iranian revolution is only possible with repression of the revolution. Revolution must be suppressed, not the Islamic Republic! ...The Iranian revolution, which is the greatest contemporary revolution, a revolution in which the working class and labour made councils, defeated most part of the state machine, and despite the Islamic current caused the armed uprising and military barracks to be evacuated, from the point of view of the interests of the global bourgeoisie, it must fail. And to defeat this revolution, the bourgeoisie must be a queue! The bourgeoisie must be united. The local bourgeoisie must unite under the authority of the monopoly bourgeoisie.”*

Many individuals in the audience were flabbergasted when listening to the nonsense of Lady Soraya Shahabi that referred to the greatest contemporary revolution that had broken the bourgeois state machine and that through imperialism, Iraq had been raped in order to defeat the revolution. Such assertions express the level to which these disciples

accept such nonsense. It is not appropriate that Mansoor Hekmat announced that thousands of people (of course, we want to lower thousands to hundreds) gathered around the worker-communism without knowing that “Lenin is an eatable or drinkable phenomenon!”<sup>128</sup> Historical memory is alive, Ms Soraya Shahabi has only undermined her own intelligence.

One of Mansoor Hekmat’s disciples, Mahmoud Qazvini, a former member of the Central Committee of the worker-communist party and a Hekmatist party, spoke about the scandal of the “ideologues” of worker-communism (such as Ms Soraya Meteor) and, as a former party leader himself, he stated:

*“I want the members of the worker-communist party of Iran to ban Hamid Taghvai in the comment on political and theoretical matters, to avoid he lose face himself and all of them. I am ashamed that at one time such a person was the leader of a party that I was a member of. So far, I do not know any Marxist claimer to comment so unthinking on issues.”*<sup>129</sup>

While we review the bourgeois and reactionary position of the UCM towards the Iran-Iraq war, in that the UCM was in the service of making workers into cannon fodder for the war, we are going to discuss what led to the wars. That is, with the arrival of the decadent era of

---

<sup>128</sup> The Fuhrer of “worker-communism”, Mansoor Hekmat in his article “Goodbye, comrade” on 20 April 1999, touching precious gold as this: “Thousands honorable man rounding up to the party that they don’t know Lenin is eatable or drinking phenomena and Marxists and senior workers in the party should not indicate this as their less esteem but see that their own success.”

<sup>129</sup> The populism of Hamid Taghvai and the Charter for the Overthrow of the worker-communist party, Hekmatist (Mahmoud Qazvin).

capitalism all wars are imperialist and reactionary and the only revolutionary war is the class war (class struggle).

## **The era of imperialist wars and the era of communist revolutions**

War is not the product of the harsh policy of an unconventional state, rather, it stems from the need for substantial capital; avoiding war in the era of imperialism is not possible. For more than one hundred years, communists have been announcing that with the arrival of capitalism in its decadent era, the era of social revolution and imperialist, war has begun. The era of imperialism means that in order to resolve its long-term crisis and to ensure the long-term accumulation of capital, capitalism is forced to engage in war. The history of capitalism has shown that the capitalist solution to the accumulation of capital is a cycle of crisis, war and reconstruction. Any damage suffered in the process of capital accumulation can lead to far more dangerous reactions, for example, World War I and World War II and dozens of other great wars and regional wars have resulted from capital's reaction to the damage caused in the process of capital accumulation. Capitalism is able to function during the crisis of the destruction of constant capital (the means of production, cities, infrastructure, facilities, etc.) and even variable capital (labour power—the massacre of workers) and it can deal with the reducing rate of profit and provide the conditions for another round of capital accumulation.

It is an undeniable fact that despite the growing era of capitalism, in the era of capitalist decadence, without imperialist wars, the division of the world is almost impossible or is very difficult. However, it should be noted that the interests of the imperialist gangsters can clash even within a bloc, for example, they can be hostile to the imperialist battlefields of Vietnam with Cambodia in the former Eastern bloc or those between Greece with Turkey in the former Western bloc. World War I demonstrated that as a social system, capitalism had entered its period of decline and, as already mentioned, the era of social revolution and



imperialist war has begun. The danger of imperialist war represents a new phase in the life of capitalism and in the era of imperialism it is not possible to avoid war. For a World War to be possible, the following two conditions are necessary:

- two political blocs, economically and militarily.
- the working class must be defeated on a global level.

Following the collapse of the bipolar world (the Eastern and Western blocs), not only did two coherent political, economic and military imperialist blocs exist but we also witnessed tensions between the great imperialist gangsters. Although under the current circumstances the working class is unable to provide an alternative to capitalist barbarism, it is not yet defeated. So wars tend to be regional wars, such as the Balkans, Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya and dozens of other regional wars.

The bourgeoisie tries to grab an arms production policy to deal with the crises. Although the military production policy was proposed and continues to be proposed as an essential tool for dealing with the crisis, it cannot continue forever. If the value of the manufactured goods (weapons) is ever to be realized, war must break out in order for the goods to play their destructive role. Although weapons' production provides employment, employment that will also produce surplus value, its process leads to the reduction of constant capital and causes crises. This is because military goods do not enter the process of the production phase, which leads to a reduction in constant capital.

Reconstructing the damage caused by the First and Second World Wars led to an era of growth and economic prosperity across the decades that followed. The cycle of crisis–war–reconstruction was then repeated and today the war has shaped the process of regional wars.

## **The left of capital perspective on the reasons for the formation of the imperialist war between Iran and Iraq**

According to the UCM, the Islamic Republic failed to suppress the revolution and the train of revolution, despite its loss of internal momentum, continues to flourish. The continuation of the Iranian Revolution had jeopardized the US imperialist domination of the region and, therefore, imperialism ordered its operant, Iraq, to invade Iran in order to halt the revolution and to overthrow the undesirable Islamic Republic, thus allowing the monopoly bourgeoisie took again take control of the administration. With the resurgence of the monopoly bourgeoisie, the domination and hegemony of US imperialism were re-established in the region. The UCM wrote:

*"The Iranian revolution, a revolution so immense that the overthrow of the Shah's regime was only a small manifestation of the preludes of the proletariat and the toiling people's awakening in its context, could not and cannot leave everything intact. The continuation of the Iranian revolution has endangered the domination of U.S. imperialism over Iran and the region not from the viewpoint of the re-division of the world among the imperialists but from the standpoint of the very existence of imperialism's domination. Iranian revolution has disrupted the equation of power not among the different strata of the bourgeoisie but in the first place and essentially between the proletariat and the monopoly bourgeoisie....The suppression of the revolution and the replacement of the government, were increasingly making, then, an attack from "outside" (outside of the political forces active within the country) a suitable and desirable course of action for imperialism; the Iran-Iraq war took place in the continuation of such an attitude to the government and also to the revolution, and*

*in the context of the intensification of the activity of Bakhtiars, Palizbans and Oveissies, etc. and the amateur coups of the timid monarchists.*"<sup>130</sup>

Prior to examining the arguments of the UCM, we will very briefly look at the historical context. Contrary to the demagoguery of the UCM, the US had already informed Iran of Saddam Hussein's war preparations. In this regard, Washington sent a senior CIA agent, George Cave, who was also fluent in Persian and had worked for many years as a diplomat in Tehran, to inform Iran of Saddam Hussein's military secrets and his preparations for war.

Three Americans were present at the meeting with the Iranian authorities: Bruce Lingen, George Cave and a CIA oil analyst named Ron Smith. George Cave stated that the Iranian authorities were provided with good, detailed information. In May 1979, Charles Ness, the US chargé d'affaires in Tehran, wrote to Washington: "Providing useful information could come in the long term to re-establish formal relations with Iran's future intelligence agency."<sup>131</sup>

Although Iraq was not part of the Eastern bloc, Soviet interest in Iraq rose sharply from 1958 onward. In summary, the historical background is as follows. With the onset of the Cold War in the early 1950s, the US ambassador, George Kennan, proposed that the government needed to deal with the Soviet advances in the Middle East by creating containment.

In 1955, Turkey and Iraq agreed to the Baghdad Pact and, later, Iran, Pakistan and Great Britain joined the Pact. However, the US was a serious economic and political supporter and for reasons of convenience, it did not officially join the Pact. Britain assessed the Baghdad treaty as a "Financial Ring" of defence in the Middle East against the Soviet Union

---

<sup>130</sup> About the manifesto "The invasion of the Iraqi regime and our tasks"

<sup>131</sup> [http://www.bbc.com/persian/iran/2015/02/150210\\_u01-revolution-cave-yazdi](http://www.bbc.com/persian/iran/2015/02/150210_u01-revolution-cave-yazdi)

that could be used to actually surround the Soviet Union and, in the process, could cause the Soviet to collapse.

Following the coup of Abdul Karim Qassem in 1958, someone who had Soviet tendencies, Iraq withdrew from the Baghdad Pact. The headquarters of the Baghdad Pact was subsequently transferred to Turkey and the name of the pact was changed to the Central Treaty Organization (CENTO). Following the coup led by Saddam Hussein, Iraq continued its orientation towards the Soviet Union and in 1972 it signed a treaty with the Soviet Union whereby weapons and thousands of Soviet advisers were sent to Iraq.

However, during the eight-year war, but not at the time of its occurrence, Iraq's relationship with the Soviet Union deteriorated: pro-Soviet Palestinian groups in Iraq were expelled and pro-Soviet groups were suppressed. Subsequently, the Soviet influence was reduced and there was an increased penetration from the US.

With this background in mind, we will return to the demagoguery of the UCM. According to the UCM, the attackers that were ordered by imperialism to "invade" the border were trying to crush the revolution. Of course, the question that arises is why did US imperialism resort to Iraq to suppress the Iranian Revolution when Iraq had Soviet sentiments? Is it not logical reasoning that a country like Turkey, which was a member of the CENTO pact and had a very close relationship with the US, would be more likely to take action to suppress Iran's revolution? Apparently, the UCM blows into the bell of the trumpet rather than using its own mouthpiece (the UCM does not know which end is up). These elements of the preparations for the war propaganda of the left of capital have been used to emphasize the importance of invasion in order to provide contexts for participation in the war - a war that according to the UCM's demagoguery was imposed:

*"The military clashes between the Islamic Republic regime and the Ba'athist regime of Iraq, which had started a long time ago, have*

*now assumed more extensive dimensions with the invasion of the Ba'ath regime into the Iranian borders and this has become one of the acute problems of the present situation.*”<sup>132</sup>

The UCM continues to argue that the Iranian Revolution has damaged imperialist interests and, therefore, that imperialism is looking to damage the revolution. The UCM states that the fundamental blows have affected the imperialist interests of Iran’s revolution that seek to secure and protect the interests of the oil monopolies in the Gulf, thus, in practice, serving the consolidation of US imperialist domination and finally setting up a “monopoly bourgeoisie” that has imposed this war on Iran. It is inappropriate that the Islamic bourgeoisie is also referring to the “imposed war” in its advertising.

*“To revive the stability of the imperialist security of the Gulf, upon which effective blows have been delivered as a result of the Iranian revolution, and to secure and protect the interests of the oil monopolies in the Gulf, thus serving in practice the consolidation of the domination of U.S. imperialism over the Gulf region.”*<sup>133</sup>

Of course, from the perspective of the UCM, imperialism (for internationalists any capitalist state is imperialist) has lost interest in Iran because of the drastic blows caused by the revolution and it now wants to revive its interest. Through the coup, imperialism failed to suppress the revolution and, therefore, it must suppress the revolution by using external forces or by making it ineffective. It is in this context that imperialism has now resorted to war.

---

<sup>132</sup> The invasion of the Iraqi regime and our tasks – Unity of communist militants

<sup>133</sup> As above

*“Here is the middle-east, the Gulf region, a region where the monopoly capital under the leadership of American imperialism had established, until before the Iranian revolution, definite relations with the proletariat of the countries in the region (and thereby with the non-proletarian toilers)...Here, in this region and in the most important dominated country of the Gulf (both economically and politically), a revolution is in progress which has threatened these relations together with their internal imperialist balance and equilibrium, and its continuation will throw the imperialist economy and policy into the abyss of crisis, not only in Iran but in the whole of the middle-east. Here the proletariat has definite ideals, aims and possibilities and the monopoly capital is likewise looking for the creation and revival of definite economic and political conditions. Here a definite line up, because of the progress of Iranian revolution, has come to exist between the two camps of revolution and counter-revolution over definite questions, etc... To explain the necessity of war is to analyse its place in the course of development of these relations of production and class relations and class conflicts.”<sup>134</sup>*

The UCM evaluated the Iraqi government as an operative of US imperialism, something akin to Fedaian’s “King chaining dog of America”. Such assessments may be appealing to the left of capital and they are suitable for the anti-imperialist struggle but they are alien to the anti-capitalist battle and also to Marxists (internationalists) because the duty of every state is to ensure class domination over society. In the era of capitalist decadence, in the era of imperialism, when capitalism extended its rule over all the earth and the most remote parts of the planet were also

---

<sup>134</sup> War, theory and the “Theory of war”

penetrated, the duty of every imperialist state was to defend the interests of the ruling class of its own country within the global capitalist system.

*“The invasion of the Ba’ath regime of Iraq into Iran, in its continuation and depending on definite circumstances, has the possibility of becoming a war of annexation (in the form of the division of Iran, the military occupation of Iran, annexation of regions of Iran into Iraq, etc.). This invasion is in reality in the service of providing grounds, facilities and help for the bourgeois-imperialist counter-revolution in accomplishing its final assault on the Iranian revolution, and thus is in its nature against the revolution of the workers and toilers of Iran.”*<sup>135</sup>

In challenging the rants of the UCM, it should be emphasized that for the bourgeoisie, as well as the proletariat, class interests take precedence over national interests, hence, the bourgeoisie not only attacks other bourgeoisie that are threatened by the danger of revolution, or worse, have been severely weakened by revolution, but it also assists the bourgeoisie. One of the great examples is the Paris Commune. When the revolution threatened the bourgeoisie in France and the French bourgeoisie was preparing for the destruction of the Paris Commune, Prussians not only stopped their attack but they freed tens of thousands of prisoners to help the Versailles army to push for the suppression of the Paris Commune. Somehow, this also occurred in Russia when a bloc of imperialist countries, known as the “Entente”, intervened and organized a military offensive to crush the Soviet Republic.

If the revolution had continued as the UCM stated, in the class interests of the bourgeoisie, both that of Iran and Iraq, Iran would have needed to declare a joint war against both the revolution and the proletariat. Finally, following a lot of preparation, the UCM demagogy

---

<sup>135</sup> The invasion of the Iraqi regime and our tasks – Unity of communist militants

states that the war serves to suppress the revolution and to prevent the development of the revolution and, therefore, it urges the workers to participate in the war in order to defend the gains of the revolution. The main ideas of the UCM are wrapped up in expressions about defending the revolution, i.e., leading workers to an imperialist mess (which means war) in order to defend the interests of its own bourgeoisie.

*“workers and toilers of Iran assess the present war, a war between two capitalist governments whose consequence is in the service of suppressing and preventing” the escalation of the Iranian revolution; and hence they defend the revolution and its gains against the war of the capitalists.”*<sup>136</sup>

---

<sup>136</sup> The invasion of the Iraqi regime and our tasks – Unity of communist militants



## Turning workers into cannon fodder on the battlefield of war to defend the imperialist war

The UCM used all its efforts to assert that the disgraceful Islamic Republic had failed to overthrow the revolution. In its coup, the bourgeoisie had also failed to suppress the revolution and, despite all the problems, the train of the revolution had continued at pace, thus forcing the bourgeoisie to resort to its operant, Iraq, to suppress the revolution. Workers participating in the war must defend their revolution. The UCM stated the following and recalled the workers participating in the imperialist war:

*“Participation in the war would only mean that the workers defend their revolution against the war of capitalists and fight for the achievements that they gained in the struggle against the bourgeoisie and now extending and the realization of these achievements will be against the entire bourgeoisie and will weaken the ranks of the bourgeoisie more and more.”<sup>137</sup>*

The UCM turns workers into cannon fodder under the guise of defending the gains of the revolution but the achievements of which revolution? The proletariat’s revolutionary struggle had been defeated earlier in the years 1978–1980 because of the undisputed dominance of Iran’s left of the capital political milieu, which had resulted in the resounding defeat of the proletariat. In September 1980, at the time of the outbreak of the war, the Iranian proletariat had lost the last strongholds of the remnants of the revolutionary struggle. Thanks to this failure, that bourgeoisie (whether with the Islamic ideological superstructure or the ideological superstructure of the left of capital, such as the majority of Fedaian, the Communist League, the UCM, etc.) was able to turn the

---

<sup>137</sup> *Towards Socialism* No:3 - Anarcho-Pacifism

proletariat into cannon fodder for eight years. Certainly, without planning, one cannot participate in the war and defend the revolution. To mobilize the proletariat to participate in the war the UCM needed to present its platform and a practical solution. In this regard, the UCM provided its proposed platform as follows:

*“From the viewpoint of the workers and toilers of Iran, the invasion of Iraq is another manifestation of the attempts of the bourgeois-imperialist counter-revolution in preparing and creating the grounds and conditions of its final assault on the revolutionary workers and toilers of Iran. Such attacks whether they are carried out by the Palizbans, Bakhtiars, Madanis, etc., or by the Islamic Republic regime or by the armies of the countries of the region or by the army of U.S. imperialism, can be answered in a revolutionary manner only through the creation of a revolutionary front based on armed workers and toilers and under the leadership of communists. Attempts towards the organisation of this front regardless of the imminence of this or that certain attack, is at this moment the task of the communist movement of Iran.*

*(c) Merely advocate the struggle against the present regime and overlook the Iraqi war and the politics, which are followed by it.*

*(f) Agitation for the independent arming of the masses and the necessity for the masses and the revolutionary organisations to be permanently armed.*

*(g) The agitation and organisation of defence committees in factories, localities, schools, offices, etc, independent of the government and bourgeois parties.*

*(j) The agitation of masses by historical examples of victorious mass resistances under the leadership of communists (examples such as Vietnam, Korea, Albania, etc.)*

*(k) The agitation and organisation of mass resistance in the probable occupied zones with the purpose of expelling the occupying forces.* ”<sup>138</sup>

The UCM was so enamoured with participating in the war that in order to defend the gains of the revolution it stated that those who are merely promoting a fight with the Islamic bourgeoisie (the current regime) are ignoring the war in Iraq. In other words, although they do not participate in the war, they must fight decisively. Better than this, they cannot keep the bourgeoisie out of the line of the gunfire from a proletarian attack. In reality, it was not irrelevant that the UCM continued to view the Islamic bourgeoisie, led by the criminal Khomeini, as the petty-bourgeoisie!

The left of capital still continues its demagoguery so that it can more easily throw soil into the eyes of the proletariat. Bringing the proletariat to the imperialist slaughter in wars like Vietnam and Korea provide successful examples of mass resistance. More importantly, the leadership of the anti-communists (a Stalinist) is introduced to communist leader-ship.

Does the UCM agitate for the masses to be armed and does it raise the need to arm the masses? We shall return to this issue later in this article. The UCM was horrified by the premature uprising (early uprising) but, at the same time, it agitated for the arming of the masses! This was merely to bring the workers into the war in order to expel the occupying forces. The blood of the workers must be thrown up so that the interests of its own bourgeoisie can be provided for. Drawing the proletariat into the imperialist shambles should also be referred to as defending the gains of the revolution. The left of capital plays its role well.

As an executive and operant of the policies of US imperialism, Iraq invaded Iran to suppress the revolution. To defend the revolution and to

---

<sup>138</sup> The invasion of the Iraqi regime and our tasks – Unity of communist militants

drive out the occupying forces, the UCM called for the organization of a revolutionary front that was to participate in the war with the invasive bourgeoisie. However, this front needed to be independent of the Islamic bourgeoisie! The UCM did not consider the Islamic Republic to be identical to the revolution since the Islamic Republic defends against the invasion of US imperialism and so the “revolution” that is independent of the Islamic Republic must defend itself. To mobilize the masses to war, the counter-revolutionaries (the Islamic Republic) established the Organization for Mobilization of the Oppressed (Basij), therefore, the revolution has also mobilized the masses to war and to stimulate and organize mass resistance “the army of the masses” needs to be established.

In such circumstances, in contrast to the Iraqi invasion, the counter-revolution (the Islamic Republic) and the revolution are on the same side but they constituted two fronts against the invasion. The counter-revolutionary front, the Islamic Republic’s defence against the invasion, is unfair and the revolutionary front of the proletariat, which is independent of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie and defends the revolution against the invasion of imperialism, is fair. The two fronts of revolution and counter-revolution should not be mixed. However, the other social-chauvinists of the left, like the Communist League, the Socialist Workers, the Fedaian Majority and so on, did not respect this distinction. On the contrary, they wanted to appear as a single unit in the face of the invasion of Iraq, a unit within which they would emerge as one body. In this regard, even the Fedaian Majority went as far as to want to blend the blood of Pasdar (the Army of the Guardians of the Islamic Revolution) with the Fedai (a pro-Soviet leftist organization) in order to nourish the revolutionary tree but the UCM wanted the lines to be respected (revolution and counter-revolution) and did not want the blood to be blended and intermixed.

The UCM continually repeated phrases such as “occupied regions”, “occupying army”, “invasion”, “Iraqi mercenaries” and so on, in order to

stimulate the emotions of the masses and to make it easier to draw them into participation in the war to defend the revolution.

*“But the defence of the revolution against Iraq and in the occupied zones inevitably drives the proletariat to the forms of struggle of the Uprising period. There is no doubt that the commanders of the mercenary occupying army of Iraq are and will be no different from the military commanders of the regimes of Shah, Oveissie, Azhari, etc. Here the revolution is being attacked precisely by methods, which the regime of the Shah propounded and adopted, and the proletariat can and must, by taking into account the mentality of the masses in the occupied areas, agitate and organise various forms of forcible resistance against the Iraqi invasion. Both of these two forms of resistance (resistance in regions under the control of the Islamic Republic regime and in regions occupied by the Iraqi army) assume their real meaning, only as the different forms of the single tactical policy of the proletariat, i.e., the tactical policy of defending the revolution.”<sup>139</sup>*

The imperialist war between Iran and Iraq, which was in the imperialist interests of both countries, was interpreted as the invasion of the operant of imperialism on the Iranian Revolution. This means that the Iranian bourgeoisie was not able to crush the Iranian “revolution” and, therefore, the operant of imperialism had invaded in order to stop the movement of the train of revolution, imperialism had thus prevented the movement of the revolutionary train. In other words, through its operant, Iraq, US imperialism and the Islamic Republic were fighting each other in order to suppress the “revolution”. This scenario, although persuasive for the disciples of the religion of the Worker-communism, merely expresses the confusion of the left of capital that wants to grab hold of the radical

---

<sup>139</sup> The invasion of the Iraqi regime and our tasks – Unity of communist militants

phrase by sending workers into the imperialist shambles (war) to give them a “proletarian” identity.

## Vote for war credits

In 1980, when the imperialist war of Iran-Iraq took place, the UCM was a small, unknown group and, therefore, they had no representatives in parliament who could argue for the adoption of their policy position towards the war. However, the UCM activists overcame these barriers, appearing as the consultants of the Islamic bourgeoisie and stating that, “the capitalists and their government should pay the cost of the war!” In other words, they voted for war credits that would be used to push back the invaders’ attack. The UCM writes:

*“At the present moment we cannot limit the struggle to fight just to the regime, being in the service of invasion... We can only offer and insist on the demands of the proletariat against the Islamic Republic and that the independent struggle against any foreign invasion could prevent the strengthening of the ranks of the bourgeoisie and lead to strengthening and promoting the struggle of the proletariat... The capitalists and their government should pay the cost of war.”<sup>140</sup>*

Of course, the vote for war credits was also declared as a proletarian demand: workers need weapons and military equipment to be able to defend the revolution and so the capitalists must pay for the cost of this. In other words, in the opinion of the UCM the proletariat is arming itself at the expense of the capitalists. The question that arises for these demagogues is where do the capitalists earn their money? Is not the money of the capitalists generated from the workers’ blood (surplus value) as a result of their exploitation? What is the origin of money in capitalist society?

---

<sup>140</sup> *Towards Socialism* No:3 - Anarcho-Pacifism

Thanks to the imperialist war on both sides, working hours had increased, labour intensity had become more inhumane, real wages had fallen and, under the rules of war, any protests were brutally repressed. The UCM actually wanted to further the war at the expense of the workers so that the interests of its own bourgeoisie would be provided for.



## The bankruptcy of the UCM

At the time of the Iran-Iraq war, the left of capital dominated the political milieu of Iran and there was no internationalist tendency, not even an extremely weak one. However, internationalist tendencies at the international level were analysed in the Iran-Iraq war from an internationalist perspective and were defended from proletarian positions. Some of the texts have even been translated into Persian.<sup>141</sup>

One of the currents of the left of capital that represented the radical phase factions of the left of capital, the Organization of the Struggle on the Path to the Emancipation of the Working Class (Peykar), adopted a non-bourgeois position with regard to the Iran-Iraq war.<sup>142</sup> In an article, the UCM attacked its comrades in the left, who, in theory, are anarchists but in practice are pacifists. In this regard, the UCM said that the tactic of transforming reactionary warfare into war against the reactionary (civil war) is anti-internationalist. This is because it had led the proletariat to defeat and had strengthened the positions of imperialism in the region and, apparently, the UCM proletariat was not ready to take power:

*“The tactic of ‘converting the reactionary war into a war against the reactionary’... this tactic is objectively anti-internationalism,*

---

<sup>141</sup> In this regard, we can refer to the positions of the Left Communist, as set out in two articles from its two main tendencies:

- Statement on the Iran-Iraq War of the Internationalist Communist Tendency,
- The War between Iran and Iraq - A taste of capitalist barbarism, *Internationalism* No. 41.

<sup>142</sup> The reasons why one of the currents of the left of capital, namely, the Organization of the Struggle on the Path to the Emancipation of the Working Class (Peykar), adopted a non-bourgeois position is not the subject of this article and we do not discuss it here.

*because of propelling of the Iranian proletariat towards defeat and causing consolidation of the imperialist reaction and violence in the whole region... And the proletariat in Iraq should not adopt this policy.”*<sup>143</sup>

The UCM then accused the anarcho-pacifists, of course, from the perspective of the UCM, of encouraging the proletariat without considering the political and organizational readiness for an early uprising and it then warned them that the failure of the uprising would lead to the consolidation of the monopoly bourgeois:

*“Anarcho-Pacifists ... With the onset of war, put on the agenda of day order of the revolutionary proletariat the overthrow of the bourgeois rule...They don’t understand that if overthrowing the current government does not lead to the establishment of a democratic revolutionary alternative, it will lead to the consolidation of the counter-revolution under the leadership of the monopoly bourgeoisie, and hence uprising (civil war and ...), apart from the preparation of the revolutionary proletariat, apart from the need to provide an independent proletarian alternative, apart from the programme of the proletariat in the present revolution, and apart from the need for organizational preparedness of the proletariat (the issue of party) that is a necessary condition of a victorious insurrection led by the proletariat, puts generally on the agenda of the masses.”*<sup>144</sup>

The UCM continued its argument by accusing the anarcho-pacifists of calling the proletariat to engage in a formidable, unplanned, barren, premature and, most importantly, non-realizable uprising.

---

<sup>143</sup> *Towards Socialism* No:3 - Anarcho-Pacifism

<sup>144</sup> As above

*“The social-chauvinism invites the proletariat to give up the fight for the political power, and Anarcho-Pacifism invites it [the proletariat] into an indecisive, unprofessional, slavish, unprofessional, and inevitably premature and non-realizable uprising.”*<sup>145</sup>

We have noticed that, in the opinion of the UCM, the proletariat was politically and organizationally unprepared for the uprising and that the uprising was premature and non-realizable! One should not seek the overthrow of the bourgeoisie but at the same time call to “Arm the workers!”<sup>146</sup> We have seen earlier that the UCM was promoting the slogan to incite the arming of the masses. Make no mistake, this call to arms was not supposed to enable the workers or the masses to challenge the bourgeoisie since the conditions for the uprising were not ready. It was, in fact, intended to turn the workers into cannon fodder in the direction of defending of the interests of its own bourgeoisie under the guise of defending the revolution. The UCM did not shout, “Workers arm yourselves!”, this was a call to “Arm the workers!”. In the first case, the workers would have reached a degree of class-consciousness that meant they were arming themselves and constituting their own armed forces. In the latter case, a third actor was needed to arm the workers for a specific purpose, rather than the workers arming themselves.

Comparing the UCM slogan of “Arm the workers!” with the slogan of the Fedaiyan Majority-“Arm the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps with heavy weapons!” - shows that the extent of the intersection between the two political tendencies goes beyond the level of their influence in society. Both currents were attempting to turn the workers into cannon

---

<sup>145</sup> As above

<sup>146</sup> As source 143

fodder in an imperialist war and their hands were stained with the blood of the workers.

Further, it must be emphasized that revolutionary defeatism is currently not a concept used for an uprising but the UCM hijacked every possible thread to ensure that no one would directly oppose the Iran-Iraq war because it led to the failure of class struggle. It is interesting that the UCM also recommended that the proletariat of Iraq should adopt its policies and it ranted at length:

*“Defence of the Revolution and the struggle for the development of its achievements can only be the real internationalist tactic of the proletariat of Iran. Because objectively it expresses further weakening of the ranks of the bourgeoisie in the region and prevents it from strengthening the power of the bourgeoisie... it is internationalist because it relies on the policy that the proletariat of Iraq and the proletariat of the region have adopted the same policy and with detailed consideration of the circumstances of their struggle they have formed their tactics based on this policy.”<sup>147</sup>*

If, in order to mobilize the masses, the Islamic bourgeoisie preached the promise of paradise to the Basijis (member of the Organization for Mobilization of the Oppressed), the secular bourgeoisie, namely, the UCM, preached that the war would bring a situation that would favour the proletariat, a situation in which it could develop the achievements of the revolution. They, therefore, drew the proletariat into the war as cannon fodder:

*“If the war intensifies the possibility for the defeated counter-revolution (which invades from outside the borders) to grab at (or, at least, come closer to) political power, and if this third force*

---

<sup>147</sup> *Towards Socialism* No:3 - Anarcho-Pacifism

*should enter the country by jets, tanks and cannons to assist the bourgeoisie, then taking a 'stand against' it and 'impeding' its arrival and establishment can place no task on the agenda of the proletariat but to array geographically and militarily against this third force... This prevention has no meaning other than defending the gains of the revolution against the means that the war make available to the bourgeoisie to take them back, and expanding these gains on the basis of the circumstances that the war may bring about in the advantage of the proletariat... Taking the hands of the Mullahs off the government and economy, restoring the bourgeois law and order, and reorganizing the chaotic economy; this is the platform of the monopoly bourgeoisie."*<sup>148</sup>

The monopoly bourgeoisie was supposed to reduce the power of the mullahs in respect of the government, the economy and the sovereignty. However, not only, was not it the case that the mullahs' failed to rule Iran but the political superstructure of the Absolute Governance of the Jurist was also created. What was the Worker-communism (the heirs of the UCM) response to this nonsense? If the social-chauvinists, such as the Fedaiyan Majority, had minimal internal coherence in drawing the workers into the massacre, they even publicly announced that they had become an integral part of the intelligence apparatus. However, the UCM, with entire bankruptcy and with confusion of thought, was trying to provide a radical stance for its war policy, namely, participating in the war.

The UCM had gained so much of a "proletarian" position that they accused their critics, those who considered the policy of participation in the war as a defence of the revolution and a defence against Iraq, of belonging to the petty bourgeoisie whilst they (the UCM) remained loyal to proletarian politics in order to mobilize the workers for the imperialist war:

---

<sup>148</sup> The invasion of the Iraqi regime and our tasks – Unity of communist militants

*“Only a petty-bourgeois tied in phrases, or anyone who still identities the. Islamic Republic regime with the ‘revolution’, can regard the policy of ‘defending the revolution against the war of the capitalists’ as defencism against Iraq.”*<sup>149</sup>

We have already stated that Marxism is not a religion and that Marxist theories are not holy revelations. With changes in society and the lessons from past experience, a political tendency can criticize its earlier political orientation, its position, its theory or theories and replace them with a new position or theory. This process is quite logical and principled. On the one hand, this issue shows the loyalty of a tendency to the principles in which it believes and, on the other hand, it shows the seriousness of a tendency. Yet, the heirs of the UCM easily and simply deny everything and, ultimately, with a lack of principle that completely denies that they had summoned the workers under the title of participating in the war in order to defend the revolution. The history of this tendency is fraught with lack of principles. Obviously, they are lying when they say that they considered the war to be reactionary from the outset. They hypocritically state:

*“We, from the beginning, considered this war to be reactionary, and against the interests of the masses of people, workers and toilers had no interest in this war.”*<sup>150</sup>

The activists of the worker-communism are also not shy of deception, hypocrisy and lying and, apparently, lying has become a well-established tradition in the religion of worker-communism!

---

<sup>149</sup> As above

<sup>150</sup> The final messages and notifications of the first conference of the foreign organization of the communist party of Iran, page 10.

## Worker-communism and other wars

We have investigated the position of the UCM in the face of the Iran-Iraq war and have shown how under the title of defence of the revolution they called workers to participate in the imperialist war. The question that arises here is what is the position of the heirs of the UCM (the worker-communism) in respect of other wars? We investigate the position of Mansoor Hekmat on the Iraqi occupation of Kuwait. Mansoor Hekmat claimed that the Palestinian issue was behind the event, that the Arab nation had been humiliated and that Saddam Hussein had become a justice seeker who wanted the accumulated wealth to be in the hands of all the Arabs. Mansoor Hekmat stated:

*“Palestine is behind this event. Why would the Arab people become happy? Because they think the Palestinian issue has the answer. Because for years, they have been humiliated by Israel and the United States. As a result, they are happy and make [Saddam] the leader of the Arab world...With the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait for its own interests, it has stirred up a thousand and one problems that were dormant in the Arab world, including the Palestinian issue, deprivation, poverty and so on. It is clear that Saddam Hussein later says that I am a representative and all wealth accumulated here must be in the hands of all Arabs.”<sup>151</sup>*

We use the context of the left communist to discuss the suggestion that national liberation movements are part of the infantry in imperialist tensions. The Palestinian issue has also been part of the tensions between imperialist policies of the big and small gangsters. At that time, Saddam Hussein tried to cover his imperialist ambitions with his nationalist

---

<sup>151</sup> Political discussion about the occupation of Kuwait and the regional crisis, Mansoor Hekmat.

ambitions and to position himself as representing Pan-Arabism and as the successor to Abdul Nasser. Yet neither Saddam Hussein nor Gamal Abdel Nasser were able or wanted the accumulated wealth to be in the hands of all the Arabs. Mansoor Hekmat continued his inconsistent line of thought by asserting that the problem of the Arab nation is not only that its workers are oppressed but also that the Arab world has been humiliated.

*“The problem of the Arab nation is not just that its workers are oppressed. The Arab people have been made helpless for thirty to forty years...The Arab world has been humiliated and the Arab world has been humiliated and sees that it can claim something from this channel.”*<sup>152</sup>

Mansoor Hekmat is trying to pretend [dissemble] that the main contradiction in the Arab world has been the conflict between the oppressed and injured (humiliated) countries and the oppressive (humiliating) countries. In other words, in the narrative of the left of capital, the antagonism between labour and capital is dominated by the anti-imperialist struggle. It is not because of a lack of knowledge of the left of capital that it cannot understand the development and function of capitalism but because it belongs to the left of capital.

We have noticed that the Arab nation has been humiliated for decades but that it was rehabilitated by the occupation of a small Arabic country (Kuwait). Let us see the reaction of the West to the rehabilitation of the Arab world. If the Western gangsters had resorted to atomic bombs in their combat operations that would have led to the end of capitalism. According to Mansoor Hekmat, if Western gangsters cannot subdue the Arab world in a very colonial way, the US will fail and vast revolutions will begin in Europe. Mansoor Hekmat had a prophetic vision about this:

---

<sup>152</sup> Political discussion about the occupation of Kuwait and the regional crisis, Mansoor Hekmat.



*“A widespread Western-wide dispersal in the region will not go away until the atomic bombs do not destabilize, and will not stand from move until not broken-down, otherwise, it is the end of capitalism. It will be the end of the current system of the world that began with Perestroika. The end of the ‘Cold War’. If they fail at the beginning of the war that subdued the Arab world in a very colonial way, apart from this there will be a decisive defeat of the US in the world and a vast revolution in Europe will start.”<sup>153</sup>*

The Arab world lined up behind the Western gangsters, an imperialist massacre took place and the Arab world itself became part of this military expedition and widespread massacres. With the onset of the imperialist slaughter (the start of the war), the gangsters called on the Arab countries or used the language of the UCM and the Arab world was not only subdued in a very colonial way but as a former close ally of the Western gangsters it was actively involved in the killing of the proletariat and also prepared itself for the next massacre. Most ludicrous of all is that in the case of the outbreak of war, if the Western gangsters had been unable to subdue the Arab world in a very colonial manner, a vast revolution in Europe would have begun. What revolution would have started in Europe? The left of capital is not the material force of the revolution and the development of the class struggle of the proletariat, rather, imperialist tensions constitute the material force of the revolution.

Mansoor Hekmat believed that the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait and the possible response of the West to the military expedition are the most important events in recent history and he believed that the war should not take place. The question that arises here is what was Mansoor Hekmat’s solution for avoiding war?

---

<sup>153</sup> Political discussion about the occupation of Kuwait and the regional crisis, Mansoor Hekmat.

*“The argument I have is that this is one of the most important events of contemporary history. It is more important than the start of World War II. It could be the start of World War III, and it is not guaranteed to be atomic and only related to the USA, it will be a war against each other. The situation is just as important.... Let the Arabs decide themselves. This decision is not about a gap between nations and governments and their positions. It is a formula for firstly having a broad social justification.*

*Secondly, in my opinion, it will avoid the outbreak of war. This is assuming that Egypt and so on did not start a war with Iraq but began to negotiate. All over the world which says that entrust to the Arab world, they say from this point that if you give to these [Arabs], they will probably end in peace and there will not be a big change in the lives of the people.”<sup>154</sup>*

Mansoor Hekmat wanted the Arabs to make their own decisions and he continued by saying that if the decision were given to the Arabs, they would probably end up with peace. Apparently, the ideologue of the left of capital is incapable of understanding that capitalism is a global system that has flaws and that the most remote corners of the planet also have flaws. This war was not caused by the humiliation of the Arab nation, not because Saddam Hussein was a dictator but by capitalism's reaction to its own needs. Global capitalism has pursued particular interests in this war.

From the language of its ideologue, the left of capital continues its capital approbation statements. These statements continue to be friendly to capital. However, they also have only minimal coherence. Mansoor Hekmat says:

---

<sup>154</sup> Political discussion about the occupation of Kuwait and the regional crisis, Mansoor Hekmat.

*“Arab nationalism has already been able to impose recognition of the weight of economics and politics of the Arab world to the West. Up here the West has pledged to make compromises on the Palestinian question, which until yesterday was unprecedented. In addition, there have been side benefits. Nationalism in the Middle East regained the initiative of Pan-Islamism. Islam was referred to as the secondary role in the politics of the Arab world, as a mobilizing tool in the service of political action, which is essentially nationalist. The recent conflict in Iran has even helped the case of Pan-Islamic factions such as Hezbollah to be closed. As for Iraq, self-survival is considered, after a respectable military resistance, a political victory, and in the long-term even military victory. The occupation of Iraq by the United States or even the long-term military presence of the United States in the region will definitely turn the current war into second Vietnam for this country [USA]. This is a situation that will probably lead to a split in the unity of the West and isolation of the United States from the European continent. Besides this case, the situation in Iraq as an influential country in the Arab world will be strengthened.”<sup>155</sup>*

Thanks to the military expedition of the Western gangsters, it was assumed that nationalism had reinstated the impetus for Pan-Islamism and that Islam would play a secondary role in the Arab world in terms of mobilizing the masses. Most importantly, Iraq’s position as an influential country in the Arab world is strengthening.

Iraq is not only becoming an influential country in the Arab world but has actually become a weak country in that it has come under the

---

<sup>155</sup> Bloody Sunrise of New World Order — War of the USA in the Middle East, *Worker Today* No.10.

sphere of influence of the Iranian gangsters, which have an ideological Islamic superstructure.

Islamic ideology not only became the banner of the reactionary movements in the Middle East but also played, and still plays, a major role in the imperialist tensions. If the nationalist movements have been instrumental in the Eastern bloc and in line with the imperialist interests of the Eastern bloc, Islamic movements have been a tool of the Western bloc that has been used to deal with the advance of the Eastern Bloc. With the collapse of the Eastern bloc, there has been a loss of support for nationalist movements and they have become meaningless. However, in addition to being a tool, Islamic movements are used by Western gangsters in the imperialist competition in the Middle East and Iran.

Moving forward to consider the war in Afghanistan, the US military expedition to Afghanistan was in line with the new world order and in keeping with the US consolidation of its positions following the collapse of the bipolar world (Eastern bloc and Western bloc). In so doing, it took the title of the war of modernization and political Islam. Employing demagoguery, the US war of modernization, namely, a military expedition of Western gangs led by the US, they argued that with very few casualties they could compromise the regime and make life better for the people of Afghanistan. This military expedition was supposed to bring the victory of civilization over Islamic barbarism. The ideologue of the left wing capital has outdone the supremacy of the capitalist journalists in demagoguery:

*“In the war in Afghanistan, however, the US was still struggling to stabilize its power, but it was a matter of overthrowing the rule of political Islam, which could with few injuries lead to comprising to the regime that is better for the people [of Afghanistan]. America each formula was obtained from the war, the result of the Taliban's defeat was not the victory of the United States as the sole power of the world. The result of this victory from the perspective of the*

*people of the world is the failure of political Islam and the victory of civilization over the Islamic barbarism.”*<sup>156</sup>

---

<sup>156</sup> America Attacking and the New Strategy of Bullying Acts in the World, *Weekly International* No. 126, 4 October, Kourosh Modaresi.

## The Unity of Communist Militants and the coup

The Nojeh coup plot was discovered on 9 July 1980. The aim of the coup was to attack the house of Khomeini, to capture parliament and to broadcast the arrests of those responsible for the Islamic Republic. After the victory, the coup, which was more than just the officers and commanders of the Air Force, was supposed to reinstate Bakhtiar (the King's last Prime Minister) as the interim Prime Minister. The coup was also called the "great salvation of the Iranian uprising". The coup was discovered before any action took place and was severely suppressed.

Since the UCM believed a revolution was underway, a revolution that the Islamic Republic had failed to suppress, it believed that through a coup, imperialism would suppress the revolution and capture its stronghold.

*"The success of the coup is not to substitute the new administration in place of the current ruling, but to include the emergence of a political force that can be applied to the united and undisputed leadership in the camp of the bourgeois-imperialist counter-revolution, organizing the final storming of the bourgeoisie for definite suppression of the revolution and the establishment of favourable governance of this class."*<sup>157</sup>

The UCM argued that the bourgeoisie had certainly welcomed the coup, however, the bourgeoisie was invisible and did not intervene in the affairs of state because the administration of the country and the provision of the conditions for capital accumulation was, according to the UCM, of course, carried out by the "traditional petty-bourgeoisie". The intended purpose of the UCM's "traditional petty-bourgeoisie" was the same as the Islamic bourgeoisie, that is, the same as criminal leaders such as

---

<sup>157</sup> Our proposed tactical platform against the coup.

Khomeini. These demagogues only continued for two months, up until the bloodiest massacres in the modern history of Iran (20 June 1981) when the bourgeois villains declared that there were to be no “wounded” and that the soldiers should just “kill in the street” and when they still obstinately called for a “petty-bourgeois leadership.” The UCM proclaimed that the petty-bourgeoisie, which had become reactionary, assuming that it had previously been revolutionary, and would be against the coup.<sup>158</sup> The left of capital stated:

*“Confrontation of class forces in favour of and against the coup does not entirely match the forces of revolution and counter-revolution and cannot be classified. The bourgeoisie will undoubtedly be in a favourable position in the coup and will bring in its wake a large part of the upper strata of the petty bourgeoisie – especially in the modern and bureaucrat sectors of the petty bourgeoisie. Traditional petty bourgeoisie - which is already fully converted to reaction and plays an active part in the society of the current ruling - because that coup is tantamount to it losing all its current concessions, will be the actual force against the coup. This section of the petty bourgeoisie will try to organize the defence of the present government's reactionary front against the coup. The fundamental forces of the revolution, the proletariat and non-proletariat working people, since for them the coup means a return to the previous situation – it is the most rabid form of rule of the bourgeoisie, and potentially the most decisive force in the struggle against the coup.”*<sup>159</sup>

---

<sup>158</sup> The position of the UCM in relation to evaluating the class position of Khomeini as petty-bourgeois and then the evaluation of the petty-bourgeois as revolutionary, is referred to in Part I of this series.

<sup>159</sup> Our proposed tactical platform against the coup.

The bourgeoisie was supposed to welcome the coup and, at the same time, two completely different fronts emerged to defend against it: the reactionary front, which was represented by the petty-bourgeoisie, and the revolutionary front, which was to be the most decisive force fighting against the coup.

While the UCM was attempting to call the proletariat to join the struggle of the bourgeois, unfortunately, the last stronghold of the Iranian proletariat that had survived the struggles that had taken place between 1978 and 1980, which was being suppressed by a rabid and unbridled Islamic bourgeoisie, was breathing its last breath and could not regain its strength. However, the UCM tried everything to lead the workers into the bourgeois camp but it did so by taking an approach that was suggestive of a proletarian position and one that aimed at defending the democratic achievements.

According to the UCM, suppressing the coup would mean the defeat of the bourgeoisie, which was consolidating its rule, and also regaining lost strongholds for the continuation of the revolution and the conquering of new positions that would promote the revolution. We look at the confusing approach of Mansoor Hekmat:

*“From the standpoint of the proletariat and the non-proletarian working class, suppressing the coup could only be the concept of the bourgeoisie defeat in the consolidation of its authority, preventing the emergence of a fresh reactionary, the development of democratic gains, obtaining lost strongholds, continuing the revolution, and conquering new strongholds to promote the revolution. Hence, the realization of the potential of the main forces of the revolution against the coup lies in moving the communist alternative to the masses and the absorption of them to whatever wider proletarian that is consistent with democracy, disclosure and the constant rejection of liberalism and the fight is against political indifference. And the basis of the proletarian*



*tactics is to create a revolutionary queue against the coup not in unity with the traditional petty bourgeoisie and with the support of the liberal bourgeoisie, but also in the fight against them and to prepare grounds for organizing more independent mass resistance.*”<sup>160</sup>

Finally, as previously announced, the coup was discovered before it was able to take any action and it was violently suppressed by the Islamic bourgeoisie, not the petty-bourgeoisie. What was Mansoor Hekmat’s response and that of his disciples in the religion of worker-communism? Would suppressing the coup lead to conquering the lost strongholds of the revolution? This nonsense was written by someone who has been given the title the “Marx of the epoch”.

In the name of communism, Stalin threw to the ground the most honourable and the most cherished communists, the creators of the October Revolution. Fortunately, the religion of worker-communism did not have the opportunity to throw to the ground the most honourable communists but, unfortunately, it has played the most significant role in dragging revolutionary and communist values and terms like “international”, “revolution”, “communism” and “proletariat” through the mud, all, of course, in the name of communism.

---

<sup>160</sup> Our proposed tactical platform against the coup.

## **Rebuilding the Third Line under the Title of Revolutionary Marxism**

The revolutionary struggles of 1978–1979 led to the formation of a generation that was protesting the current order and demanding radical changes in society. This generation had insurrectionist views and was in pursuit of its ideal society. The systems of the former Soviet Union and China were not attractive to them and they were looking for a better and more radical alternative. By establishing the tendency of the Third Line (current three)<sup>161</sup>, which was a radical phrase, they were able to absorb others within the generation and their numbers grew rapidly.

Before proceeding with this discussion, it is necessary to explain that the concept, “radical phrase”, in terms of the theory of the internationalists who refer to the currents or tendencies of the left of capital that try to use radical terms in their positions. In a similar manner to the parties of worker-communism in Iran, the revolutionary communist party in the US and so on, these groups try to present a radical and revolutionary image of their counter-revolutionary positions in order to attract the layers of protesters in society.

However, the Third Line tendency (current three), which was full of paradoxes and internal contradictions, had been established from a set of positions and consistent theories of the left of capital that were not part of its theoretical basis. The radicalism and the protest attitude of the Third Line would, in the short term, have masked its inner contradictions although, in the long term, the inner contradictions of the Third Line would have been revealed and, consequently, it would have undergone an internal crisis. The unity of Communist Militants (UCM) was a small group belonging to this tendency. In this regard, Mansoor Hekmat said:

---

<sup>161</sup> The third line (current three) was Stalinism influenced by Maoism, the characteristics of this line were described in the first section.

*“We generally saw ourselves on this third line, and especially on the left wing of it ... Therefore, we as a circle, firstly, we saw the third line as the mainstream of the communist movement.”<sup>162</sup>*

As we have already referred to the Stalinism that was influenced by Maoism (the Third Line), which the UCM called the mainstream of the communist movement, and we have explained how this tendency has played an anti-communist role in all social events, here we merely reiterate the connection between the UCM and the history of the Third Line.

Mansoor Hekmat correctly believed that the history of the tendency that he represented was not separate from other currents within the Third Line. In this regard, he said:

*“Our history was not isolated from the history of the Peykar and the Razmandegan, But the dirty Islamic republic sprinkled blood to one of the most important center of the left, and eliminated the best people of a community.”<sup>163</sup>*

In the short term, it is definitely possible to use the term “radical” and to say that it took a radical position on social events but that in the long term there is a need to provide real explanations for these events.

Despite its radical appearance, the protestations of the Third Line tendency was shown to have inner contradictions and these were clearly revealed in all social events, particularly because a generation of ideals, protest and insurgents in society formed the ranks of this tendency. One of the obvious examples of this contradiction was the position of the Peykar with regard to the war between Iran and Iraq. In its organ (Nr 73), which

---

<sup>162</sup> Report of Mansoor Hekmat from the Central Committee of the UCM to the First Congress of the UC, *Towards Socialism* No. 5.

<sup>163</sup> The History of the UCM, Speech to the Marx Society of London, 15 May 2000.

had adopted a position similar to the UCM during the two days when it was annexed to the Peykar 73, it assessed the war as unfair and reactionary. The internal contradictions of the Third Line led to a crisis within the tendency. Most of the currents within the Third Line were in crisis prior to the summer of 1981, before the massacre of the Islamic bourgeoisie (Razmandegan, Nabard, Arman, Vahdate Englab, etc.). The Organization of the Struggle on the Path to the Emancipation of the Working Class (Peykar) did not for disintegrated because the unbridled crackdown of the Islamic bourgeoisie but, because of its internal contradictions, it experienced a crisis and disintegrated. The crisis within Peykar made its butchering and slaughter much easier and bloodier. We have already stated that due to the close relationship that the Tudeh Party of Iran had with the Soviet Union and because its propaganda system was dominated by Stalinism, at that time, aside from the Tudeh Party of Iran, the radical phrase part of the left of capital did not theoretically dominate even the political apparatus of the left of capital (Stalinism). Their position was to search for ideals, justice, national independence, economic development and democracy.

Their positions were full of contradictions and confusion that did not even have the appearance of minimal consistency. In the end, the positions of the radical phrase wing of the left of capital revealed their inner contradictions and the tendency of the Third Line was faced with a deep crisis. In the long term, it was not possible to respond to social events with a series of inconsistent and radical phrase positions. As a consequence of this crisis, the currents of the Third Line lost their meaning and it was no longer possible to gather people around this tendency. The form and arrangement of the Third Line tendency had lost its charm for the radical phrase wing of the left of capital; a different alternative to the radical phrase wing of the capital was the order of the day.

Of course, two currents of the tendency of the Third Line were not part of the crisis in 1981. In other words, their crisis was delayed. The first

of these was the Revolutionary Organization of the Toilers of Kurdistan of Iran (Komala) and the second, the UCM, was responsible for the reconstruction and restoration of the positions of the Third Line under the new name of “revolutionary Marxism”. The reason why, in 1981, Komala was not undergoing the same crisis as other groups in the Third Line will be discussed in the next few pages. Mansoor Hekmat evaluated the historical context and the conditions for the formation of revolutionary Marxism and considered them to be a critique of the ideological and theoretical premises of the petty-bourgeois radical left and the unprecedented upsurge of the working class movement following the 1979 Iranian Revolution. According to Mansoor Hekmat, revolutionary Marxism is not part of the critique of the basic foundations of capitalist relations or the theoretical premises of the bourgeois left but is formed from a critique of the theoretical premises of the left of the petty-bourgeoisie. So, it would seem that all the nonsense that suggests that their Marxism (the Marxism of the UCM) comes from the West and is rooted in Marx itself, was simply a lie for the demagoguery. Mansoor Hekmat states:

*“The revolution initiated two important developments. First, a growing critique of ideological and theoretical premises of the petty bourgeois radical Left from a Marxist standpoint, and second, an unprecedented upsurge of the working class movement. Together the two elements created conditions most conducive for the emergence of a revolutionary Marxist organizational trend distinct from the existing radical Left.”*<sup>164</sup>

As we have already explained, in December 1979, when the class struggle was in serious retreat, the Circle of Sahand ended its support for the Arman and declared itself as a group, the UCM. The ending of the

---

<sup>164</sup> Left Nationalism and Working Class Communism - Mansoor Hekmat

support and the announcement of independent activity was manifested in its impact on the organizations of the Third Line tendency. According to Mansoor Hekmat, revolutionary Marxism grew rapidly during the Iranian Revolution, criticizing the ideological foundations of petty-bourgeois socialism and breaking the populist left. Of course, the UCM was also an overwhelming and clear defender of this break with the populist left. He said:

*“A parallel development could also be observed at the ideological and organizational level. Principled and revolutionary Marxism grew rapidly in the course of the revolution, questioning and criticising the whole ideological foundation of Iranian petty bourgeois socialism. This process affected all organizations of the radical Left and in particular those of the Third Line. This radicalism could be identified by a return to Marxist classics and the works of Lenin, an emphasis on the primacy of class struggle, a re-orientation towards work among the working class, and the advocacy of radical tactics. The most vocal and consistent exponent of this break with the populist Left was Ettehad-e Mobarezan-e Kommonist (Unity of Communist Militants).”<sup>165</sup>*

To play the role of rebuilding the Third Line required that the background of the carriers of revolutionary Marxism should be regarded as guiltless and Marxist. The activists of the UCM, with the Stalinist tradition style that had developed, rewrote the history of their group. The group formed by a circle of fans of the Arman one of the groups of the Third Line that was considered to be the only communist group that had advocated the independent interests of the working class and had expressed the goals and policies of the proletarian conscious of Iran and the UCM during stormy period, has never done left and right! The UCM

---

<sup>165</sup> As above

announced that turning the workers into cannon fodder under the name of defending the revolution, evaluating the bourgeois leader (Khomeini) as the petty-bourgeoisie and then evaluating the petty-bourgeoisie as revolutionary, the four class theory of the revolution of the UCM, were all proletarian goals. The UCM wrote as follows:

*“There is only one exception. ‘The unity of communist militants’ is the only communist group that can safely claim that since its establishment has been an advocating of the independent interests of the working class and expressing the goals and policies of the conscious proletariat of Iran ... The unity of communist militants’ during this stormy period, has never done left and right.”<sup>166</sup>*

The scenario that was then meant to take shape, namely, the ideology of revolutionary Marxism, represented the radical phrase wing of the left of capital and was supposed to be a flag under which to gather the protesting insurgent militants in society. This time, the ideology of revolutionary Marxism was supposed to form a barrier to the radicalization of criticism from the protesting militants on the left of capital.

It was assumed that this would lead to the UCM being promoted to the level of the workers’ representative. In preparation for such a scenario, the workers were reminded that they should not forget that the UCM was their true representative:

*“We published this news to say that workers! Your representatives are Communists, Communists, and in particular the Unity of Communist Militants.”<sup>167</sup>*

---

<sup>166</sup> *Communist Worker* No. 1, Pages 2 and 19.

<sup>167</sup> *Communist Worker*, 27 March 1981, pages 15–20.

In order to validate their second hand Stalinist and Maoist approaches, under the ideology of revolutionary Marxism the workers and revolutionaries were advised to criticize populism and were told that to be able to critique revisionism and populism they did not need to know the history and experience of the workers' movement and the classical Marxist texts but only needed to study the second hand Stalinist literature on revolutionary Marxism. Revolutionary Marxism would provide the answers to all of the problems and, most importantly, was the only credible experience and future hope. One question was answered in the following way:

*"We cannot introduce any works other than the works of revolutionary Marxism in the critique of populist revisionism."*<sup>168</sup>

Finally, the ideology of revolutionary Marxism was successful in reassembling several of the positions of the left of capital and in retouching them it produced consistency in the inconsistent positions of the Third Lines and, again, appeared to be radical, asserting that revolutionary Marxism would be able to organize the dispersed forces via an assembly called the Communist Party of Iran. The formation of the Communist Party of Iran indicated that the UCM, together with Komala, had succeeded in rebuilding the Third Line under the concept of revolutionary Marxism. Of course, in explaining this point it is important to note that following the defeat of the bourgeois and the petty-bourgeois illusions, revolutionary Marxism would, apparently, be able to eliminate the barriers to the formation of the Communist Party and, in September 1983, the Communist Party of Iran was formed.

*"The Communist Party of Iran has been constituted in the continuation of the victorious struggles of revolutionary Marxism*

---

<sup>168</sup> Reply to Letters, *Communist*, No. 12, page 14.



*against the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois illusions and delusions and the revisionist thoughts that the left of Iran was drowning in itself. Revolutionary Marxism in Iran relies on revolution which took to the scene of the struggle the vanguard of the proletariat, was ripen and over the course of several years, criticized petty-bourgeois socialism claiming Marxism in its methodological foundations, economic, political and organizational and raised with firmness the independent flag of communism of Marx, Engels and Lenin. The rapid growth and formation of revolutionary Marxism in Iran was the political and institutional reflection of the objective presence of the working class in Iran at the scene of revolution, at the same time, the class, with its active presence in the field of revolutionary struggle provided the material background and favorable conditions for transforming this revolutionary theory into a social material force and strengthening of the political and institutional forces and its vanguard organizations.”<sup>169</sup>*

After all this, and within a few years, the philosophy of invention in relation to the historical context and the social conditions of the formation of revolutionary Marxism and the struggle against other non-Marxist tendencies that had resulted in revolutionary Marxism and raised the independent flag of the communism of Marx, Engels and Lenin, was revealed to have contradictions and it faced a crisis. The founder of this political tradition came to the conclusion that revolutionary Marxism itself was, after all, a temporary intellectual and political context for two different traditions of struggling. Mansoor Hekmat emphasized its temporary aspects and spoke of different traditions: in his opinion, the

---

<sup>169</sup> Declaration of the Founding Congress of the Communist Party of Iran, September 1983.

struggle for worker-socialism and the tradition of the struggle for non-worker left radicalism. He wrote:

*“In this way, ‘Revolutionary Marxism of Iran’ Itself was a **temporary** Intellectual and political framework for two **different** traditions of struggle. Worker socialism and radicalism of the non-working left of Iran. The gap between these two traditions until the plan of discussions of the First Congress of the Unity of Communist Militants was not yet evident.”*<sup>170</sup> [Emphasis in the original text]

Of course, the disciples of Mansoor Hekmat stepped forward and announced that their leader had said that the theory of revolutionary Marxism was Marxist in its social context but, like the rest of left, it was bourgeois and petty-bourgeois, in other words, it was a movement belonging to the bourgeoisie or, at best, belonging to the petty-bourgeoisie. The basic question that arises here is how can a bourgeois social context provide a Marxist theory? At first glance, this may indicate the poverty of the theoretical stance and opinions of its contributors but, in reality, it represents the vain efforts of the left of capital to provide theoretical coherence for its bankrupt political positions. As Rahman Hossein Zadeh writes:

*“Mansoor Hekmat said and wrote that revolutionary Marxism is Marxist in theory, but its social context is like the rest of the left, and it must change social raids and would be in the context of social-working.”*<sup>171</sup>

Finally, we conclude that the so-called revolutionary Marxism could not have had any effect on the lives of wage slaves as it would have

---

<sup>170</sup> On the Activity of the Party in Kurdistan, Mansoor Hekmat, page 18.

<sup>171</sup> Working Class and Communist Organization or Working Class and Left-wing Coalition Organization, Rahman Hossein Zadeh.

had to have changed the social rails and be placed in the context of the working class. We will turn to this issue again in the discussion of the worker-communism faction. Agitators and propagandists of revolutionary Marxism state that their approach cannot be seen as being able to revolutionize the working class because revolutionary Marxism was still socially located on the pillars of the other social classes and needs to be transformed into the social application of Marxism. After years of demagoguery about revolutionary Marxism being an independent communist flag, it is now preached that the ideology of revolutionary Marxism has been the social platform of other classes and has nothing to do with the working class! This argument is stated as follows:

*“This communism, our communism (the current so-called revolutionary Marxism), also does not answer this contradiction and the ineffectiveness of communism to the life of our working generation. Was said that revolutionary Marxism was still socially located in another class pole and should be change to the social application of Marxism and put it on its social and class background.”<sup>172</sup>*

As we have already mentioned the Communist Party of Iran used the ideology of revolutionary Marxism to reconstruct and restore the positions of the Third Line under its new name and, in the short term, this organization raised the flag of the radical phrase wing of the left of capital. We have repeatedly stated that during those years, the circles and collectives had always taken a radical position and had been critical toward the left of capital and, on occasion, they had also presented serious criticisms of left of capital. The formation of an aggregation under the

---

<sup>172</sup> Evaluation of battles and branches of the worker-communism in Iran, part 3, Majid Hosseini, 18th January 2008

name of the Communist Party of Iran, with the ideology of revolutionary Marxism, effectively prevented the radicalization of these critiques, in practice, preventing them from raising questions about the left of capital. If the blood-bath of the Islamic bourgeoisie had not gone away, if the left of capital had not poisoned the political milieu with its seemingly radical and counter-revolutionary ideology, if the critics had continued to criticize, then it might have been possible to go beyond the critique of these circles and to move towards internationalist positions (communist positions). With all this in mind, we now examine the formation of the Communist Party of Iran.

## **The formation of the only communist party of the world**

Prior to examining the aggregation of the tendencies that formed the communist party of Iran, it is essential to provide a short explanation of our notional theory of the Marxist concept of working-class organization and, especially, the communist party.

It is necessary to mention that, from the beginning and consistently, the organizational issue could not be determined for the labour movement and for Marxism, since this has undergone fundamental change with the development of capitalism. The organization of the working class in response to the development of capitalism has evolved from the concept of the proletariat. Examining these developments and the changing the forms of proletarian organization, in other words, examining the experiences of the workers' movement and learning from these experiences is one step in the direction of taking the next steps.

The organization of the proletariat through the Communist League was the first form of organization of the working class in the history of the worker's movement as a social class. In the year 1848–1849, in presenting their manifesto, for the first time in the history of this social class, the workers provided their social class bill of indictment against the bourgeois class and the manifesto of the workers ended with a call for the “workers of all countries to unite!” The Communist League was dissolved in 1849 following the suppression of the revolution and the collapse of the revolutionary wave in Europe.

The First International presents the arrival of the proletariat onto the stage of social and political struggle as a social class in the major European countries. In the First International, all of the forces of the working class, apart from its political orientation, were gathered in an organization to advance the workers' economic, political and educational struggles. The First International was dissolved in 1876 following the defeat of the Paris Commune and the ebb of the class struggle.

The labour parties formed the Second International in 1889 during the era when capitalist society was flourishing. Its short-term goal, its “minimum programme”, was the struggle for social reform within the capitalist system. The long-term goal was to establish a political framework for the pursuit of the historic mission of the proletariat, the social revolution. Within the Second International, the distinction was made between the general organization of the class (trade unions) and the special organization of the class (the party), the goal of the latter was to defend the proletarian historical programme. During this period, the goal of the organization was to **organize** the working class. Unions were a school for struggle and the struggle was a school for communism. Reforms provided the working class with an opportunity to achieve betterment in capitalist society and through these everyday struggles, capitalist society could have become more humane. However, the Second International was formed on the basis of the national workers’ parties of different countries, an approach that was in opposition to the final goal of the proletariat. On the other hand, the short-term struggle for reform was becoming a dominant trend. After the death of Engels, the position of the reformists grew within the Second International. At the beginning of the First World War, the majority of parties in the Second International defended the bourgeoisie and turned the workers into cannon fodder in the imperialist war - only a small minority remained loyal to proletarian positions. Following the merger of the labour parties into the camp of capital, the Second International collapsed.

During periods in which the conditions were not conducive to the emergence of a revolutionary party, periods in which the revolutionary organization has no direct influence on the class and the revolutionary struggles of the working class, or in periods when the class struggle is in decline and retreat, such organizations are dissolved once the historic need for them has ended and they are then re-formed with the rise and expansion of the class struggle, for example, as was the case for the Communist League and the First International. However, throughout

history, the working class has always posed an issue for bourgeois ideology. The purpose of the infiltration of bourgeois ideology is to sterilize the class struggle of the proletariat and to create the main obstacle to allowing the working class to implement its historical ordinance (communist revolution). Therefore, the continuation of a proletarian organization with different organizational forms has been a historical necessity for the proletariat. In periods of declining class struggle, a revolutionary organization with a very weak influence on the working class continues to operate and in periods when the working class has a strong influence and revolutionary conditions, which can have a direct and immediate impact on the class struggle, it takes the form of a party. The revolutionary organization is a bridge between the stagnant periods of class struggle and an evolved stage of the class struggle in which the proletariat challenges the bourgeoisie. The task of the revolutionary organization is to actively participate in the class struggle, to defend the proletarian positions and programme and to strive to prepare for the future of the internationalist party. For example, when the revolutionary wave began, the Bolsheviks in Russia and the Spartacus League in Germany had a revolutionary organization that took the form of a party. It is not unnecessary for internationalists, even if their organizations exist in different countries, to call themselves currents, tendencies, etc., such as the “International Communist Current” or the “Internationalist Communist Tendency”.

In contrast to the growth period of capitalism, during the period of capitalist decline the proletarian political organizations can only take the form of revolutionary minorities whose task is neither to organize the working class nor take power in its stead, without being the **political leadership** - a political compass with political clarity and influence over the working classes; these are the fundamental elements of the implementation of a communist revolution. The Third International was formed when social revolution was on the agenda. With the formation of the Comintern during the era of capitalist decline, the trade unions were

merged into the state apparatus and workers' councils were introduced as proletarian instruments.

The party is the **political organism** that is created by the proletariat in order to develop, expand and deepen its own class-consciousness and through the exercise of **political leadership** (by directing, guiding and leading the proletariat) it aims to destroy the capitalist state and system in order to build a communist society. The task of the party is to defend the communist programme until the elimination of social classes has been achieved; with the disappearance of social classes, the party also loses its necessity. The party is neither the class itself nor the mass organization of the class (the councils during the revolutionary period) but a vanguard of the class. In the revolutionary period the working class exercises its dictatorship through global councils. The dictatorship of the proletariat is the dictatorship of the organized class through the workers' councils, not through party dictatorship.<sup>173</sup>

The political leadership of the party is a collective leadership, not the personal leadership of someone who is very famous in bourgeois parties, such as those known as personalities in the worker-communism parties. We will return to this issue later.

Throughout the history of the working class, the proletarian revolutionary organization has always been a direct and indirect target of bourgeois attacks. On the one hand, the downfall of the class struggle and, on the other hand, the penetration of bourgeois ideology, places revolutionary currents in danger of degeneration, a clear example of which would be the degeneration of the Comintern and the communist parties in the late 1920s. To defend against such a situation and in defence of communist positions and revolutionary principals and the revolutionary organization, a revolutionary current may build a faction. The task of the

---

<sup>173</sup> For more information of the positions of *Internationalist Voice* in this regard, see “*Revolutionary Organization or the Revolutionary Publication?*” on the website of Internationalist Voice.



faction is not to actively participate in the struggles of the working class but to engage with the militants of the revolutionary organization themselves. A clear example of such a communist movement is that of the Left Communist Faction during the decline of the Communist International. It is important to note that the Italian Left Communist Faction was not a faction within the Italian Communist Party but was a faction within the Communist International. Indeed, one of the fundamental differences between the Italian Left Communist faction and Trotskyism was that the former wanted to move forward to discuss with clarity all the tendencies and currents that were involved in the struggle against the decadence of the Communist International and the defence of the communist programme. In contrast, the Trotskyist current moved with haste and without serious debate and, despite the start of the anti-revolutionary black era, it began the process of Kurdish National revolutionary era was the order of the day, while for the Italian faction the formation of the Party at that time was meaningless. Trotsky was not able to understand the counter-revolution. Trotsky was not able to understand the counter-revolution and he asserted that May and June of 1936 in France (workers strike, factory occupations, etc.) was the beginning of the revolution.

We have previously explained that proletarian political leadership is a collective leadership manifestation of proletarian class-consciousness that can manifest itself in the representatives of the class and it should not be reduced to a technical level. Contrary to the class-consciousness of the proletariat (communist consciousness), which is a collective characteristic, the characteristic of all ideologies-including the ideology of worker-communism, the empowerment of personalities, the creation of extraordinary leaders, the sanctity of individual creativity, etc.-lead to the continuation and redevelopment of the ideological superstructure society, which is aimed at subjugating wage slaves. The founder of worker-communism recommends to his disciples that they should not forget that they are sober politicians of the country, lest they forget that they are

important and high profile figures in society. In training his disciples in the bourgeois societies, Mansoor Hekmat teaches how to play the role of a politician:

*“We are the few hundred people who create a political-party movement in Iran. This movement may continue to have a liberated area, or may have fallen into power, may be in war, may be in peace. Maybe in the coalition cabinet. The expectation that comes from the comrades is that I am a prominent politician of this country. Each of us must think that he is a high-profile political figure in society. Well, obviously, he should not spurious think like that ... and it must really be such a person.”<sup>174</sup>*

With this explanation in mind, we return to the formation of the Communist Party of Iran. As we explained earlier, the formation of the Communist Party indicated that the UCM had been able to rebuild the Third Line as “revolutionary Marxism” and had done so through a collectivist approach called the Communist Party of Iran. Two currents had played a role in the formation of the Party. We have already examined the Unity of Communist Militants, we now look at the new actor in the formation of the Communist Party, namely, Komala. In the fall of 1969, a group of Kurdish intellectuals who had Maoist tendencies and who were influenced by the Revolutionary Organization of the Iranian Tudeh Party, founded the organization that was later called the Revolutionary Organization of the Toilers of Kurdistan of Iran (Komala). The name itself indicates that Komala was an organization for the toilers, not for the working class and, moreover, for the toilers’ of a specific region, Kurdistan in Iran. In this regard, in the debates of the First Congress it was stated that:

---

<sup>174</sup> Speech at the Opening Ceremony of the Second Congress of the worker-communist party of Iran, April 1998.

*“All our opinions were inspired by Mao's thought without any social research, without a clear and closed connection with the masses, and we only accepted Mao's thought under the influence of the disproportionate perceptions of the social status of Kurdistan.”*<sup>175</sup>

The members of this gathering were mostly arrested before they became seriously involved. Years later, during the release of political prisoners in the fall of 1978, these people were released from prison and they took part in a massive gathering to rebuild their organization in the fall of 1978, which was still profoundly influenced by Maoism. The gathering later became known as the First Congress of Komala. The Congress continued to emphasize the semi-colonial-semi-feudal thesis of Iranian society and ended its work by agreeing its logo and name.

At that time, one of the main pillars of Komala was its anti-dictatorship stance, in other words, it was anti-monarchy. According to Komala, every regime that came to power that was not that of the Shah was in the interests of the revolution and it evaluated the thinking that with the coming of the Islamic Republic the situation would get worse, an incorrect view. Komala went so far as to compare the disgraceful Islamic Republic with the interim government in April 1917 in Russia and to demagogically discredit Lenin to justify its reactionary and counter-revolutionary positions. At the First Congress Komala asserted:

*“This opinion is wrong that perhaps the coming of the Islamic Republic is worse than the current situation. Every regime and apparatus come to the power instead of the Shah's monarchy, it is in any case in the interest of the revolution, and such a republic can only be recognized by people themselves direct experiences. Sample formation of the interim government of Russia, which*

---

<sup>175</sup> From the debates of the First Congress of Komala, page 31.

*Lenin, in April 1917, was still opposed to the uprising, but he later agreed that he would not stop the people from coming to the resurrection.”*<sup>176</sup>

In addition to social protests and anti-dictatorship, Kurdish society had the opportunity to protest against their national oppression.

A large part of these circles that were anti-dictatorship and demanded independence, masked their nationalist protest in the guise of left-wing politics, which was very convenient for Komala. These circles found Komala to be a useful flag for their protest and joined the organization and formed foundations. The fact is that the Komala organization was formed during the developments of 1979. Mansoor Hekmat points this out:

*“The formation of the Kamalah in the broad meaning of the word was formed in the revolution [1979].”*<sup>177</sup>

However, when Komala was formed it lacked a programme, a statute and an opinion and position on the social events. Komala suffered from a lack of knowledge even when compared with other currents within the left of capital. It did not even have an official publication. Komala’s only published newsletter contained news on events related to the national liberation war in Kurdistan. In this regard, Majid Hosseini, one of the former leaders of Komala, said:

*“In addition to the political consequences of the regime's attacks and capture of cities, with the start of the second round of the "movement" the May 1980, until the Second Congress of [Komala]*

---

<sup>176</sup> From the debates of the First Congress of Komala, page 442.

<sup>177</sup> The Crisis and Branches in Komala, a lecture to the Marx Society of London, March 2001.

*the spring of 1981, Komala was faced with another political problem, the identity crisis, and proposing of the viewpoints famous to one and two. The Democrat party understood this situation, and during this time escalated propaganda against Komala, around that the organization does not have a program and statute and it's not clear what the policy is and what it is. On behalf of the left, the Peykar and the Fadai Khalq guerrillas put pressure on the Komala to discuss the future of the armed struggle, the national issue, the program and the constitution and.....”<sup>178</sup>*

In 1980, Komala was suffering greatly from a lack of political knowledge and theoretical poverty, even in comparison with the other currents of the left of capital. Despite its numerical growth and influence in Kurdish society, it still lacked a statute and a programme and it functioned like a circle. In 1980, in a very poor internal theoretical publication and via its “Viewpoint One” and “Viewpoint Two”, it tried to give, at the very least, some coherence to its disadvantaged position and it also proposed its draft statute. Political confusion and the lack of the least amount of uniformity of consistency throughout this so-called theoretical pamphlet can be seen as we look at some of the text.

For Komala, the political superstructure that followed the developments of 1979 (and in certain other circumstances) that took the form of the clergy of Islam is not evaluated as bourgeois but has its roots in feudal relations of production. Although this appears to be show the poverty of Komala’s knowledge, in reality this assessment demonstrates that Komala belonged to the left of capital and did so in order to respond to the specific circumstances of the Kurdish community at that time. The fundamental question is why the ideology of Maoism can be a superstructure of society in China, why Stalinist ideology could have been

---

<sup>178</sup> Evaluation of battles and branches of the worker-communism in Iran, part 3, Majid Hosseini, 18th January 2008

the superstructure of the Eastern bloc countries, why Nazi ideology could have been the ideological superstructure of Germany in the late 1930s and early 1940s yet the Islamic clergy, a special form of ideology, cannot be the political superstructure of Iranian society? Komala writes:

*“The roots of the emergence and evolution of the clergy can only be conceived within this relationship [feudal relations of production] (pre-feudal relations, namely slavery, is not meant because the discussion is on the bourgeois or non-bourgeois nature of the clergy, and the purpose is proving clerical dependence on production before the mode of production of capitalism).”<sup>179</sup>*

All the efforts of Komala that were in this direction were in opposition to the clergy and, at its head, the bourgeois Khomeini. The bourgeois leadership of Iran was struggling around the clock to restart the bourgeois apparatus in the process of accumulation of capital. However, because of the disorder that occurred during the revolutionary struggles, the demands of the Khomeini were not to be evaluated as bourgeois:

*“Khomeini’s demands are not essentially bourgeois, but an attempt to preserve the institutions and independence of the interests of the clergy, which is itself related to the construction of feudal relations.”<sup>180</sup>*

After much preparation, the underground class of the leader of the bourgeoisie of Iran, Khomeini, was eventually evaluated as petty-bourgeois, although, of course, with feudal tendencies and imagination. The petty-bourgeoisie can also show opposite tendencies. The criminal Khomeini was seen as being neither reactionary nor bourgeois nor

---

<sup>179</sup> The internal theoretical journal of Komala, page 54.

<sup>180</sup> The internal theoretical journal of Komala - Page 57

counter-revolutionary but was only reduced to having reactionary petty-bourgeois tendencies:

*“Khomeini gradually became the main element among the clergy... around himself has pseudo-fascist Phalanges Hezbollah factions that do not turn away from anything. The reactionary and even feudal fantasies exists in her ideology. We know that the petty bourgeoisie can have diverse tendencies, from the extreme left to the reactionary right. Khomeini represents the reactionary tendencies of the petty bourgeoisie.”*<sup>181</sup>

Finally, after evaluating Khomeini as being non-bourgeois in nature, Komala described its four-class and Maoist theory as the class composition in relation to the events of 1979. The interesting point is that under the Maoist four-class view, only the national bourgeoisie forms the ranks of the revolution and the “comprador bourgeoisie” is usually placed in the counter-revolutionary camp. However, Komala apparently ignored its four-class theory and declared that even parts of the comprador bourgeoisie had joined the revolutionary line-up (the opposition). It stated:

*“To understand the nature of the new ruling class, must first consider the composition of the "opposition" classes in the time of the Shah...Not only the tailors masses, not only the petty-bourgeois masses, but also the modest, non-bureaucratic bourgeoisie, and even parts of the comprador bourgeoisie, were joined to the lineup of the opposition.”*<sup>182</sup>

Komala also divided Iran’s sovereignty into bourgeois and petty-bourgeois and viewed the clergy as forming the petty-bourgeois faction,

---

<sup>181</sup> The internal theoretical journal of Komala - Page 72

<sup>182</sup> The internal theoretical journal of Komala - Page 68

which was, of course, in the service of the dependent capitalism. We will pass on the way in which this contradicts the theory of feudal relations but the fundamental question is, does not the political superstructure reflect the infrastructure of a society? Can the petty-bourgeoisie constitute state sovereignty? The logical consequence of such a thought was that in Iran, the mode of production was both bourgeois and petty-bourgeois. In other words, we are faced with a new kind of mode of production in human history, the petty-bourgeois mode of production. Komala expressed its nonsenses as follows:

*“Between the two [sovereignty] factions the bourgeoisie and the petty-bourgeoisie, there were contradictions from the beginning ... The ruling clergy can not be anything but an agent of dependent capitalism and the entire governing body, except for the consolidation of the dependent capitalist regime and the rebuilding and development of its repressive machine can not do anything else.”<sup>183</sup>*

It is an irrefutable fact that the periphery of the bourgeois is often unable to deliver its demands with its class ideology and it, therefore, seeks to dress up Marxism to achieve independence, economic development and democracy and it expresses its demands using the language of the left. This issue is not specific to Iran and it can clearly be seen in other countries. Komala also clearly displayed this attitude. During the first presidential election, most of the Third Line currents boycotted the election but because of the self-determination in much of the Mojahedin's demands, Komala supported Rajavi's candidacy. Majid Husseini, a former leader of Komala, explained the reason for the adoption of this policy by the then leader of Komala:

---

<sup>183</sup> The internal theoretical journal of Komala - Page 74



*“Supporting Massoud Rajavi's candidacy on behalf of Komala because the Mojahedin had accepted a number of autonomous demands was another example of the manifestation of nationalism, and was the type of response of the leadership of the organization in those years.”*<sup>184</sup>

Over time, the Stalinism within Komala overcame the Maoism and, during those years, Komala was closely associated with other trends within the Third Line. Yet despite this, Komala was theoretically one of the most backward currents within the Third Line. It represented a kind of radical pragmatism from the horizon of the Third Line in Kurdistan, which has been able to attract the protesting and young generation of the Kurdish community. The opinion of one of the former leaders of Komala in relation to the positions, views and theory during the time of Komala is as follows:

*“From a formal and theoretical point of view, Komala represented the most backward section of populism (Maoist) in Iran.”*<sup>185</sup>

In April 1981, Komala held its Second Congress in order to rethink its intellectual turmoil and to at least provide theoretical coherence. As we have previously stated, Komala presented its views in “Viewpoint One” and “Viewpoint Two” through its internal publications, which reflects Komala’s theoretical poverty even in comparison with the other currents on the left of capital. The Komala Congress did not have the theoretical ability or the opportunity to respond to the problems it faced and to provide independent standpoints. Hence, in practice, it saw taking up the position of a radical phrase group of the left of capital as a way out, i.e., the positions of the Unity of Communist Militants. By accepting these

---

<sup>184</sup> Evaluation of battles and branches of the worker-communism in Iran, part 3, Majid Hosseini, 18<sup>th</sup> January 2008

<sup>185</sup> As above

positions, Komala effectively delayed its crisis, in other words, its crisis was tied to the crisis of revolutionary Marxism. However, the resolutions of the Second Congress of Komala were also highly heterogeneous, which could be a reflection of its internal contradictions as well as a reflection of the protest generation within it. Komala's adoption of revolutionary Marxism was justified thus:

*"Continuing and ultimately it, with accepting the view of revolutionary Marxism at the Second Congress of the Komala on behalf of this organization, the spring of 1981, the last barrages of resistance of populism were left behind. This action of Komala kicked off the obstacles and left in Iran more than any other period closed to each other."*<sup>186</sup>

Before proceeding with the discussion, it should be noted that there is no possibility of the formation of a revolutionary faction from within the left of capital. There are theoretical reasons for this and, therefore, it should not be reduced to technical issues. In contrast, the possibility of the loss of peoples and the orientation of the circles to the internationalist position is possible. An example of this is the crisis in the Italian section of the Communist Party of Italy, which was influenced by the internationalist positions and by the militants accepting the internationalist positions. We will mention this issue in the section on left-communism. As we explained earlier, the resolutions of the Second Congress of Komala were heterogeneous and contradictory. On a particularly critical issue, the national issue, the Congress adopted the unconventional position of the left of capital, which could be a reflection of inner controversy. Majid Hosseini explained this as follows:

---

<sup>186</sup> Evaluation of battles and branches of the worker-communism in Iran, part 3, Majid Hosseini, 18<sup>th</sup> January 2008

*“By accepting the revolutionary Marxism viewpoint, Komala could go bypass the currents of the so-called third line and politically placed in a more offensive and supportive position. But the congress stepped back in addressing the national issue. In the resolution saying that the Kurd issue, the National issue, is related to the bourgeoisie, and the proletariat should not practice in it, and the national issue is solved in socialism. This apparently left position was righteous, non-practice and subjective, and brought immediate societal and practical consequences for Komala.”<sup>187</sup>*

During the Second Congress, Komala announced that the national struggle in Kurdistan was not a continuation of the conscious struggle of the working class and was not in keeping with the communist agenda but was a national struggle that had been established as a consequence of the specific conditions in Kurdistan. This struggle would not bring about a change in the relations of production. In other words, the struggle for national liberation is within the range of bourgeois movements and cannot be viewed with the horizons of class struggle. The resolution of the Second Congress states:

*“Set up the resistance movement [the national struggle in Kurdistan] has not been the continuation of the conscious struggle and was not according to the program of the working class. This movement has developed and continues in certain concrete conditions ... This movement can not conquer the victory of the bourgeoisie in the sense of changing relations Production in the Kurdistan Region.”<sup>188</sup>*

---

<sup>187</sup> Evaluation of battles and branches of the worker-communism in Iran, part 3, Majid Hosseini, 18<sup>th</sup> January 2008

<sup>188</sup> Resolutions of the Second Congress of Komala, page 21.

Komala's Second Congress considered that the elimination of national oppression would only be possible with the realization of socialism. This position is not in line with the criteria and framework of the left of capital. The Congress also considered eliminating national oppression through the realization of the proletarian programme:

*"The elimination of national oppression is ultimately possible by the right of self-determination for the oppressed peoples of Iran only through the realization of the socialist program of the proletariat."*<sup>189</sup>

In respect to the national issue, the second resolution of the Congress did, in fact, question Komala's activities and operations. In other words, the implementation of this clause in the resolution of the Second Congress required a fundamental change in the functioning and political life of Komala, the majority of whose activities were summed up as guerrilla warfare (national issue). On the one hand, this presented a serious problem for Komala's activists and for Komala's identity, which was summarized as national liberation, and, on the other hand, the lack of importance given to national liberation and guerrilla warfare among Komala's rivals in the struggle for national independence would strengthen the Democratic Party of Kurdistan. Following Komala's Second Congress, its contact with the UCM becomes more serious.

*"However, this Congress [the Second Congress] turned to the left a lot and solving the national problem entirely postponed to socialism, which resulted in many problems for the organization and its cadres that brought forward propaganda activities. The rejection of the national issue in this form, and its postponement to socialism, brought about a kind of austerity and frustration in the*

---

<sup>189</sup> As above

*Komala ranks, and virtually gave this field to the Democratic Party [of Kurdistan]. Contact with the unity of Communist militants was the only thing that could have pushed Komala away.”<sup>190</sup>*

Mansoor Hekmat was definitely very happy with the fact that the opinions of his anonymous group had reached the ears of Komala. At that time, Komala had established a bureau, an office and military forces that represented the radicalism of the left of capital and it became one of the actors in the Kurdistan issue. However, Mansoor Hekmat was more clever than optimistic about the resolution of the Second Congress of Komala in relation to the national issue. He could have predicted that this resolution would question the existential philosophy of Komala. The forces of Komala, the facilities of Komala, the identity of Komala and so on, were of great importance for the long-term goals of Mansoor Hekmat. Mansour Hekmat evaluated the resolution on the national issue incorrectly and, instead, preached the routine position of the left of capital. In connection with the meeting held between Komala and the UCM, we read:

*“Zhoobin [Mansoor Hekmat] at the meeting expressed his satisfaction with the orientation of the Second Congresses and the turn to the left of Komala and called it an important event in the communist movement, but he criticized the turning more to the left on this congress, including the postponement of a national solution to socialism. According to Zhoobin [Mansour Hekmat], the national question was a real ting, and putting it on socialism and pacifist approach to it was a political mistake, opening the way for the Democratic Party [of Kurdistan] and will isolating Komala.”<sup>191</sup>*

---

<sup>190</sup> *Biography of Mansoor Hekmat* by Soheila Sharifi - Page 34

<sup>191</sup> As above

Komala was apparently unaware of the consequences when it issued its congressional resolution and it was now caught up in a predicament. Using the radical phrase positions of the left of capital, Mansoor Hekmat saved Komala from this predicament and blocked the radicalization of criticisms of the national issue from within Komala. Following the meeting between Komala and the UCM, Komala called for an extraordinary conference that has become known as the 6th Conference. In a resolution at that conference, Komala corrected its earlier position in relation to the national issue and stated that the elimination of national oppression was only possible with the realization of socialism. Thus, it wrongly regained the position of the left of capital. This shift in positions was explained as follows:

*“Following these tapes, Komala’s leadership immediately called for an extraordinary conference, known as the 6th Conference, in which it issued a resolution that corrected the mistakes of the Second Congresses.”<sup>192</sup>*

On the one hand, the positional and theoretical poverty of Komala was on the same scale as the left of capital and, on the other hand, the leaders of Komala knew that in the long term, its practices would have to change. Continuing their activities, which meant playing the role of the important actor in Kurdistan and the region, required change in its organizational form in order to overcome its shortcomings. In such a situation, the formation of the Communist Party makes sense for Komala. Komala’s opinion on the contexts of the formation and the concepts of the Communist Party was even more backward and more mechanical than other currents of the left of capital. The development of the programme of the Communist Party was a major problem—the preparation of social

---

<sup>192</sup> *Biography of Mansoor Hekmat* by Soheila Sharifi - Page 34

conditions, the evolution of the class struggle and the issue of building the party were reduced to the drafting of the programme. Komala wrote:

*“In the current circumstances, the main ring for the creation of the party is the formulation of the program. Any kind of giving priority to the problem of linking the program [to the class] and even the eclecticism of the program and the link [to the class] a sign of limited understanding, economistic and non-dialectical understanding. In our view, the process of codifying the program is at the same time, the process of expansion and deepening link [to the class], the process of expanding and deepening revolutionary practice.”<sup>193</sup>*

Due to its extreme theoretical poverty, Komala was not able to formulate a programme that would be well-received by the tendencies of the radical phrases of the left of capital and, therefore, it logically presented the UCM programme of a proposed programme for the Communist Party of Iran. Mansoor Hekmat was to be responsible for any minor changes that needed to be made. We will return to these minor changes that would make the Communist Party programme more capital-friendly. The adoption of the UCM programme as a draft programme for the Communist Party of Iran is described as follows:

*“The correct and timely encounter of the unity of communist militants attracted more trust of the leadership of the Komala and a wider range of its cadres. After the sixth conference round of discussion over the program, the proposed program of the unity of the Communist militants to form the party was seriously planned in the Komala organization. The joint meeting of the Central Committee of the Komala and the unity of communist militants was*

---

<sup>193</sup> Resolutions of the Second Congress of Komala. Page 24

*held, it was decided the program that unity of communist militants had been prepared and had already been acquired by Komala and many other leftist organizations, being the basis for the drafting of the new common program of Komala and the unity of communist militants, and Mansoor Hekmat took responsibility on the writing of the new text.*”<sup>194</sup>

Finally, in May of the 1982, Komala held its Third Congress. With the approval of the programme of the Communist Party, this Congress paved the way for the formation of a new organization under name of the Communist Party of Iran. The Communist Party of Iran hosted its constituent assembly in one of the Kurdistan villages under the rule of Komala, thus declaring its existence. Those who have listened to the audio-tapes of the founding congressional are aware of the sounds of various kinds of animals in the background. If this style for holding the founding congress was welcomed by the Maoist because it expresses their strength and reflects their belonging to the village and the peasants (which is the main force of their revolution), it was alien to the radical phrase Stalinist currents who evaluated society as capitalist and also to other similar traditions on the left of capital. Extending the flag of Stalinism in one of the villages under the control of Komala is explained as follows:

*“In the course of almost five years of continuous and determined struggle for revolutionary Marxism in removing the theoretical and practical obstacles that has been in the way for the establishment of the Communist Party in Iran ...The Communist Party of Iran in the continuing of that achievements and by relying on those class barriers that formed revolutionary Marxism from the beginning*

---

<sup>194</sup> Evaluation of battles and branches of the worker-communism in Iran, part 3, Majid Hosseini, 18th January 2008



*and on the context of the Iranian revolution, one after another was to conquer the proletariat of Iran. The history of the formation of this party is the history of conquering these barricades. Crashing the narrow-minded and Short-sighted views of the petty-bourgeoisie claiming Marxism and the promotion and consolidation of proletarian critique of capital and imperialism among a large section of the pioneer of the communist movement of Iran in the first years after the uprising, to raise the independent flag of the proletariat in a mass revolutionary movement to the wide of the Kurdish peoples movement and its leadership and organizing under this flag and compilation and presentation of theoretical principles and the political aims and slogans of the proletariat in the form of a communist program ....These are all the solid foundation stone and foundations and the stableness that gave revolutionary Marxism in Iran the historical opportunity and possibility to establish the Communist Party of Iran on September 2, 1983.*"<sup>195</sup>

The founding congress of the Communist Party of Iran emphasized that revolutionary Marxism was not just a theoretical movement but that the Iranian Communist Party includes forces that, in the past and currently, have had a live and massive revolution on their agenda. In other words, the goal of forming the Communist Party of Iran was to organize a vibrant and massive revolution. The Party was supposed to be the headquarters of the revolutionary command that would lead to a democratic revolution. How, after decades, do the heirs of what we will refer to as "the anti-Communist Party of Iran" respond to these demagogueries? Like the bourgeois parties, through agitation and

---

<sup>195</sup> Announcement of the Founding Congress and the first plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Iran, 15 September 1983.

propaganda, the new party strove to pretend to be a suitable vessel for the protesting forces within society:

*“But revolutionary Marxism of Iran was not just a theoretical movement, and the Communist Party of Iran was built on the path of a communist revolutionaries, and now it has embraced forces that, in the past and present, have organized and led a huge live revolution on their orders. If the absence of an independent proletarian party made a decisive victory to the Iranian revolution impossible, the growth and deepening of the proletarian and revolutionary movement against the most brutal and massive invasion of the bourgeoisie beholden to the work of revolutionary Marxists which the Communist Party of Iran represents and encompasses them. The revolutionary Marxist who today is the ranks of the Communist Party of Iran was the forces that ...did not go back one step of the struggling to form the Communist Party of Iran and finally in the revolutionary Kurdistan, in the head of the earth, freed and protected by the forces of the masses and in advance, founded the Communist Party of Iran.”*<sup>196</sup>

By forming the anti-Communist Party of Iran, a party that was built on the ruins of the defeat of the class struggle, a party whose formation was a barrier to any radical critique of the left of capital, the complete ideological and organizational breakdown of the socialists of Iran—from nationalist and populist traditions - was announced. This was a party whose main force consisted of the nationalist and populist movement (Kurdish National Movement).

---

<sup>196</sup> Declaration of the Founding Congress of the Communist Party of Iran

*“The formation of the CPI marked the final ideological and organizational break of Iranian socialism from the nationalist and populist tradition.”<sup>197</sup>*

The basic question that comes to the mind of each truth seeker is this, after all this agitation, after the breakup of populism, after raising the independent flag of the proletariat, after the formation of the headquarters of the great and vibrant revolution, will the programme of the Communist Party of Iran fulfil the goals of the proletariat? The Communist Party believed that the conscious proletariat, which had now established its revolutionary headquarters in the Communist Party of Iran, could not immediately achieve a socialist revolution but must first seek a democratic revolution—the theme of the democratic revolution was also realized in the Party’s minimum programme. The programme of the anti-Communist Party states:

*“In such a situation the proletariat and the communist party of it cannot do an immediate socialist revolution ... The political and economic content of the victory of the democratic revolution is the realization of the minimum program of the proletariat.*

- The direct participation of people in the administration of the country, the strict abolition of the election of governors, prefects, and mayors by the government, the election of these officials at all levels by the people and their cancellation whenever a majority of electors decide.*
- ensuring the safety and health of the workplace and reducing workplace hazards to the minimum possible, regardless of profitable considerations, monitoring regular medical examinations against the risks and diseases caused by the type of work at the expense of employers and the state,*

---

<sup>197</sup> Left Nationalism and Working Class Communism

- *Supplying welfare and cultural needs in the work environment and residential areas of the community, such as auditoriums, rest rooms, dining, bathrooms and toilets, land and gyms, nurseries and kindergartens, clinics, libraries and adult literacy classes at a cost Employers and government*
- *Set up a dispute resolution court with a jury consisting of elected representatives of the workers for arbitration in cases of dispute between the worker and the employer. The cost of forming courts should be entirely up to the employers.*
- *confiscation and nationalization of foreign and domestic monopoly capital,*
- *Control the democratic councils of the people on foreign trade,*
- *Provision for a progressive taxation of inheritance and property, and on the income derived from the ownership of the means of production and exchange*
- *In a situation where the provision of minimum livelihoods and welfare requires to the workers to provide round the clock, burdensome and onerous work that destroys their health and well-being and deprivation them from possibility and opportunity of spiritual growth and raise their level of political and class consciousness, we are for supply of the comfort and material well-being of the workers and in order to protect the working class from physical and psychological deterioration and increasing their ability to struggle for the definitive release of the oppression and exploitation of capitalism, we want realization of the following points to all workers:*
  - *Reduced weekly work to a maximum of 40 hours and a minimum of two consecutive days per week for each worker;*
  - *Reducing the maximum retirement age to 55 years*
  - *Reducing the working days of breastfeeding mothers to 7 hours.”*

Most of this nonsense (albeit not all) will be realized in countries with bourgeois democracies but the demands made in some such countries are greater than those set out in the programme of the anti-Communist Party of Iran. For example, some Western European countries have a 37-hour working week, as opposed to the 40-hour requirement of the Communist Party of Iran, and new mothers are entitled to a year or more of maternity with a salary, yet wage slavery continues across the globe, including in the so-called capitalist heaven. The improvement in some conditions in Western bourgeois democracies is in line with the benefits of capital accumulation because despite these conditions, private ownership of the means of production, namely, the capitalist dictatorship, makes life hell even in the paradise of capital for wage slaves.

The fact is that the left-wing of the bourgeoisie has a periphery in which it can express its desires, the left-wing guise that looks for a conventional bourgeois democracy that is in keeping with the accumulation of capital. In this sense, the announcements of the choices of governor, prefects, mayor, etc., are akin to those of a bourgeois democracy rather than a communist society. The selection or even the dismissal in a general election of each of these representatives maintains the foundations of bourgeois society. The emptying of the concept of communism and its presentation within a capitalist-friendly image was the form taken in the agitation of the anti-Communist Party. Their propaganda is no more than demagoguery.

The dictatorship of the proletariat, that is, the exercise of sovereignty of the workers through the global councils, with the right to vote and rights over the dismissal and the installation of governors, mayors, etc., namely, the bourgeois democracy, varies and expresses two different types of social system.

For Mansoor Hekmat, the function of the left of capital, which is in line with the needs of capital, can adopt different procedures and forms in accordance with the needs of capital. This relates to the history of the workers' movement and he states that when parties want to appear as

social forces they turn to the right. In contrast, Mansoor Hekmat states that his current was among the few communist organizations since the Bolsheviks who wanted to be a mass party on the basis of radicalism and maximalism:

*“Historically whenever Left parties have wanted to become social forces and to assert themselves on a social scale, they have turned to the right. And they have justified this shift to the right by claiming that society is even further to the right, so if they want votes, they have to make a turn to the right. And, of course, historically they have failed in this. Some representative of a radical Left party may get into parliament for a spell, but in the next round he or she will be sent home packing. We are among the few communist organisations since the Bolsheviks who want to become mass parties on the basis of our radicalism and maximalism.”<sup>198</sup>*

We now return to the issue of the scale of Mansoor Hekmat’s turn to the right, the concept of the left of capital and the demagoguery of this ideologue of the bourgeoisie. The UCM claimed that it was the only group that did not turn either left or right, the only group that was communist. This is, of course, a lie and in a publication of April 1981, we read the following:

*“in this kind of circumstances:*

*14) Reducing the maximum retirement age to 50 years*

*17) Reducing the working day of breastfeeding mothers to 6 hours.”*

---

<sup>198</sup> Party and Society: From a pressure group to a political party

Yet, two years later, when the UCM tried to appear as social force, in the programme of the anti-Communist Party which was actually the programme of the UCM - Mansoor Hekmat was responsible for the “minor” changes that effectively turned the above demands to the right and he did so on the same scale as the bourgeois parties:

- *“Reducing the maximum retirement age to 55 years*
- *Reducing the working day of breastfeeding mothers to 7 hours.”*

This form of demagoguery is based on lies and has no principles, like all other bourgeois currents it is part of the tradition of this anti-communist movement. Slurring the proletarian and communist values has been one of the masterpieces of this radical phrase and capital friendly current.

In order to attract the radical forces towards themselves and, on the other hand, to prevent any radicalization of criticisms to the left of capital, in forming a cumulative assembly under the name of the Communist Party of Iran the ideologues of this anti-communist organization declared that the currents of communism in Iran were divided into two distinct elements: the Communist Party of Iran and the revisionist enemies of the Communist Party:

*“Now as far as goes back to Iran, the division of the currents claiming of Communism into two distinct parts, the Communist Party of Iran and the revisionist enemies of the Communist Party, have been developed into a visible phenomenon.”<sup>199</sup>*

Years later, Mansour Hekmat, the ideological leader of worker-communism, stated that the Communist Party of Iran was a confluence of

---

<sup>199</sup> *Communist*, No. 15, December 1984

different political and social trends. There were three lines in the Communist Party that expressed class membership and movement. Of the three lines - the right, the centre and the left - as a member of the working class, Mansoor Hekmat belonged to the left-wing tendency and he stated:

*“The basic discussion we have made in that party since then is that the Communist Party of Iran is confluence with various political and social trends, and we have named these tendencies ... we see three lines ... The Communist Party of Iran in a historical material process was broken down due to the political situation and because of the class and divisional differences it contained.”*<sup>200</sup>

Finally, after a lot of demagoguery about raising the flag of independence of the working class, the revolutionaries who founded the headquarters of the great and present revolution (which aimed to lead and organize the great revolution) and the development of the communist forces were split into the Communist Party and the revisionist enemies of the Communist Party and we heard from the leader that this was merely part of the agitation of the propaganda machine. In fact, the formation of the Communist Party occurred as a result of a compromise and has since been tied to that compromise in all of its actions and activities. This issue is explained as follows:

*“In this plenum [the second plenum of communist party of Iran] about the founding congress of the [Iranian Communist Party] and providing it, Mansoor Hekmat says: ‘The founder's congress has a compromise, until its determination date, until its next actions, until its announcement, until its aftermath, until its mode of operation is fully sealed of compromising.’ a few sentences continue: ‘as soon as*

---

<sup>200</sup> The Crisis and Branches in Komala, a lecture to the Marx Society of London, March 2001.



*the debate was to be deeply, annoyance come.’ and ‘We came forward with compromise, but we should not make compromise as principles.’ At the same meeting, in the explanation of the distance between the word and the action says: ‘in between words to the action located of other classes’.*”<sup>201</sup>

---

<sup>201</sup> Evaluation of battles and branches of the worker-communism in Iran, part 3, Majid Hosseini, 18<sup>th</sup> January 2008

## **Bundism and the special rights of Komala**

The history of the workers' movement is the expression of the interests of the entire class, thus, the advancement of the interests of a particular group within the working class contradicts the nature and objectives of the working class. Yet, with all this, groups of the working class have tried to advance their own interests despite the fact that the advancement of the interests of an independent group is alien to working class traditions. One obvious example of this is Bundism. The General Union of Jewish Workers (the Bund) was formed in 1897 and, which involved workers from Russia, Poland and Lithuania. The Union joined the Russian Social-Democratic Party during its First Congress in 1898. In 1903, during the Second Congress of the Social-Democratic Party of Russia, the Bundists demanded that they be recognized as representatives of the Jewish workers of Russia and that they functioned as a special group of Jewish workers. The Congress rejected this request because it was not in line with the interests and class unity of all workers. As a consequence, the Bundists left the party.

As previously explained, Komala was able to set up an office and a force in Kurdistan and became one of the actors of the nationalist issue in Kurdistan. Mansoor Hekmat knew that providing Komala with a radical role in the Kurdish movement would not produce a targeted and radical assessment of Komala. Thus, Komala could not have been a flag for the formation of the Communist Party of Iran because it would first have to change its nature to become proletarian. Therefore, Mansoor Hekmat argued that relations within the Kurdish community, as in other parts of Iran, were capitalist (this is quite true) and that two social classes were influential in the social developments of that society. Therefore, the Democratic Party of Kurdistan represents the Kurdish bourgeoisie and Komala represents a proletarian force. In this regard, Mansoor Hekmat

advised that the identification of Komala as a proletarian force should be considered as one of the central tasks of the communists. He wrote:

*“In the field of propaganda, the attention and activity of the communists must mainly focus on explaining the pivotal political issues and the real prospects of this movement and in identifying the Komala as the proletarian and pioneering force in the resistance movement [Kurdish national movement].”*<sup>202</sup>

The first step was the introduction of Komala as a proletarian force in the political milieu that was supposed to serve as the next step. The next step was to gain support from Komala and especially the base forces of Komala. Mansoor Hekmat was aware of the national struggle and the role that Komala played in the Kurdish Autonomy Movement, especially during the various meetings that had been held with the Komala forces prior to the formation of the Communist Party of Iran. It was during these meetings that Mansoor Hekmat posited the “special rights of Komala” and convinced the participants that the position of Komala would increase rather than reduce, for example, by promoting it as the national defender of the proletarian militant! Mansoor Hekmat knew that the phenomenon of “special ethnic rights” not only does not exist in the history of the communist and workers’ tradition but is also in opposition to the proletarian principles that defend the interests of the whole class. However, Mansoor Hekmat belonged to a different tradition, a bourgeois tradition in which deals and compromises are natural and are in line with class interests. Mansoor Hekmat assessed this as a tactical compromise against the pressure of nationalism and he believed that it was necessary in order to strengthen communism. This compromise and capitalist-friendly innovation of Mansoor Hekmat is explained as follows:

---

<sup>202</sup> Notes on the Communist Propaganda Tasks in Relation to the Revolutionary Movement of People of Kurdistan.

*“In the winter of 1983, a seminar was held under the title of the Northern Primary Seminar in Kurdistan, in which Mansoor Hekmat presented his theses on the theory of the formation of the party and the concrete way of doing it in Iran ... One of the discussions of this seminar was on National Movement and the role of Komala in the coming days of the formation of the Communist Party, which led to the adoption of a document known as the special rights of Komala in the founding congress of the Communist Party of Iran .... Mansour Hekmat defended the argument of the special rights of Komala and convinced the participants that it was necessary to recognize these special rights in view of the characteristics of the resistance movement in Kurdistan and strengthening Komala against its nationalist rivals such as the Democratic Party [of Kurdistan]. He was aware of this that this is a kind of compromise against the pressure of nationalism on Komala and the communist movement, but tacitly, it was a necessary and true compromise.”<sup>203</sup>*

Before focusing attention on the special rights of Komala, it is also necessary to mention that during the constituent congress of the Communist Party of Iran, Mansoor Hekmat and the UCM had still not established their position and that they soon backed down against the position of Komala, thus taking leverage of the Party at the right time. It was in keeping with this context that Abdullah Mohtadi, one of the cadres of Komala, was elected to the position of First Secretary General of the Communist Party at its founding congress. This tribute to Komala is explained as follows:

*“The founding congress [of the Communist Party of Iran] ... elected Abdullah Mohtadi as the first secretary general of the*

---

<sup>203</sup> *Biography of Mansoor Hekmat* by Soheila Sharifi - page 44

*party, and this was the most controversial and in the opinion of the opposing people it was giving tribute to the pressures of nationalism within the Komala, which tried to keep Komala untouched as far as possible from the aliens!’’<sup>204</sup>*

After the formation of the Communist Party of Iran and the election of Abdullah Mohtadi as its General Secretary, it was time for the ideological ceremony to present the election of the new leader of Komala. As with the bourgeois parties, the introduction of the ideological symbol of the party is the responsibility of the leader. Abdullah Mohtadi spoke to the members of Komala telling them that nothing important had happened: I am the Secretary General of the Party and Komala makes up the majority of the Party’s members. Mansoor Hekmat provided a better explanation for the selection of General Secretary Abdullah Mohtadi:

*“When the party was formed, Secretary-General Abdullah Mehtadi spoke to all that nothing important has happened. See, I am the secretary general of the party and see that Kamala has the majority of the members of this organization. He was responding to a pessimistic.”<sup>205</sup>*

With these explanations, we return to the special rights for Komala. It is interesting to note that with demagoguery, giving tribute to a national group induces the removal of barriers to the path of the universal unity of the proletariat. Apparently, the proletariat of Iran achieves universality not in its place of work or in its social life but in the camps of Komala where it does not have even the smallest amount of class power. Marxist and proletarian concepts, principles and values are drained into slime and the

---

<sup>204</sup> *Biography of Mansoor Hekmat* by Soheila Sharifi - page 47

<sup>205</sup> Crisis and Branches in Komala, Mansour Hekmat.

special rights of a national group are spoken of as Marxist principles. Let us examine some of the special rights of Komala.

*“This part of the statute that formulated on the basis of the views of the revolutionary Marxism on the national question and the principled Marxist approach to the obstacles that this issue has to the universal unity of the proletariat, is explained with precise and clear manner on the basis and necessity of the special rights of the Kurdistan part of the Communist Party of Iran and on this basis defines the position of the Komala in the Communist Party of Iran. Article II: Komala personality can be do:*

- 1. Establish and adopt the position, policies and slogans of the proletarian Kurdistan on the national issue and determine and approve the right of self-determination to the Kurdish nation.*
- 3. To name of yourself and in relation to the interests and issues of the people of Kurdistan, to attend the international level and internationally authorities and make the necessary decisions.*
- 7. Determining and setting its tactics in the direction of continuing or defeating a revolutionary war of the people of Kurdistan against the central government. If necessary, enter into negotiations with the central government on issues related to the demands of the people of Kurdistan, and wherever the interests of the movement of the people of Kurdistan Movement, signing the necessary conventions.*
- 8. Organize and lead the revolutionary sovereignty in Kurdistan at all levels. Determine the participation way of itself in the highest organs of sovereignty stemming from the victory of the People's Movement of Kurdistan.”*<sup>206</sup>

---

<sup>206</sup> The Constitution of the Communist Party of Iran.

Earlier, we explained that giving special privileges to a particular ethnic group is in opposition to the nature and objectives of the workers' movement, rather, the interests of the whole working class must be considered. Bundism and the Second Congress of the Social-Democratic Party of Russia lie within the historical memory of the workers' movement. Special privileges or special rights are alien to the tradition of the internationalists and the communists and if, as a result of the influence of the bourgeois ideology of a particular group of the working class, one element gains privileges, the communists and internationalists will certainly struggle against it.

Retaining common bourgeois traditions and agreeing to special ethnic rights also contrasts with the Marxist concept of the Party: when this occurs the Party loses its integrity and solidarity and becomes a federation.

On the basis of its special rights, Komala can be present at any international or regional institute in relation to the "people of Kurdistan" without having to conform to the positions of the Party and without being subject to Party control. No matter how much they may be in conflict with the interest of the proletariat, Komala is able to be a signatory to any convention that is in the interests of the people of Kurdistan. This cannot be seen as a problem for the anti-Communist Party of Iran! The fact that the national movements are the infantry in imperialist tensions and the signed conventions are part of the imperialist policies of the large and small gangsters is not a problem for the anti-Communist Party.

With its special rights, Komala may, if necessary, enter into negotiations with the central government on issues related to the "people of Kurdistan." We currently put aside the technical problems and the consequences that the negotiation with the central government would have had for Komala and note that the rival of Komala in the national movement, the Democratic Party of Kurdistan of Iran, paid a heavy price for this with the assassination of its leaders. Just look at the moral aspect of the issue. Imagine the summer of 1988 when the Islamic bourgeoisie

again launched a blood-bath and when Komala was negotiating with the Islamic bourgeoisie on issues relevant to the “people of Kurdistan.” On one side of the negotiating table were the butchers of the Islamic bourgeoisie and, on the other side, the representatives of the “people of Kurdistan” (Komala) who were bargaining (negotiating) for the interests of the “people of Kurdistan.” It is really disgusting!



## **Marxism or narcissism**

Marxism is the theory of the conditions for the release of wage slaves. Marxism is not dogma but is fluid and evolves with the evolution of capitalism and with the history of the labour movement and Marxists add to its richness. Great Marxists in the history of the labour movement and in the richness of Marxism have given immortal services to the labour movement. Marx, Engels, Lenin, Rosa Luxemburg, Bordiga and Pannekoek are just a few examples. These thinkers did not dream of becoming famous and Marxism is not a religion and does not make a fetish out of these thinkers. After the defeat of the wave of the world revolution and the triumph of Stalinism from the ruins of the October Revolution and after the death of Lenin, the counter-revolution with Stalin at its head was advancing along a path that would empty the revolutionary positions of Lenin. It began to produce a kind of ideology, a kind of religion and to transform Lenin's revolutionary theories into a kind of fetish. Under the name of Leninism and with the statue of Lenin, Stalin waged war on Lenin's revolutionary and communist ideas. Lenin is not depicted through his statues but through his revolutionary theories and proletarian battles.

Humans (and characters) are the product of their own social conditions and the phenomenon of the cult of personality is a product of a special need. The class society, in line with its own needs, creates a personality cult due to certain social conditions. For the ultimate victory of the counter-revolution from the ruins of the October Revolution, the formation of a particular kind of ideology that was embodied in the personality of Stalin was essential. Melding the supernatural with the ideological personality of the leader, a leader who has acquired the abilities of the "gods" and surrounds time and space. Ideologues of worker-communism have played a significant role in the formation of the cult of the personality within worker-communism (e.g., the personality

cult of Mansoor Hekmat). In this regard, we consider the conversation between Hamid Taghvaei and Mansoor Hekmat from the language of Hamid Taghvaei:

*“I said to Zhoobin that he was like Lenin. It was not just a joke, and I really saw similarities between his personality and Lenin, the sharpness, the clarity of the word, and the wilfulness was a distinctive feature of both. Zhoobin said, jokingly, you are probably also Trotsky. And then we started dreaming about that our homes will be museums in the future and [people] will come to see our little office. I was said people will surely say that Zhoobin and Hamid and others have been living and worked in these houses and this office. I joked around with my wife Mitra and I was said she should take notes of everything, because in the future, must with style of the wife of Lenin, Krupskaya, should be write my memories... None of us thought that one day the statue of Zhoobin would be raised in the Highgate cemetery of London opposite to the tomb of Marx.”<sup>207</sup>*

One of London’s tourist attractions is Highgate cemetery where Marx and his family were laid to rest. Not directly in front of Marx’s tomb, as the disciples of Mansoor Hekmat would have like, but a little bit further along, a small statue of Mansoor Hekmat has been installed. According to Hamid Taghvaei, those whose graves are closer to Marx’s tomb than the statue of Mansur Hekmat are more Marxist, more important and more well-known! Contrary to these ideological and religious ideas, Marx is embodied in communist consciousness. The phrase from Marx, which is carved on his tomb, is a true portrayal of this thinker of the proletariat: “Philosophers have only *interpreted* the world, in various ways. The point, however, is to *change* it”.

---

<sup>207</sup> *Biography of Mansoor Hekmat*, Soheila Sharifi, page 24.

In the second part of this article we explained that unlike the national leftists of today, such as the worker-communists, Sultanzadeh was an internationalist who believed in the world revolution. Mansoor Hekmat, with demagoguery and by aligning unrelated names, was, on the one hand, discrediting a great internationalist like Avetis Sultanzadeh and, on the other hand, resorting to the lie that their apparently second-hand Stalinist ideas had come from Europe. We have clearly explained all these lies in the previous sections. If we leave aside the above issues, Mansoor Hekmat scrambling to raise his position in the political milieu up to the level of Avetis Sultanzadeh:

*“You are going to look at Sultanzadeh and Haydar AmoOghli, and come forward to bring Jazenai, Ahmadzadeh and Pooyan and bring all their literature and put at a table and then [put literature] of the UCM and see what these said? The UCM from my point was the bridge that connected the communism of Iran to European communism, to the Marxist communism of the Western world.”<sup>208</sup>*

Because his anonymous group has found an ear and had become one of the main actors in the formation of an organization called the anti-Communist Party of Iran, Mansoor Hekmat took advantage of the situation and declared that their current was a reflection of the historic need of the global working class (!) and that their current (the UCM) is not an Iranian or Kurdish current but is part of a global movement. The demagoguery, the need for which appeared in different countries during this period, increased the necessity for their existence. Their current would first establish a communist party in Iran and then that communist party would create a new communist international. Would it have been the case that a few years after the communist international had been created by the anti-Communist Party of Iran the latter would have declared that it was a

---

<sup>208</sup> Oral History of the UCM, Mansoor Hekmat.

confluence of different social movements, all which had been stamped by compromise stamp?. What was the response of the ideologists of worker-communism to this nonsense of Mansoor Hekmat?

*“We are part of a global movement. We are not an Iranian, Tehranian or Kurdish current... our current reflects the historic needs of the global working class. The need that has appeared in different countries in this period... the communist party of Iran will make the communist international. Our current will create the communist party of Iran... Those comrades who were insistent that we instead of the duties of students abroad, they put forward the fundamental issue of internationalism on the agenda of Congress, [they] showed breadth of their opinion.”*<sup>209</sup>

The propaganda about the construction of the communist international continued but was more intrinsic. During the constitution of the foundation of the anti-Communist Party of Iran it is also announced that the Party would establish a new communist international, the headquarters of the fighter command of the international working class, alongside of the global elements of the world working class. It was supposed that on this occasion, the Party of Iran would play the role of the Bolshevik Party and this would lead to the formation of the International.

*“Our party can and should with the power of the revolutionary proletariat of Iran and alongside of the various parts of the world working class, on the context of the bankruptcy and the continuing decline of revisionism globally and the deadly economic crisis that has captured the capitalist world, to set up the combatant*

---

<sup>209</sup> Mansoor Hekmat’s report from the Central Committee of the UCM to the First Congress of the UCM, *Toward Socialism* No. 5, pages 22-24.

*headquarters of the working class, the new communist international.*”<sup>210</sup>

Following this, the propaganda machine of the new party announced that the new communist international would be created by the anti-Communist Party of Iran and that it was time to prepare the interior of the new party. In the internal relations of the new party, it was announced that in the international arena, the Communist Party had, if not millions, tens and hundreds of thousands of sympathizers and supporters and that the anti-communist party of Iran was so influential that it would be able to reverse the fortunes of the British trade union movement. The expression of such nonsense in inter-party relations represents the level of acceptance of such thoughts in the internal relations of the new party-relations that were more in keeping with an ideological or religious sect than with a bourgeois party.

*“One of the comrades of the spokesman on the tape says: ‘the communist party in the international arena, if not millions, but tens and hundreds of thousands!! of sympathizers and supporters.’... ‘For example, it was said in a banner that our party would be able to reverse British multi-year Trade-Unionism.’”*<sup>211</sup>

After his promotion to leader, in a lecture entitled, “Will Communism win in Iran?”, Mansoor Hekmat suggested to his disciples that they were important and key figures within the community and he told them that they could not have authority of their own country, the country where they had grown up or where they had perhaps organized hundreds of thousands of community elites. The organization of hundreds

---

<sup>210</sup> Declaration of the Founding Congress of the Communist Party of Iran.

<sup>211</sup> About the Organizational Changes of the Organization of Sympathizers of the Communist Party of Iran Abroad, pages 7 and 35.

of thousands of other elites in the community is not exaggerated but is a clear lie in the pursuit of its goals. This is an ideological system and shows adherence to the leader. The Mujahedin was the only current of the opposition that held meetings with audiences of 100,000 people (or several hundred thousand people) in Tehran. If the figures provided by Mansoor Hekmat were correct, he could have had the same credibility as the Mujahedin. Mansoor Hekmat claimed that people within the Worker-communist Party of Iran had better abilities than the ministers and lawyers to manage the community. Of course, in the following sections we will see that these highly educated, competent and capable people were not capable of being in line with the positions of worker-communism! The emphasis of the leaders of worker-communism, the elites, the ministers, the lawyers and so on, was the humiliation of the working class. The real translation of the brilliant words of the leader of worker-communism is based on the further rumination of the cerebral secretions of the other ideologues of the bourgeoisie, which suggest that intelligent people enjoy great opportunities in the society because of their education and effort whereas less talented and lazy people eventually form the ranks of the working class. Mansour Hekmat said:

*“Mr. Khatami can do the dialogue of civilizations, but you cannot have the authority of the country where you grew up, and perhaps at that time, you have organized a hundred thousand of elites of that society. They do not think that the same people who are in the worker-communist party and in the communist movement, if they participate in a job ad in a free environment, their ability to manage the community will be greater than those ministers and lawyers. First, they have suppressed them so that they can rule.”<sup>212</sup>*

---

<sup>212</sup> Is it Possible to Win Communism in Iran? Mansoor Hekmat.

On 15 May 2000 (please remember the date), in his speech entitled “The Oral History of the UCM”, Mansoor Hekmat promised that if within 20 or 30 years (that is, several years) they had failed to remove the Worker-communist Party from the scene of the struggle and had established a headquarters and office, photographs of the creators of the UCM would be posted on the walls and second-hand Stalinist handouts would be placed behind the showcases. Apparently, Mansoor Hekmat’s self-fascination had no limits and he claimed that if it had not been for the UCM, then socialism in Iran would not be any greater than it was in Brazil, Argentina, Turkey and Greece! Is there a fundamental difference between the socialism proposed in the political milieu in the countries he mentioned? The four-class party of the UCM, the petty-bourgeois evaluation of the leader of the bourgeoisie of Iran, a criminal like Khomeini turning the workers into cannon fodder in an imperialist war, etc., are all introduced as part of another type of communism. What hypocrisy!

*“I think that in the future of the Iranian society, perhaps 20 to 30 years if the day of socialism triumphs in Iran, or a communist party and, for example, the worker-communist party be a current that cannot eliminate it from the scene of an open struggle and they can establish headquarters, bureau and office of it, photo of the creators of the UCM will be put on the walls and will be put the pamphlets that I called out behind the showcases and they say that these discussions started from these [persons] and will show the status of this organization in history. Without the UCM, socialism in Iran would not be more than Brazil, Argentina, Turkey and Greece, if it get a lot of luck. The UCM. The UCM has caused that another type of communism being introduced to the society of Iran.”<sup>213</sup>*

---

<sup>213</sup> Oral History of the UCM, Mansoor Hekmat.

The whole effort of the leader of the worker-communism had been to pretend that communism is associated with worker-communism. The entire propaganda machine of worker-communism, with full agitation that is akin to other bourgeois parties, was engaged in a scramble to pretend that worker-communism was the flagship of communism. Donations received from the bourgeois institutions (surplus value earned from the blood of workers) provided a boost for the organization's propaganda machine. Their ideological propaganda tradition is also familiar in the political milieu. The Mujahedin claimed that no one was opposed to the Iranian regime and that, other than the worker-communist Party, no one believed in the need for a communist society! What a lie! What obscenity!

For almost one hundred years, the international communists (left communists) have defended the proletarian position with their teeth and in the darkest periods of the counter-revolution they have defended the proletarian position and have declared that only a communist revolution across of the globe would save humanity from destruction. Now, an ideologue of the left of capital, by resorting to several Stalinist approaches in line with its class and bourgeois interests, was pretending to be the flagship of communism. Mansoor Hekmat noted:

*“This position seems to me to be of a degree, arises especially in recent years in Iran. Communism associates with worker-communist Party. In a sense theoretically too, the worker-communist party has also been the flagship of communism. As a thought, as an alternative and as a kind of society, outside of us somebody does not believe that a communist society should come. In propaganda of a current is not that it should bring communist or socialist society, and the line of worker- communism is which it is associated.”*<sup>214</sup>

---

<sup>214</sup> Is it Possible to Win Communism in Iran? Mansoor Hekmat.



When the Communist Party of Iran was scheduled to be established by the New International, it was later announced that the Party was the site of a confluence of social movements. After the failure of the International Renaissance Project through the Communist Party of Iran, it was assumed that worker-communism would take over the task of reviving communism and reviving Marxism using the several approaches of Stalinism! Unfortunately, the leader of the Worker-communism is no longer alive to explain how the ideologues of the Party—who were not in line with worker-communism (we will return to this in later)—would be able to revive the International in the name of worker-communism.

*“If communism has a future in global scale is through the parties that do it ... But if something is going to revive communism in the world, is the power and competence of the two or three worker-communist parties of the world which in the countries of medium size be power. This rehabilitates the communism, revives Marxist theory, revives the manifesto, revives the capital... We are the parties that can become a power community, we will revive communism. This is the only real response after the collapse of the Eastern bloc ... This will come from us.”<sup>215</sup>*

In fact, the construction of the Communist International was also part of the agitation of the propaganda machine and the demagoguery of the Worker-communism in pursuit of the goal of achieving political power. From the standpoint of that party, the groups formed in other countries should play the role of a jumping-platform to strengthen the worker-communism in Iran and to help it to gain political power.

In the next section on socialism in one country, we will see that Mansoor Hekmat did not intend to start a revolution. He believed in ultra-flexible and wise diplomacy and did not intend to enter into hostilities

---

<sup>215</sup> Party and Community: from pressure group to political party.

with the West and the countries of the region. Finally, Mansoor Hekmat expressed his true understanding of the process of building the Communist International, the political expansion of worker-communism and his approach to gaining political power for worker-communism.

*“In my opinion, our point of departure for the creation of the International is to find, or helping to create, organizations are in the most important countries of the world, which have more or less the same program and practical agenda and have been busy by influencing of their community...In a word, the political expansion of the worker-communist party of Iran – bringing it closer to [political] power, contact with the communist circles of the more important countries to push them to form active political parties with similar agenda as ours, and definitely creating a trilogy for the international publication of our views and finding our associates, this, in my opinion, is the real way forward in the path of a communist worker international.”<sup>216</sup>*

All of these exaggerations, the lies and the political charlatanism, were laid out in the late 1990s within the conditions that Kourosh Modarresi, the Head of the Inland Committee of the Worker-communist Party of Iran, devised during the April Crisis of worker-communism. He confessed that almost until late 1997, the Party activities inside of the country had undergone a complete recession, in other words, it was not engaged in any activity.

*“The internal committee is composed of a one-and-a-half year plan of action, codified and approved by the political office. This committee created, following a relatively complete recession in*

---

<sup>216</sup> Mansoor Hekmat’s letter under the title, “To comrade Bahman Shafiqh, copy to the comrades of the Central Committee on the text of Rafiq Bahman Shafiq.”

*organized activities within the country, since the establishment of the party.*"<sup>217</sup>

Mahmoud Qazvini, a former member of the Central Committee of the worker-communist Party and a Hekmatist, commented on Hamid Taqvaei, according to Mansoor Hekmat the second character of the UCM, commented as follows. Mahmoud Qazvini could generalized his thoughts on the leader of the UCM, his ideological leader, Mansoor Hekmat, saying that he demanded that the disciples of worker-communism avoid political commentary on the leader of the worker-communism. Mahmoud is also ashamed that such a leader has once been his leader. Confused positions, under the title of worker-communism, which are disparate and bourgeois positions, are baseless and unfounded and it is for this reason that the disciples of the religion of worker-communism did not doubt or hesitate because they had been brainwashed and were unable to think for themselves. He wrote:

*"I call on the members of the worker-communist party of Iran to ban Hamid Taqvaei from political and theoretical commentary so that he do not carry more than this his honour and all of them. I am ashamed that such a person was at one time the leader of the party I was a member of. So far, I do not have any Marxist contender to comment so careless on the issues...These word are obviously unfounded. These word says for this reason that the members of the worker-communist party of Iran did not find any suspicion and thought. Says for the humans that they are brainwashed and unable to think."*<sup>218</sup>

---

<sup>217</sup> The Fact, Kourosh Modaresi, 23 April 1999.

<sup>218</sup> The Populism of Hamid Taqvaei and the Overthrowing Charter of the worker-communist party—Hekmatist, Mahmoud Qazvini.

## **Worker-communism and Stalinism**

In the previous sections, we have clearly shown that the origin of worker-communism has been second-hand Stalinism and during its evolutionary process has been fed by a Maoist context. Stalinism is not just a referral or a loyalty to Stalin the individual, such a visionary approach would be highly superficial and would not be taken seriously. Stalinism represents the victory of the counter-revolution from the ruins of the glorious October Revolution that followed the breakdown of the wave of world revolution and expresses the declaration of belonging and loyalty to the anti-communist and bourgeois theses under the name of communism. We will focus on the core of Stalinism, namely, the anti-Marxist thesis of “socialism in one country” in the following pages of this section. In this section on the language of the theorists of worker-communism, we will look briefly at Khrushchev’s views on the question of Stalinism and at how his revisionism dominated the Soviet Communist Party.

A characteristic of Stalinism, irrespective of its traditional type or its radical phrase, such as worker-communism, is its particular ideological view of the historical events that have a special place and play a special role in this ideology’s personality (the cult of personality). The historical context and the intervention force of society, namely, the proletariat, will be obedient to the ideological character, which becomes even more ridiculous with the death of the characters (individuality), for example, with the death of Stalin in Russia or the death of Mao in China. Worker-communism has not gained political power anywhere and, so, with the death of its ideologue (Mansoor Hekmat), the mode of production would also be changed. However, Mansoor Hekmat’s death accelerated the collapse of worker-communism. Whether of the traditional type or the radical phrase, Stalinists are unanimous in their belief that with the death of Stalin, the Soviet Communist Party became the advocate of bourgeois

reformism. Their point of reference is the Khrushchev's revisionism. As Mansoor Hekmat wrote:

*"The sovereignty of revisionism on the communist parties of Soviet and china has led to defeat and retreating of the global working class of its two important strongholds in these countries. Now the bourgeoisie in the Soviet Union has succeeded in destroying the dictatorship of the proletariat and revive its political sovereignty and capitalist system in this country ...Today, these two countries belong to the bourgeois-imperialist counter-revolutionary camp of the world. Today, the Soviet Union is at the world level is ensign and the point of reliance on the revisionism of Khrushchev and the advocate of bourgeois reformism, which in the era of imperialism is a reactionary current."*<sup>219</sup>

It is an irrefutable fact that on the ruins of the defeat of the October Revolution, on the bones of the communists beaten till bloody, the bourgeoisie re-established its political sovereignty in Russia. When and how it was restored expresses the distance between the opinions of the two classes. Internationalists believe that it was not Stalin's death but the late 1920s, after the defeat of the wave of world revolution, that the bourgeoisie, using Stalinist ideology, was able to celebrate its counter-revolutionary victory on the ruins of the October Revolution. However, the radical phrase Stalinists (including the Unity of Communist Militants) assessed the coming of Khrushchev in the mid-1950s as the revival of capitalism.

The Unity of Communist Militants (UCM) believed that the early advance of the proletariat in the cause of building socialism was defeated and that at the time of writing the programme for the UCM, the Mars of 1981, the Soviet Union was the flagship of Khrushchev's revisionism. In

---

<sup>219</sup> The Programme of UCM

other words, at the time of Stalin and until the arrival of Khrushchev, the Soviet proletariat continued to build on socialism. We will bypass the view that the imperialist World War II was evaluated as progressive and, consequently, that the creation of state capitalism in the Eastern European countries, which took place at the time of Stalin, was an advance in the construction of socialism and that this progress was defeated after the coming of Khrushchev. The UCM programme noted:

*“The Soviet Communist Party has become a bourgeois party, and the bourgeoisie, relying on it, the early advance of the Soviet proletariat in the building of socialism has dragged to failure and has established a monopoly of state capitalism in this country. The Soviet Union is today the flagship and the centerpiece of the Khrushchev revisionism of.”*<sup>220</sup>

The radical phrase Stalinists believed or continue to believe that after Stalin’s death, Khrushchev’s revisionism dominated the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the communist movement more generally. Therefore, they did not evaluate the socialist Eastern bloc and its satellites after Stalin’s death but in their literature they referred to some as progressive and as approaching becoming socialist states. One such country was Cuba, where Mansoor Hekmat believed the socialist breeze had blown. In the late 1950s, following the overthrow of the Batista regime, Cuban guerrillas established a new government and emphasized that they were not seeking communism or Marxism but seeking democracy and social justice. However, following tensions with the West and especially the US, at the time of Khrushchev they were drawn to the Eastern bloc, at the head of which was the Soviet Union, and they became members of the cast in the Cold War. No social revolution (socialist) has taken place in Cuba. Despite this, Mansoor Hekmat stated:

---

<sup>220</sup> The Programme of UCM

*“For example, the Cuban Revolution, nobody voted to bring Batista out. This should not be a concern. What I and you should ask is that what this government wants? What does it do and who does it represent in the community? What system is it?”<sup>221</sup>*

These are merely brief mentions of the UCM view of the advance of revisionism and its domination over the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which, in the opinion of the UCM, resulted in the defeat of the proletarian efforts to build socialism when Khrushchev came to power. In none of the works of the UCM is there anything to deny Stalinism. Therefore, in order to illustrate the Stalinist and counter-revolutionary nature of the UCM, we will mainly rely on the topic of the ideology of Stalinism. However, prior to discussing these issues, we will make brief reference to the Maoism of worker-communism.

---

<sup>221</sup> Mansoor Hekmat in conversation with Dariush Navidi, *Bidar Magazine*, 1999.

## Worker-communism and Maoism

The bourgeois ideologue, Mansoor Hekmat, laughed at the Red Book of Mao and when he was promoted to a leadership position his demagogic approach was that his Marxism had originated in Marx and was not related to Maoist traditions. First, let us take a look at Mansoor Hekmat's view of the phenomenon of the domination of revisionism within the Chinese Communist Party, which, according to him, had led to the expulsion of the working class from political power in China. The UCM programme, written by Mansoor Hekmat, states:

*"The sovereignty of revisionism over the Soviet and Chinese Communist Parties has led to the defeat and rejection of the global working class from their two major bases in these countries ... In China, with the definitive control of revisionism on the Communist Party of the country, the working class is expelled from political power and the power of bourgeoisie and the capitalist system have been consolidated, and today these two countries belong to the bourgeois-imperialist counter-revolutionary camp of the world ... China is also the flagship and the point of reliance on the "three worlds" revisionism and the advocate of the most reactionary trends and currents of Bourgeois."*<sup>222</sup>

According to the programme of the UCM, there was a period during which the working class in China possessed political power and revisionism had not yet dominated the Chinese Communist Party. According to the arguments of the UCM, after the definitive domination of revisionism over the Communist Party of China the working class was driven out of political power in China. This explanation and argument is found not only in the UCM but also in the Maoists of the radical phrase in

---

<sup>222</sup> The Programme of UCM



the Revolutionary International Movement (RIM) and the Communist Party of Iran (MLM)<sup>223</sup>. We will return to the shared arguments of the Maoists and Mansoor Hekmat.

The fact is that the capitalist system is a global system and, consequently, the reaction of the workers' movement is also global. Following the wave of world revolution, the workers' movement in China, albeit with a slight delay, was challenging capitalism. Between 1919 and 1927 we witnessed the battles and victories of the anti-capitalist struggles of the Chinese proletariat that had been calling for the death of capitalism. However, the irrefutable fact is that after the Chinese proletariat had drawn blood in 1927, particularly the proletariat of Shanghai and Canton (which was the result of the policy of creating a united front with the Kuomintang of China), the Chinese Communist Party joined the bourgeois camp. After this date, the history of the Chinese Communist Party has been the history of the political apparatus of the left of capital. Something that was also called the "mass revolution of China" was actually the gravestone of the proletarian revolution of China that was drowned in the blood of the workers of Shanghai and Canton. The working class has never been able to take political power in China. What constitutes the "political power of the working class"- as it is seen by Mansoor Hekmat and the Maoists-is, in fact, the formation of state capitalism with the ideology of a Maoist political superstructure that, at the height of the anti-revolutionary era, was shaped over the ruins of the defeat of the anti-capitalist and heroic struggles of the Chinese proletariat.<sup>224</sup>

---

<sup>223</sup> It should be noted that the Communist League has long been under the name of the Communist Party of Iran (Marxist-Leninist-Maoist).

<sup>224</sup> For more information on the positions of the internationalists on the mass revolution of China, the failure of the anti-capitalist struggles of the Chinese proletariat, the areas of crisis in the anti-revolutionary camp and the emergence of an ideology called Maoism, see the *Internationalist Voice* pamphlet entitled, "Maoism - the Real Child of Stalinism."

Mansoor Hekmat expressed his Maoist insight and understanding of the sovereignty of the people and the exercise of the sovereignty of revolutionary democracy in the free zones. First, let us take a look at Mansoor Hekmat's speech to the Third Congress of Komala. He said:

*"It's talk about that how the force of mass must be used to promote their material and spiritual life, how to make it alive and activate. The political dimension of the issue, in my opinion, is more important at this stage, that is, how can revolutionary democracy in the liberated areas be implemented? Have we clarity plan for the realization and implementation of revolutionary democracy and the granting of sovereignty to the deprived people of Kurdistan and whether we are going to implement it?"*<sup>225</sup>

In the Maoist literature, "free zones" are of particular importance and refer to the areas where Maoist forces have taken control from the government forces. The irrefutable fact is that commodity relations (capitalist relations) are still dominant in these areas even though the People's Army (Komala or any other name) has control over those areas. It is also an undeniable fact that the departure of Komala to the villages was due to Maoist understandings rather than being a response to the police and security pressures. At this point, Mansoor Hekmat was playing a very important role in the policies of Komala. The question that arises here is concerned with the meaning and understanding that Mansoor Hekmat had of the realization and practice of revolutionary democracy in the free zones. We hear the answer to this question:

*"After the arrival of Mansoor Hekmat in one of the villages of the Bukan area, Rahman Hussein Zadeh, who was then responsible for the village committee of the Komala in the area, recalled: 'Nader*

---

<sup>225</sup> Biography of Mansoor Hekmat written by Soheila Sharifi page 34

*[Mansoor Hekmat] asked me what the village committee is doing? ... Nader said that it is better to do things that directly benefit the working people of the region and have a positive impact on their daily lives and make life better for them. He said that this area will not remain in your control long-term, the regime will soon capture everywhere. You have to make sure that the people remember the Communist regime and have benefited from it. People should live in relative comfort we are in the position of a government. We want people to live in relative comfort. He suggested that we set up a health plan and help them with the villagers, for example, cover sewage, provide health education classes, and teach people how to take care of themselves and their children'.*"<sup>226</sup>

From the imagination and perception of Mansour Hekmat we can understand the realization and application of revolutionary democracy under the rule of Komala. If the realization of such acts is called the government of Komala there is definitely no problem but referring to it as "communist rule" is to place a slur on the ideas and principles of communism and to present a monstrous image of communist society. For the time being, we are convinced that "communist rule" does not make sense. Government means the existence of a kind of state whereas a socialist or communist society lacks any state. Under the dictatorship of the proletariat, which is itself a kind of state, it is not the communists but the working class that act as a dictatorship through the global councils. We refer to this in more detail in other sections of this article.

Once the realization and the exercise of revolutionary democracy has occurred in the free zones, the realization of the issues mentioned above was seen as being part of the practice and function of the government of Komala.

---

<sup>226</sup> Biography of Mansoor Hekmat written by Soheila Sharifi page 38

Years later, Mohammed Fatahi, a member of the Central Committee (Hekmatist), confessed that no workers in the free zone felt that the rules of the class society were under the leadership of the Maoist style Komala government and they felt it was no different from the rule of the Islamic Republic. He wrote:

*“I am telling about Komala, because it was the crown jewels of the left on a large social scale and controlled areas of the country under its domains...No worker felt that the class rules were different under the leadership of the two governments and by going of Komala, his salary was lower and his hours of work went up. In the mind of the community, Komala was a military force that retreated and went and went and went.”<sup>227</sup>*

---

<sup>227</sup> The Problem of Communism in Iran is not Sectarianism but Bourgeois Gender of its Political Tradition!, Mohammad Fatahi.

## Worker-communism and the transition state

After the overthrow of capitalism by the communist revolution, it will not be possible to directly establish a communist system and society will still need a form of “state”. In other words, there is a revolutionary transition period between capitalist society and communist society in which a political transition will also take shape - one where the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat will be the form of that state and this will mean a complete breakdown of the bourgeois state apparatus. In his letter of March 1852, written to J. Weydemeyer in New York, Marx stated this as follows:

*“... And now as to myself, no credit is due to me for discovering the existence of classes in modern society or the struggle between them. Long before me bourgeois historians had described the historical development of this class struggle and bourgeois economists, the economic economy of the classes. What I did that was new was to prove:*

- 1. that the **existence of classes** is only bound up with **particular historical phases in the development of production**,*
- 2. that the class struggle necessarily leads to the **dictatorship of the proletariat**,*
- 3. that this dictatorship itself only constitutes the transition to the **abolition of all classes and to a classless society** .”*

Political power, earned on a global scale or, at least, on a regional scale, is the first condition and the first step in the transition from capitalist society. Unlike previous transitions, this transition can only start from within the capitalist system and, therefore, the necessary condition for the commencement of this process is the existence of a communist

revolution. Earlier transitions have always begun from within the previous social system and have gradually grown to become a dominant social system.

In contrast with earlier periods, the main institutions of the capitalist state, such as the police, the army, the judicial system, etc., cannot serve the proletariat but must be destroyed. Following the first victory of the proletariat, capitalism will show its reaction through reactionary warfare, such as the attack on the October Revolution. At this point, the main orientation of the dictatorship of the proletariat must be in the direction of the destruction of the power of capitalism and the advance of the victories of the proletariat and everything should be directed toward this. However, Mansoor Hekmat believed that after a victory, the proletariat should not be invited to the conflict for at least 10 years and should have a flexible diplomacy. We currently put aside Mansoor Hekmat's opinion and demagoguery of the advancement of the communist revolution, which he refers to as being "invited to the conflict". Mansoor Hekmat says:

*"Another point is that, in my opinion, people see themselves in the government ... Such a government should have an extremely flexible and wise diplomacy. In my opinion, the intention of war and the issuance of such things should never be left to any place. Must give assurance that we do not fight with anyone. Are you fascist? Bravo, good for you! We want to do another thing here. I do not think that we should invite any controversy. There should never be hostility towards the West and the countries of the region. The solution is that you have a flexible diplomacy... As a result, the key is that the victorious communism, it must be idolatry and will coexist with the world of his time. At least 10 years."*<sup>228</sup>

---

<sup>228</sup> Is it Possible to Win Communism in Iran?, Mansoor Hekmat.

Contrary to the demagoguery of the left of the political capitalist apparatus, the first task of a victorious communist revolution is not ultra-flexible and wise diplomacy and the creation of a socialist island, which is not possible, but the endless effort, support, assistance and backing for the spread of the wave of the universal revolution in the direction of victory. We should not forget that the wave of the universal revolution (1917–1924) did not occur in Moscow or Leningrad but that its failure was in Berlin and Munich and that about twenty-thousand revolutions in the heart of Europe were massacred by the barbarians, which paved the way for the growth of Nazism in the 1930s.<sup>229</sup>

Contrary to Mansoor Hekmat's view of the "rule of the people", only the social class is only interested in communism and for this reason the class independence of the working class and the emphasis of its communist programme are of particular importance. Only the working class as a whole class can take society towards communism, not a minority of the class, even if it is a revolutionary minority.

Since the capitalist system is a universal system, the dictatorship of the proletariat removes the political and economic dominance of global capital from its dominant territory and, consequently, although it restricts and makes conditions on profitability, the accumulation of capital, etc., it is still under the impact of the global capitalist system. In such a situation, embryonic socialism begins to grow in the form of contingent and limited conditions under the rule of the dictatorship of the proletariat. At this point, we are faced with the manner in which capitalism is being destroyed and with the growth of the socialist mode of production. The decline of the global capitalist system and the growth and enlargement of the embryo of socialism depend entirely on the evolution of the universal revolution.

---

<sup>229</sup> For more information about the German Revolution and the massacre of communists and revolutionaries, see the book "German Revolution" on the website of Internationalist Voice.

The essential task of the dictatorship of the proletariat is the expropriation of the exploiting class through the socialization of the means of production and the progressive development of this socialized segment in order to remove all productive activities. At the transitional stage, the non-exploitative classes and layers in society that are based on the non-socialized sector of the economy will continue to exist and will still bear the stamp of classes. The elimination of non-social classes and layers, the gradual solution for the social sector, will slowly lead to the abolition of the final classes, which will also lead to the decline of the proletarian state.

Indeed, through planning that is based on the social and individual needs that are organized by the workers' council, the socialist revolution will provide society with the means of production. It should be emphasized that placing the means of production in the service of social needs according to the structures of the dictatorship of the proletariat is substantially representative of socialization. In the *Communist Manifesto*, Marx writes in this regard:

*“The proletariat will use its political supremacy to wrest, by degree, all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralise all instruments of production in the hands of the State, i.e., of the proletariat organised as the ruling class; and to increase the total productive forces as rapidly as possible.”*<sup>230</sup>

Having briefly explained our views on the transition from capitalism to socialism, the dictatorship of the proletariat, we will now turn to the ideology of worker-communism in relation to this issue. According to Mansoor Hekmat, during the transition period, which is also the revolutionary period, there is no council, nor is there a constituent assembly or a parliament but, in the process of dispossessing the regime-

---

<sup>230</sup> Manifesto of the Communist Party, Marx and Engels.



and not the capitalist system- the parties are committed to building society and to giving power to the people - not to the working class. We currently put aside the populism and the people's government of Mansoor Hekmat and he states:

*"We believe in a transitional category of revolutionary times. When we annihilate the Islamic Republic, there is no council, and nothing else... There is no constituent Assembly, there is no parliamentary, as a result, in the process of dropping the regime, certain parties are sure to come power and these parties are committed to building a society and empowering the people."*<sup>231</sup>

We have previously considered the UCM's Maoist (multi-class) approach in relation to the social revolution, which is also relevant to the transition government. Mansoor Hekmat believed that the working class of Iran was not capable of establishing its own government but that the combination of class forces (Maoist multi-class) has the ability to perform another revolution and this is a revolution for democracy:

*"The working class of Iran in the present situation does not have the capacity to immediately establish its government immediately. Creating this preparation is our duty. But in any case, a combination of the class forces of the community is capable of carrying out "another revolution." This revolution is a revolution for democracy, and is component and sectional in the whole process of the workers' revolution. The victory of this revolution is helping the victory of the workers' revolution. The victory of this revolution with real force and is already available classes demanding revolutionary democracy is a practical task. This revolution must definitely overthrow the present state and the*

---

<sup>231</sup> Mansoor Hekmat's talk in Paltak on 26 December 2001, in *Hekmat* No.2.

*existing political regime. What can and should be sidelined immediately?... The revolutionary republic for us is the continuation of the revolutionary fate of tomorrow's overthrow through the formation of an interim revolutionary state. This revolutionary government is vital. If one is to facilitate socialist struggle for political democracy, if anyone wants to do revolution for the democracy, or even if someone has two eyes and sees that if he himself does not revolutionize, there are certain social classes and social strata doing revolution for the democracy, then must answer what should be the outcome of this revolution in relation to political power.*"<sup>232</sup>

Mansoor Hekmat wanted to revolutionize democracy. The result of a democratic revolution is the formation of an interim revolutionary government that will lead to the formation of a revolutionary republic. Mahmoud Qazvini, a former member of the central committee of the workers-communist Party of Iran and the Hekmatist Party, provided more detail about the interim government proposed by his leader:

*"I can say that this government is not just the government of the working class. It is the government of the working class government and the masses of the uprising of the people, many of whom not only seek socialism but also oppose it. We consider this a fuzzy state in the revolution, this state is not an organ of the implementation of the historical intentions of this or that class. Our participation in this state depends on the interests of the progress of the workers' revolution. No matter how far the victory over the Islamic Republic and political Islam is made more complete and deeper and this does not mean except the formation of the interim government, the victory of the workers' revolution is easier and*

---

<sup>232</sup> Mansoor Hekmat, *Towards Socialism* No. 2 (Second Period).

*more rigorous. This is state of Air Forces of revolution of 1979, is the government of the victory of the participants in the July 18 rebellion, the state of the Fereydunkenar rebels. This is not a state of order, a state of war.*"<sup>233</sup>

Perhaps, at first glance, the above nonsense reflects the author's lack of knowledge of Marxist positions in relation to the state but, in fact, it is the expression of the views of left of capital that pours soil into the eyes of the working class. The demagoguery that suggests that the state is not an organ of the implementation of the historical intentions of this or that class is misleading, on the contrary, the state is applying the dictatorship of one class against another class. The state is a product of the irreconcilability of class antagonisms. A state made up of classes is not a concept! In principle, no matter what form it takes the state is essentially a capitalist machine. In Engel's famous work, *The Origin of Family, Private Property and State*, his historical analysis clearly states that the Marxist idea of the state is precisely the state that is the product of the irreconcilable manifestation of class contradictions. He writes:

*"The state is, therefore, by no means a power forced on society from without; just as little is it 'the reality of the ethical idea', 'the image and reality of reason', as Hegel maintains. Rather, it is a product of society at a certain stage of development; it is the admission that this society has become entangled in an insoluble contradiction with itself, that it has split into irreconcilable antagonisms which it is powerless to dispel. But in order that these antagonisms, these classes with conflicting economic interests, might not consume themselves and society in fruitless struggle, it*

---

<sup>233</sup> The Populism of Hamid Taqvaei and the Overthrowing Charter of the worker-communist Party-Hekmatist, Mahmoud Qazvini.

*became necessary to have a power, seemingly standing above society, that would alleviate the conflict and keep it within the bounds of 'order'; and this power, arisen out of society but placing itself above it, and alienating itself more and more from it, is the state."*

Of course, according to the Mansour Hekmat, the revolution for democracy is vital since it is part of the entire process of the workers' revolution. He believed that, first, the "revolutionary republic" does not represent the political superstructure of the economy and, second, that through its process the revolutionary state (the revolutionary republic) becomes obsolete and is replaced by the dictatorship of the proletariat:

*"We do not look at the revolutionary republic as the 'political superstructure of Iranian economy' but we consider it as 'state in a revolutionary period', which must organize the atrocity of the toilers from above, for the cause of democracy. If a revolution is possible for democracy, then the democratic revolutionary stat is not only possible, but it is vital. That itself the historical process of this revolution and the revolutionary state at what time interval do 'old' and put on the order of the day the dictatorship of the proletariat, is another matter."*<sup>234</sup>

According to Mansoor Hekmat's reasoning, up to this point we are experiencing a revolutionary government (revolutionary republic). Finally, on a bright day for the revolution and in the process of the continuation of the revolution, a top-down process, the dictatorship of the proletariat is placed on the proletarian agenda. The proletariat within the revolutionary government (the revolutionary republic) then proclaims the formation of a state of the dictatorship of the proletariat and this is also the property of

---

<sup>234</sup> Mansoor Hekmat, *Towards Socialism* No. 2 (Second Period).

every real revolutionary state that is formed from the most active part of the revolutionary classes (not just a revolutionary class). Mansoor Hekmat presents his multi-class and Maoist dictatorship thus:

*“The same force that organizes the uprising and places the councils in the position of acceptance of the "fait accompli" is the same force that... propound the idea of transferring power to the councils and organized a violent act to overthrow of the bourgeois state and transfer of the real power, the same force is Inevitably and subject to objective political conditions, naturally finds itself in the position of leadership of the process of continuation of the revolution “from above” and the suppression of the armed resistance of the bourgeoisie, and should take this duty with the same degree of certainty. The property of any interim revolutionary government is the formation of the most active part of the revolutionary classes, namely actual uprisers.”<sup>235</sup>*

We have already seen that Mansoor Hekmat advised that the revolutionary government should abandon the conflict for at least 10 years and should use diplomacy. After the 10-year period, in the process of the continuation of the revolution the revolutionary state would metamorphosize from above into the dictatorship of the proletariat. The period of repression of the bourgeoisie can begin with the formation of the dictatorship of the proletariat. According to Mansoor Hekmat, the dictatorship of the proletariat has two-stages:

*“The dictatorship of the proletariat (or the transitional period in general) consists of two distinct, more or less distinct periods: the first period of the political establishment of the dictatorship of the*

---

<sup>235</sup> As above

*proletariat, and the second period of social transition under the stabilized' dictatorship of the proletariat.*

*The first period is a period that begins immediately with the formation of the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat. This is the period when the working-class government as a temporary revolutionary state of workers acts a 'Revolutionary period state'. The basic duty and priority of this state, like any state resulting from the uprising, is the suppression of the necessary inevitable and, to the end of life, the defeat of reactionary, that is, the bourgeoisie ... In other words, the dictatorship of the proletariat during this period is the 'interim administration' of the dictatorship of the proletariat, with the characteristics of a temporary revolutionary state.*

*The second period corresponds to the political stability of proletarian power. This is the period in which the dictatorship of the proletariat acts as a "non-temporary" state. Here, the very profound definitions of Marxism about the dictatorship of the proletariat as the direct organization of the whole working class as a ruling class and the establishment of proletarian democracy in its most comprehensive form are practically materialized.*"<sup>236</sup>

For the first time in history, the communist revolution (the labour revolution) will be the revolution of an exploited class not only against its own exploiting class but also as a revolution against any form of exploitation of man by man. The proletariat has no historical duty to consolidate its class power over other social classes but has a duty to form a classless society. Although the dictatorship of the proletariat takes the form of a state, in its own process, by dismantling the material relations of society, the state is no longer a means of repression or, better, if stabilized, the state is no longer the state but goes into decline.

---

<sup>236</sup> Mansoor Hekmat, *Towards Socialism* No. 2 (Second Period).

Sadly, Mansoor Hekmat is polluting the dictatorship of the proletariat in Russia, the survival of which was tied to the advent of the global revolution—there was never a serious suggestion of socialism in one country.

*“In Bolshevik thinking, the second phase of the dictatorship of the proletariat was depicted virtually in the context of a global revolution, and therefore, in practice, until the years of 26-24, in discussions about socialism in a country, practically and completely was not occasion concrete and serious attention and analysis.”<sup>237</sup>*

It is an irrefutable fact that the Bolsheviks assessed the continuation of the dictatorship of the proletariat in Russia in the context of a global revolution. That the discussions on “socialism in one country” began in the years 1924–1926, marked the advent of the counter-revolution because of the failure of the wave of global revolution, which celebrated its victory by establishing the anti-Marxist thesis of “socialism in one country”. We will address this issue in the following pages. Mansour Hekmat’s demagoguery states that the horizons and economic prospects of the dictatorship of the proletariat were not put in front of the prominent leaders of the working class in Russia, in other words, he seems to be suggesting that if he had been there at the time and had put this perspective in front of the leaders of the Russian working class, developments in Russia would have taken a different direction. In contrast to Mansoor Hekmat’s demagoguery, it should be stressed that the construction of an economy that is superior to capitalism, namely, the advance towards a socialist economy, is not possible within the framework of a national state but requires a global effort and the cooperation of the world proletariat. Mansoor Hekmat remarks:

---

<sup>237</sup> As above.

*“The fact that Leninism was not represented in the economic debates of 1924-1928 was partly due to the fact that the horizon and the prospect of the transition from the dictatorship of the proletariat to the revolutionary period, in which the economy was subordinated to political, a dictatorship state of the proletariat in the broad sense of the word, with the task of building a ‘superior economy of capitalism’, was not seriously placed in the agenda of the conscious avant-garde of the Russian working class ...If Lenin was, we would probably have had a much clearer picture of the economic tasks of the dictatorship of the proletariat today. Because the discussions of the years 1924-1928 were precisely the discussions that took place during the period of the transition of the dictatorship of the proletariat from the revolutionary period to the period of stability and the ‘normal’ performance.”<sup>238</sup>*

Having reviewed the counter-revolutionary and Stalinist views of Mansoor Hekmat and the UCM in relation to the transitional state, we will now consider the issue of socialism in one country from the perspective of the internationalists and will then consider the Stalinist opinions of Mansoor Hekmat.

---

<sup>238</sup> Mansoor Hekmat, *Towards Socialism* No. 2 (Second Period).



## Worker-communism and socialism in one country

According to Marxist concept and also from the perspective of the internationalists, socialism and communism are not two separate concepts but are used to describe a society in which the mode of production is socialist. In other words, it describes a non-class society in which the means of production is social and not state-owned. After the capitalist mode of production we will only see one kind of mode of production, the socialist mode of production (communism). A socialist society differs from a communist society in terms of the distribution of material benefits, which, in a socialist society, will continue to be kept within bourgeois limits. Marx points to this as follows:

*“In spite of this advance, this equal right is still constantly stigmatized by a bourgeois limitation. The right of the producers is proportional to the labour they supply; the equality consists in the fact that measurement is made with an equal standard, labour.”<sup>239</sup>*

Although the slogan of the socialist society is “to each according to his work”, the basic and fundamental characteristic of the socialist society is the socialization of the means of production; the socialization of the means of production is never a collective concept, nor does it become state-owned. We will, of course, return to this issue. The motto of the socialist society, “to each according to his work”, expresses a kind of justice that contradicts the concept of communism and a communist society. Hence, in a communist society, equal rights must be converted into unequal rights in order to adhere to the concept of communism. Marx explains how to turn justice into injustice in a communist society in order to adhere to the concept of communism:

---

<sup>239</sup> *Critique of the Gotha Program*, Marx

*“Thus, with an equal performance of labour, and hence an equal in the social consumption fund, one will in fact receive more than another, one will be richer than another, and so on. To avoid all these defects, right, instead of being equal, would have to be unequal.”<sup>240</sup>*

The unequal distribution of material welfare that results from the unequal division of social labour and, in particular, the division and the contradiction between intellectual work and physical activity, must disappear from society if it is to become communist. In other words, society must be able to advance from the lower stage of communism (socialism) to the advanced stage of communist (communism itself). In this regard, Marx describes the social context of these conditions, namely, the unequal distribution, as well as the social context of the decline of the unequal distribution:

*“But these defects are inevitable in the first phase of communist society as it is when it has just emerged after prolonged birth pangs from capitalist society. Right can never be higher than the economic structure of society and its cultural development conditioned thereby.*

*In a higher phase of communist society, after the enslaving subordination of the individual to the division of labour, and therewith also the antithesis between mental and physical labour, has vanished; after labour has become not only a means of life but life's prime want; after the productive forces have also increased with the all-around development of the individual, and all the springs of co-operative wealth flow more abundantly - only then then can the narrow horizon of bourgeois right be crossed in its*

---

<sup>240</sup> As source 239

*entirety and society inscribe on its banners: From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs!”<sup>241</sup>*

It is important to note that in the shadow of the socialization of the productive forces, the remaining effects of bourgeois rights (equal distribution for equal work), which are the result of the production of an abundance of material wealth, decline in a socialist society (rather than suddenly disappearing) when society gradually enters the higher stage of communism.

With this brief explanation of the concept of socialism, we return to the contexts of the formation of the anti-Marxist thesis of socialism in one country. In his work on the principles of communism, Engels emphasized that the communist revolution is not a national revolution but a universal revolution that will happen on a global scale:

*“Will it be possible for this revolution to take place in one country alone?*

*No. By creating the world market, big industry has already brought all the peoples of the Earth, and especially the civilized peoples, into such close relation with one another that none is independent of what happens to the others.*

*Further, it has co-ordinated the social development of the civilized countries to such an extent that, in all of them, bourgeoisie and proletariat have become the decisive classes, and the struggle between them the great struggle of the day. It follows that the communist revolution will not merely be a national phenomenon but must take place simultaneously in all civilized countries – that is to say, at least in England, America, France, and Germany.*

*It will develop in each of these countries more or less rapidly, according as one country or the other has a more developed*

---

<sup>241</sup> Critique of the Gotha Program, Marx

*industry, greater wealth, a more significant mass of productive forces. Hence, it will go slowest and will meet most obstacles in Germany, most rapidly and with the fewest difficulties in England. It will have a powerful impact on the other countries of the world, and will radically alter the course of development which they have followed up to now, while greatly stepping up its pace. It is a universal revolution and will, accordingly, have a universal range."*

For Marx, Engels and the communist movement, capitalism is a universal system and, consequently, the proletariat is also a global class. Therefore, logically, the response of the proletariat or, in other words, the solution for the proletariat, has to be universal. This issue was even more significant during the wave of world revolution. The Bolsheviks, with Lenin at their head, knew that the Russian revolution would be isolated without the victory of the revolution in other capitalist countries, especially in Germany where the revolution had begun. Therefore, they were waiting for a workers' revolution to take place in at least some European industrialized countries and Lenin insisted that the European revolution was important for humanity. In his farewell letter to the Swiss workers, Lenin argued that the idea of a revolutionary class in Russia that was isolated from other European workers, was wholly alien and stressed that these conditions would probably be very short-lived. In other words, the workers in Europe would revolutionize. He wrote:

*"The idea that the Russian proletariat is the chosen revolutionary proletariat among the workers of the world is absolutely alien to us... It is not its special qualities, but rather the special conjuncture of historical circumstances that for a certain, perhaps very short,*

*time has made the proletariat of Russia the vanguard of the revolutionary proletariat of the whole world.*"<sup>242</sup>

In contrast to the different tendencies of the capitalist left, the Bolsheviks were more aware and emphasized that they should not forget that their revolution was part of a universal revolution and that the fate of the socialist revolution in Russia depended on the fate of the German revolution, in other words, on the fate of the universal revolution. They depicted their duties only through the horizon of the universal revolution. In this context, Lenin wrote:

*"The great honour of beginning the revolution has fallen to the Russian proletariat. But the Russian proletariat must not forget that its movement and revolution are only part of a world revolutionary proletarian movement, which in Germany, for example, is gaining momentum with every passing day. Only from this angle can we define our tasks."*<sup>243</sup>

The victory of socialism on a global scale was an accepted thought in the communist movement prior to the defeat of the wave of global revolution. Even Stalin, in his pamphlet, *Concerning Questions of Leninism*, first published in May 1924, clearly rejected the idea that socialism could be built in one country and by relying solely on the working class of one country. In the first edition of this booklet we read:

*"But the overthrow of the power of the bourgeoisie and establishment of the power of the proletariat in one country does not yet mean that the complete victory of socialism has been ensured. The principal task of socialism - the organisation of*

---

<sup>242</sup> Farewell Letter to the Swiss Workers (April 8 1917) - Lenin

<sup>243</sup> Speech Delivered at the Opening of the Conference April 24 - Lenin

*socialist production - has still to be fulfilled. Can this task be fulfilled, can the final victory of socialism be achieved in one country, without the joint efforts of the proletarians in several advanced countries? No, it cannot. To overthrow the bourgeoisie the efforts of one country are sufficient; this is proved by the history of our revolution. For the final victory of socialism, for the organisation of socialist production, the efforts of one country, particularly of a peasant country like Russia, are insufficient; for that, the efforts of the proletarians of several advanced countries are required''<sup>244</sup>*

The start of the defeat of the wave of universal revolution and, consequently, the suppression of the class struggle, led to the rise of the counter-revolution. We first try to distinguish between the possibility of "the victory of socialism in one country" and the "final victory of socialism". Hence, there is the possibility of a victory for socialism in one country but the ultimate victory of socialism requires the joint efforts of the proletariat of at least some European countries. It is significant that the pamphlet speaks of socialism (the lower stage of a communist society) rather than communism (the high stage of a communist society). Stalin transformed his position and wrote:

*"It goes without saying that for the **complete** victory of socialism, for a **complete** guarantee against the restoration of the old order, the united efforts of the proletarians of several countries are necessary. It goes without saying that, without the support given to*

---

<sup>244</sup> J. V. Stalin, "Concerning Questions of Leninism", Part VI, in Stalin Works, Vol. 8, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1954,

*our revolution by the proletariat of Europe, the proletariat of Russia could not have held out against the general onslaught.*”<sup>245</sup>

Following the defeat of the wave of the universal revolution, which occurred in the shadow of the massacre of tens of thousands of revolutionaries in the heart of Europe, in the Germany, the grounds for the failure of the October Revolution were provided in Europe. The failure of the wave of world revolution was, of course, also accompanied by the victory of the counter-revolution that was built on the bones of the communists that were beaten bloody. It was in this context that, in 1926, Stalin eventually declared “the victory of socialism in one country”:

*“The party has always convinced the idea that the victory of socialism in a country, means the possibility of building socialism in that country, and which that task can be completed by the forces of a single country, had put its point of departure.”*<sup>246</sup>

To demonstrate the accuracy of their argument, the Stalinists and the defenders of socialism in one country used a quote from the *Communist Manifesto* and a quote from Lenin to suggest that, perhaps, the anti-Marxist thesis of socialism in one country was rooted in Marxist theoretical debates. We take a look at the quote from the *Communist Manifesto*:

*“Though not in substance, yet in form, the struggle of the proletariat with the bourgeoisie is at first a national struggle. The*

---

<sup>245</sup> J. V. Stalin, “October Revolution and the Tactics of Russian Communists”, in Stalin Works, Vol. 6, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1954, p. 391

<sup>246</sup> Leon Trotsky-The Third International After Lenin

*proletariat of each country must, of course, first of all settle matters with its own bourgeoisie.*"<sup>247</sup>

First, it should be noted, the unanimous formulation of a clause in *Manifesto* by proletarian scholars. They repeatedly pointed to the universal nature of the capitalist system as well as the universality of the working class and the universal response of the working class. Second, *Manifesto* was written in the era of the development of capitalism, namely, when the communist revolution was still not on the agenda of the proletariat. However, it emphasizes that in terms of meaning and content, the revolution cannot be national even though it takes a national form. Third, it has been written that the proletariat of each country must, of course, first settle matters with its own bourgeoisie. This does not mean that the proletariat of each country initially establishes socialism in its own country and then socialist states, together, establish a federal socialist system. With this explanation in mind, we return to the next quote of the Stalinists, which refers to Lenin. In an article written in 1915 that focuses on the critique of federalism, entitled *On the Slogan for a United States of Europe*, Lenin wrote:

*"The slogan of a United States of the World would hardly be a correct one, first, because it merges with socialism; second, because it may be wrongly interpreted to mean that the victory of socialism in a single country is impossible, and it may also create misconceptions as to the relations of such a country to the others. Uneven economic and political development is an absolute law of capitalism. Hence, the victory of socialism is possible first in several or even in one capitalist country alone. After expropriating the capitalists and organising their own socialist production, the victorious proletariat of that country will arise against the rest of*

---

<sup>247</sup> *Manifesto of the Communist Party* - Marx and Engels



*the world—the capitalist world—attracting to its cause the oppressed classes of other countries, stirring uprisings in those countries against the capitalists, and in case of need using even armed force against the exploiting classes and their states.*”<sup>248</sup>

The fact is that in the years before the October Revolution, the Bolsheviks, with Lenin at their head, inherited certain ambiguities from the Second International. The evolution of the class struggle forced Lenin to adapt his tasks and horizons. It was within this context that Lenin produced his *April Theses*, which became the guide for the Bolsheviks. In previous sections we have discussed the new conditions that it set out. The quotations from Lenin, cited above, confirms the correctness of the claim that Lenin evolved his views in response to the evolution of the global class struggle. On the basis of this explanation we will discuss the uneven economic and political development of capitalism.

The unconventional growth of capitalism was most evident in the era of capitalist development prior to its entry into the decadent era. As a result, in the peripheral countries of capital, there was a tendency for capital to attempt to generate accelerated growth to the level of the capitalist metropolises or to surpass the metropolises in their growth. However, this tendency was reversed when capitalism entered its decadent era. Because the capitalist system has spread to all parts of the earth and the global crisis of capitalism does not ignore any country, the consequences of capitalist crises are more destructive in the peripheral countries of capital.

The fact that capitalism has entered its decadent era does not mean that there is no great difference in the level of growth of productive forces anywhere in the world nor does it mean the end of the growth of the productive forces, it simply means that the growth of the productive forces is achieved in a highly destructive way.

---

<sup>248</sup> Lenin - On the Slogan for a United States of Europe

The growth of the proletariat is also different in different parts of the capitalist world because the characteristics of the proletariat are closely related to the growth of capitalism in each country. However, once capitalism has entered a era of decline and has fully entered into the era of imperialism, the solution is the same for all countries, namely, the proletarian world revolution.

The irrefutable fact is that the communist movement, including the Bolsheviks, believed that socialism was not a national issue but a universal one. The establishment of the Third International (the Comintern) as the World Party of the Socialist Revolutionary was an obvious objective example of such a perspective. With this in mind, we return to the views of the worker-communism and Mansoor Hekmat. In line with the presentation of his counter-revolutionary and anti-Marxist ideas, Mansoor Hekmat falsely portrayed the position of the internationalists. First, let us look at the way in which Mansoor Hekmat fabricated the position of the internationalists:

*“The viewpoint of Left Communism or the Internationalist Communist Party, sanctity and theorizing the unwillingness of the proletariat to carry out its economic tasks after earn of [political] power. This system of thought does not have any explanation of a different economy, non-capitalist for that period. Inevitably, a form of capitalism that is supposed to grow a lot productive forces, is based on the dictatorship of the proletariat, and it does not consider it necessary to think about the proletarian revolutionary economic and revolutionary problem of the proletariat and to earn the readiness to operate it. In my opinion, this view is nothing but is also gradualism and economism in the theory of Marxism ... that*

*without the German revolution in Russia, the revolution would not succeed, it does not give any guidance to anyone.*"<sup>249</sup>

Contrary to Mansoor Hekmat's demagoguery, left communism (the internationalists) has assessed the fundamental mistake of reducing the problem of the development of the revolution to one of economic development and the direct management of production by the proletariat and has clearly addressed these issues in the critique of the workers' opposition in Russia. Despite some serious criticisms, the workers' opposition in Russia was unable to understand the causes of the failure of the wave of universal revolution. Reducing the defeat to economic development and the direct management of production by the proletariat, which was the core of the platform of the workers' opposition in early 1920 in Russia, was a fundamental mistake. This view suggests that socialism can be created in one country. It is not disgraceful that the theoretical leader of the workers' opposition, Alexandra Kollontai, later turned to the defence of socialism in one country and she stood with Stalin.

We continue to examine how Mansoor Hekmat faked the opinions and positions of the internationalists in order to see how, in the shadow of that fakery, he tried to justify his counter-revolutionary and anti-Marxist ideas. In the next section, namely, on the subject of Left Communism and worker-communism, will investigate the reason for these efforts, namely, that Mansoor Hekmat and his comrades were under pressure to prevent the collapse of their members and sympathizers. In considering this issue it is essential to point out that Mansoor Hekmat's use of the notion of the opposition in the following sentence does not refer to the Russian workers' opposition faction but to the communist left (the internationalists):

---

<sup>249</sup> Bulletin of Soviet Debates - The Grounds for the Deviation and Defeat of the Proletarian Revolution in the Soviet Union.

*“Nowadays many, including some of our comrades in our own seminars, believe of opposition to the ‘necessity of a universal revolution’ and ‘the impossibility of socialism in one country’ as evidence of its ‘internationalism’. In my opinion, this view has no particular aspect of internationalism. Why should one who believes that the fate of the Russian revolution, due to the industrial retreat of Russia, has been tied to the German revolution, is necessarily called an internationalist?...But this position so-called internationalist stand of the opposition, as I have already mentioned, actually has its own limitations of theory of the opposition, and its common form with the official line, in the face of the breath of Socialism as its specific economic and social relations, and its requirements in the Russian society after the revolution, reveals. The whole point is that the only revolution in industrial Germany can provide the level of the productive forces that are essential for socialism for the proletarian revolution. This is the viewpoint in which the feasibility of moving ahead of the Russian revolution to the level of revolution in the Russian economy has already been made premature. The fact is that the German Revolution had a decisive place in the Bolshevik strategy. The likely outlook for this revolution and the practical horizon that such a revolution would bring against the Russian proletariat, was itself one of the factors that did not undermine the next steps of the Russian revolution in the context of the economic transformation of Russia itself. Indeed, the Bolsheviks had fulfilled their economic horizons subject to the German revolution.”*<sup>250</sup>

---

<sup>250</sup> Bulletin of Marxism and the Soviet Union - The Main Lines of a Socialist Critique of the Experience of the Soviet Union’s Labour Revolution.

The internationalists have stated that for the October Revolution to advance as part of the world revolution it required the German revolution, not because of the level of the growth of the productive forces in Russia, which Mansur Hekmat had called Russian industrial backwardness, but because of the universal nature of the communist revolution. In other words, if the revolution had not happened in Russia but had taken place on an advanced island, such as Britain, then for success, as part of a world revolution, it would have require the victory of the revolution in other countries. If, for now, we leave to one side the necessity of the fundamental economic and social base for the advancement of the communist revolution and the spread of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the direction of socialism, the global bourgeoisie, under siege from the victorious revolution, would try to defeat the victorious revolution by creating economic, political, ideological and military quarantine. Thus, the only way to confront the siege of the victorious revolution is the extension and development of the revolution in other regions.

It is lies the of Mansoor Hekmat that suggest that perhaps the communist left (the internationalists) believed that only revolution in industrial Germany could have provided the proletarian revolution with the level of productive forces that were vital to socialism. Internationalists believe that capitalism is a global system and that commodity relations have penetrated even the most remote parts of the globe. Therefore, the internationalists draw the conclusion that the nature of their communist revolution is based not on the special relations of a particular country but on the global capitalist situation. We do not deny that the proletariat differs in different parts of the world and that there are great differences in the level of growth of the productive forces, as well as the productive forces themselves, but the function and metabolism of the capitalist system works at the global level, hence, the response to it will also require a universal communist revolution.

Internationalists not only accept the economic tasks of the dictatorship of the proletariat but, incidentally, they also view those tasks

from an internationalist horizon. If in a concrete form, we return to the dictatorship of the proletariat in Russia, the dictatorship had a difficult economic duty: the reconstruction of the force and the means of production that had been damaged by the developments that resulted from the revolution and the civil war. At this stage, the need for the technical presence of the technocratic petty-bourgeois was also required. The irrefutable truth is that it is not possible for the proletariat of one country to solve such problems; it requires the cooperation and collaboration of the international proletariat or, at least, the proletariat of several countries. Yet, according to Mansoor Hekmat's demagoguery, those who say that the thesis of socialism in one country is not possible take away the economic tasks of the proletariat and give those tasks to the bourgeoisie. Mansoor Hekmat blames the Bolsheviks for not having the theoretical and practical readiness for the economic tasks of the proletariat and, therefore, for allowing the industrialization process to be carried out by the bourgeoisie. In other words, if Mansoor Hekmat had been in Russia at that time he would have told the Bolsheviks about the economic tasks of the proletariat and the outcome of events would have been different. Such nonsense is only given credibility among of his disciples. He wrote:

*“There is no doubt that the October Revolution failed in its economic tasks, or in any case, the economic tasks of the October Revolution are issues that could be the axis of political deviations and in any case, have a serious relationship with it. In my opinion, the lack of readiness for these economic tasks has played a vital role in defeating of the Bolsheviks in Russia. The methodology of comrade Ghulam in fact is not different from the methodology of the Internationalist Communist Party [Battaglia Comunista], which he criticizes here. This methodology sanctifies and theorizes the Bolsheviks' unwillingness to carry out the post-revolutionary economic tasks. With the verdict that the economic building of Socialism is not possible in a country, from before does not put*

*economic duty on shoulder of the proletariat in one country and so, in front of the bourgeoisie, which presents a kind of economic tasks for the material improvement of society remains defenceless and alternativeness and for this reason it fails and inevitably gives the industrialization of Russia into the bourgeoisie. In general, those who argue with this point of view of impossibility of socialism in one country, and then give this "internationalist" answer that the revolution can only triumph internationally to have an economic meaning for the proletariat, they sanctify the theoretical and practical unattractiveness of the Bolsheviks to deal with the economic tasks of the proletariat after the acquisition of power. This is the drawback of discussion of the both comrade Ghulam and Internationalist Communist Party [Battaglia Comunista], which the comrade tried to make a distinction with it. Now I'm adding this much that the lack of preparation for defining and explaining the economic tasks of a proletarian revolution in a country, when this revolution has happened in a country anyway, this means that communists do not have an economic alternative to the position of the bourgeoisie."*<sup>251</sup>

In order to continue this discussion, we must inevitably make brief reference to the contexts of the formation of socialism. The mode of capitalist production grew within the feudal system that lasted from the 15th to the 19th centuries. The bourgeoisie itself was the product of an evolutionary process in the mode of production and exchange. The economic growth of capitalism and its transformation into the dominant relations of production required a social and political relationship that manifested itself in the great revolution of France in 1789. It was no

---

<sup>251</sup> Bulletin of Soviet Debates - The Grounds for the Deviation and Defeat of the Proletarian Revolution in the Soviet Union.

coincidence that the motto of the French Revolution was “freedom-equality-fraternity”, which was the basis of the flourishing of capitalist society. Being a free citizen means the buyer and the seller of labour are contracted as having free and equal rights. Equality means equality before the law and fraternity means a feeling of belonging to bourgeois society. In other words, as long as the society did not experience a superficial level of growth of the productive forces globally and had not created its gravediggers globally, namely, the proletariat, the talk of socialism could only be a kind of fiction. Even after the formation of capitalism, Marx mentions all kinds of socialism - reactionary socialism, conservative socialism, imaginary socialism, etc.- whose purpose is everything except the liberation of humanity from the exploitation of human by human.

It is a fact that through the development of the means of production and the breakdown of the old relations, wherever it has come to power the bourgeoisie has played a revolutionary role in history. With the growth and development of large industries, as well as by taming nature, the bourgeoisie had established areas of macro production. At the same time, the bourgeoisie has also created its gravedigger, the proletariat. It is worth distinguishing the universal tendency of the capitalist mode of production from the methods of pre-capitalist production. **The growth of the productive forces has, as a consequence, the emergence and formation of a proletariat at the global level that provides the material context of the necessity for socialism.** The perception of socialism is first possible through the growth and flourishing of the productive forces. Marx expresses this clearly in the following:

*“There appears here the universalizing tendency of capital, which distinguishes it from all previous stages of production. Although limited by its very nature, it strives towards the universal development of the forces of production, and thus becomes the presupposition of a new mode of production...This tendency - which capital possesses, but which at the same time, since capital is a*



*limited form of production, contradicts it and hence drives it towards dissolution - distinguishes capital from all earlier modes of production.*"<sup>252</sup>

We now return to Mansoor Hekmat and his bourgeois and reactionary idea of socialism. Mansoor Hekmat believed that socialism could even be realized in Ghana, one of the most peripheral countries of capital. According to Mansoor Hekmat, socialism is a collection of relations between individuals and their means of production, as well as the distribution of social income. Hence, these relationships can be established anywhere. He expressed his Stalinist-Maoist understanding, which contradicts the Marxist understanding, as follows:

*"The response of a communist must be that 'the building of socialism in one country' means the low level of communist society, is practical even in Ghana. Because socialism is a collection of relations between individuals, between individuals and their means of production, as well as the distribution of social income.*"<sup>253</sup>

We have already explained that socialism is possible, first and foremost, through the growth and prosperity of the productive forces. Contrary to the nonsense of Mansoor Hekmat, socialism is not only possible in Ghana but also in the most advanced and powerful European countries, such as Germany, because the global capitalist system and the mode of capitalist production form an interconnected network in which the "independent state" has lost its meaning.

---

<sup>252</sup> Marx - *Grundrisse- Circulation costs. – Means of communication and transport*

<sup>253</sup> Bulletin of Soviet Debates - The Grounds for the Deviation and Defeat of the Proletarian Revolution in the Soviet Union.

However, socialism, whether in Ghana or Germany is only possible as part of the process of the world revolution. In the process of the world revolution, a heavy duty falls on the shoulders of the proletariat of the metropolitan countries in that they are required to help prepare the social conditions for the expansion of production that has become socialized. The task of building socialism in Ghana is not only the responsibility of the proletariat of Ghana but also of the entire proletariat. We continue to explore our understanding of the bourgeois, Stalinist-Maoist thoughts of Mansoor Hekmat who claims it is possible to establish socialism on an island in the middle of the ocean:

*“If the discussion is about a low phase, namely about that in Russia in 1924 next, consciously can go towards the building of an economic relationship and a certain level of productive forces that would take from each according to his work and give everyone as much as his work, and the element of wage labour among them is destroyed, I answer it positively. It can be, and for this there is no need for a world revolution. Even do not need for a country of the size of Russia ... Why is it not possible after interrupting the foundations of the old society, to organize social production with new relationships? Because not being the World Revolution?! If the theory that ‘socialism is only possible globally’ is correct, if this theory is correct that ‘Socialism can not be deployed in a society’, then I ask how is it that in this world young utopian people go to buy islands in the middle of the ocean, where they live in a communist way? Do they have to establish an ownership relationship between themselves?”<sup>254</sup>*

---

<sup>254</sup> Bulletin No. 2 - Problems in Analysing the Failure of the Proletariat in the Soviet Union.

Socialism is neither a state nor the “collective” ownership of the means of production but the socialization of the productive forces and the socialization of production. Comparing primitive life on an island in the middle of ocean - where there is no wage labour—with socialism presents a brutal illustration of socialism. Primitive life cannot be adapted to the metropolises and modern society and, most importantly, social production cannot be adapted to primitive production. If such an idea were to be put into practice the socialism of Mansoor Hekmat would be no better than the socialism of the Cambodian dictator, Pol Pot.

Apparently, in Mansoor Hekmat’s bourgeois understanding of socialism, the material context of socialism, namely, the growth of the productive forces and the formation of the proletarian class, are absent. He evaluated the lives of nine young utopian members of the proletarian class who were living in a “commune” on a primitive island in the middle of the ocean and compared them with socialism. Socialism is not a generalized barbarism but a socialization and flourishing of productive forces.

Finally, Mansoor Hekmat’s philosophy suggests that the construction of socialism, in the real and the Marxist sense of the word, was not only possible in Russia and, even more significant, that the avant-garde of the class, the Bolsheviks, were theoretically unprepared as they were still influenced by social-democratic thinking. For a long period, the horizons and views of the Second International influenced the Russian social-democracy thinking. Mansoor Hekmat wrote:

*“The construction of socialism in the real and Marxist sense of the word in Russia was not only practical, but also for the continuation of the revolution and stabilization of it vital...Certainly one of the most important factors in the inability of the working class of Russia to decisively complete its revolution was the theoretical unethicity of the avant-garde element of the class in this Revolution...The horizons and opinions of the Second International for the long period of time affected the thought of Russian Social-*

*Democracy... Russian Social-Democracy for a long time understand and recognize the Marxist Principles according to this International and its leaders. The separation of the Bolsheviks from the intellectual and practical influence of the Second International was a step-by-step process. This process has historical and deterministic points and sections. But the important point is that this process has not been completely and definitively completed until the 1917...In short, the first intellectual influence of the Second International was that the working class of Russia and its leading party had already diminished the pre-feasibility of establishing socialist economic relations in Russia, mainly due to its "economic retardation" in its strategy.*"<sup>255</sup>

It is a fact that the Bolshevik separation from social democracy took place as part of a process. Following the start of the First World War and the majority of social-democratic parties' defence of their own imperialist motherland in the war, and in the process of integrating the social democracy parties into the capitalist camps, the Bolsheviks and a few factions of the social-democratic parties took an internationalist stance against the war and were divided into two different camps. Contrary to the abuses of Mansoor Hekmat, the evolution of Lenin's views as a result of the evolution of the class struggle, especially as set out in the *April Theses* and in the process of attempting the socialist revolution, expresses the readiness of the avant-garde of the proletariat for the upcoming events.

Perhaps, at first glance, it appears that Mansour Hekmat is not acquainted with the topics of the period or is unaware of those discussions but such a view would be very naive. Mansoor Hekmat, as an ideologue of the left of capital, looks to social events from the horizons, from the views and the class interests of the left of capital. Many issues in various

---

<sup>255</sup> Bulletin of Marxism and the Soviet Union - The Main Lines of a Socialist Critique of the Experience of the Soviet Union's Labour Revolution.

contexts, including the economic context at the leading level of the proletariat, emerged in the period 1917 to 1925. These topics form some of the very rich and still valid issues of the proletarian movement. The defeat of the wave of world revolution and the rise of the counter-revolution forced the internationalists to defend the proletarian and Marxist positions. In this context, the formation of Left Communism was a necessity. Internationalists from Germany to Russia, from Britain to the Netherlands, from Italy to... have defended the communist positions. This will briefly be mentioned in the next section.

## **Socialism or state capitalism**

Capitalist ownership of the means of production has taken different forms throughout its history. If, in the early stages of capitalism private ownership was dominant, in the present era it is no longer private and individual but, rather, it takes a “collective” form as cartels and trusts. In the era of capitalist decline, the ownership of capital tends to be in the form of “collective” ownership and state ownership. It is necessary to note that the collective ownership of capital never means social ownership of the means of production.

As mentioned, in the era of capital degradation, in the era of imperialism, capital desires to be collective and to become state-owned. Capital, especially in periods when it is perceived to be at risk, tends to become state-owned in order to guarantee the accumulation of capital. The desire to become state-owned is more visible in peripheral capital than in metropolitan capital whereas in metropolitan capital the productive forces have taken on a more social character (without being socialized).

Due to historical constraints, the bourgeoisie of peripheral capital has not been able to accomplish the historical tasks of metropolitan capitalism and the left-wing of capital wants its class objectives to have a left ideological superstructure. In other words, in the capital of the periphery, the left-wing of capital can easily deal with Marxist demands. In the metropolitan capital, this task is more visible in the form of social-democratic parties or labour parties.

The state, no matter its purpose, is essentially a capitalist machine. The more productive forces the state has at its disposal, the more it becomes a great capitalist and the more involved it is in the exploitation of the wage slaves. We have already explained that the dictatorship of the proletariat is a special form of state within which, step by step, the productive forces become social rather than state owned. The history of the workers’ movement has taught us that state ownership of the means of production is not a solution to the struggle of the proletariat, rather, the

social ownership of the means of production and the decline of the state are the goals of the proletarian struggle. Engels explains this clearly in the following:

*“The modern state, no matter what its form, is essentially a capitalist machine, the state of the capitalists, the ideal personification of the total national capital. The more it proceeds to the taking over of productive forces, the more does it actually become the national capitalist, the more citizens does it exploit. The workers remain wage-workers - proletarians... State ownership of the productive forces is not the solution of the conflict.”*<sup>256</sup>

In terms of the legal status, state capitalism (state ownership) means that the state owns the means of production. Under state ownership of the means of production the relationship between work and capital continues to dominate and state economic planning is never in conflict with state ownership. In the model of state-owned capitalism, the disappearance of competition and its replacement with cooperation between the production units bears no similarity and has no affinity with the socialization of the productive forces.

In state capitalism, state ownership of the means of production continues to involve transforming the labour force into a commodity, which is the essential characteristic of capitalist relations of production. In so doing, an exploitative relationship is formed. In such societies and under this form of capitalism, state capitalism, the main features of capitalism - commodity production, wage labour, money, profits and the market - will remain. Examples of such are the former Eastern bloc, China, Cuba, North Korea and so on.

---

<sup>256</sup> *Anti-Dühring* - Engels

Under the dictatorship of the proletariat, the communist revolution make the means of production available to the community through social planning based on social needs, which represents the socialization of the means of production. **The socialization of the productive forces means that the relationship of the labour forces is in line with the material needs of the society, not in the interests of private capital or state capital, i.e., the goal of surplus value.** Under such conditions, people are consciously and collectively working with the socialized means of production and the socialized labour force will be appear as one unit.

With these explanations in mind, we turn to the UCM and Mansoor Hekmat to see how they wanted to present a special form of capitalist barbarism (state capitalism) as “socialism”. Hekmat assessed the acquisition of state monopoly capitalism through a revolutionary and democratic government as a step towards socialism. Certainly, in order for commodity production to continue and in order to guarantee the accumulation of capital, the ideology of capitalism means that socialism is the same as the state ownership of the means of production and the state planning of production, in other words, it is the same as state capitalism:

*“Confiscation, nationalize and... does not destroy capitalism, but it creates or develops a monopoly capitalism... And this monopoly state capitalism in the hands of a revolutionary and democratic government is a step towards socialism... Because a ‘revolutionary and democratic state’ is the most appropriate political mode to take power by the proletariat, and then the monopoly of state capitalism, is the most appropriate economic mode to start building socialism.”*<sup>257</sup>

For Mansoor Hekmat, the monopoly of state capitalism was the most appropriate economic mode for socialism because he associated state ownership of the means of production in the hands of a “revolutionary”

---

<sup>257</sup> *Towards Socialism* No. 1 (First Period), page 23.



and democratic state with socialism. We continue our inquiry into the socialist world of Mansour Hekmat, which is a special form of capitalist barbarity. Mansoor Hekmat's utopian community involved peripheral capitalist politicians who, in their promotional promises, proposed a list of actions that they would perform if they came to power, although everyone knows that in tomorrow's victory it will not be possible to fulfil such demands because there will be no material grounds for their realization. Mansoor Hekmat expressed the fulfilment of his "communist" demands as follows:

*"Now, you think that the labourer's family what percentage of their salary, what percentage of their purchasing power, is spend on housing, health, education, food, and transport. 80 percent? 80 percent of the wage is no longer important. Because it has these and society has eliminated a large part of wage labour, which he does, actually is no means for 80 percent. , and it is because of the difference of 20 percent that came to the factory. Later, in an accounted process, even 20 percent of the recreational and luxury products of the community are out of the realm of capitalism, and the organizing of using it. What will be the process of production? What will be the management? And so on, in my opinion, given today's computer technology, given the power of information exchange in the world, for all these, clear answers can be found."*<sup>258</sup>

The question that arises is how does Mansoor Hekmat guarantee all the basic needs of society, namely, housing, health, education, food and transport, which he considers to be 80 percent of the needs of the community? There is a weak mechanism for meeting the basic needs of society—social security. In Western European countries health and

---

<sup>258</sup> Is it Possible to Win Communism in Iran?, Mansoor Hekmat.

education are free and if someone is unable to afford the cost of housing, food, clothing, etc., they will receive these benefits through social security. Thus, according to the criteria of Mansoor Hekmat, Western European countries should be assessed as socialist. However, compared with their class brothers and sisters in peripheral capital, the degree of exploitation of the working class in the Marxist sense is very high in Western European countries.

In the community of peripheral capital it is not possible to guarantee everyone's basic needs. Apparently, because he talks about the possibility of the victory of communism in Iran, in the communist world of Mansoor Hekmat the worker attends for work because it allows him 20 percent access to the recreational and luxury products available in the community. Whether this can be seen as a brutal image of a communist society or a rudimentary image of a socialist society, a caricatured form of Mansoor Hekmat's demands existed in the former Eastern bloc. Mansour Hekmat provides a concrete example of how his demands can be fulfilled, namely, by providing housing, health, education, food and transportation for the community, which he also related to the former Eastern bloc:

*"Truly, in my sense, I envy people like Castro and the current of Castro in Cuba. They came, 20 years, 30 years were had power, they brought health, brought housing, cleaned the streets, they said you did not have the right to slap to someone's ears. Their socialism was not scientific and was not revolutionary Marxism, if Castro was here now, he would say, go on with your work, dear sir! My socialism was not scientific, but do you know how many millions of people multiplied by how many hours perceived themselves to be happy? Do not talk anymore. If we have wisdom we say we understand it and this gives us morale."*<sup>259</sup>

---

<sup>259</sup> Speech to the Opening Ceremony of the Second Congress of the worker-communist party of Iran, April 1998.

We have now discovered that Mansoor Hekmat wanted to provide the basic needs of society (housing, health, education, food, etc.) by adopting a system similar to that in Cuba—generalized barbarism and a special form of capitalism, state capitalism. Mansoor Hekmat may envy Castro, he may have the wisdom to figure out what Castro was saying, but he cannot foist the barbarities of capitalism (in which the state owns the means of production) in the name of socialism. In contrast to the radical phrase ideologues of the left of capital that have played a major role in besmirching the ideals and values of communism, the internationalists have been defending proletarian positions and goals for more than a hundred years and are still defending proletarian positions and goals.

We can now see how Mansoor Hekmat wants to organize society to become more prosperous the very next day after his party comes to power. Like the political demagogues, he offers promises before the election. The fight against economic corruption (extravagance and disgust), the fight against dictatorship (repression), the provision of freedom (free and prosperous manpower) and the removal the community's basic needs from the market is supposed to provide a more prosperous community for the majority of society.

We have already explained that state economic planning is never in conflict with state ownership. The disappearance of competition and its replacement by the cooperation of production units, which was the prevalent model in the former Soviet Union (state capitalism), has nothing to do with the socialization of the productive forces. In the former Eastern bloc, the market did not exist in its prevailing sense (free market). However, labour power was transformed into goods, which resulted in both surplus value and capital accumulation. Mansoor Hekmat stated:

*“In my opinion, the organization of a more affluent society with the same capabilities is possible immediately. It may be possible for two reasons at the outset: one is that manpower is freed. I think a free and happy human being in the same amount of time is better*

*created, made and produced. Initiates, gives heart, concentrates, burns heartily... Second, in my opinion, misappropriate and extravagance in these countries is tremendous. That is, the capital that is being used in Iran for the restraint of the rule and sponging on others of the ruling classes is unlimited. First, we can easily ensure that things like health, education, transportation, art, housing and food come from the marketplace ... The system I suggest is that let's take the people's needs one after the other from the free market and give out from the market system.*"<sup>260</sup>

The utopia and dreamland world of Mansoor Hekmat, which we have discovered through reviewing his ideas, would, if realized, be a Cuban-like society. It is likely that he envies Castro. Such societies represent a special kind of barbaric capital, one in which labour power is still transformed into a commodity. Contrary to Mansoor Hekmat's demagoguery about such societies, the people in those societies are not happy. In those societies, people are forced to live in a society that is like a large prison. The productive forces in those societies are greatly faded.

Socialism is not generalized barbarity but represents the socialization of the productive forces, which is directly related to the material needs of the society and not to state capital or "collective" capital, both of which are more in keeping with the production of surplus value. Internationalism is the fundamental principle of socialism and in a socialist society the needs of society can only be realized from the perspective of internationalist horizons. Within socialism, which is a global community, people consciously and collectively develop a socialized means of production. People do not try to escape from such societies because they really do feel happy.

---

<sup>260</sup> Is it Possible to Win Communism in Iran?, Mansoor Hekmat.

## The Place of Worker-communism in History

One of the characteristics of worker-communism was the adoption of a radical phrase. Further, the seemingly revolutionary and communist terms of the Unity of Communist Militants acted as a cover for the counterrevolutionary and bourgeois nature of this political tendency. Particularly, in the course of time, this political tendency tried to align itself with the communist left by hiding its counter-revolutionary nature.

The radical phrase and the pretence to converge with the communist left led, at some point, to a mistaken belief, somewhere in the political milieu of both the Iranians and non-Iranians, whereby this tendency was perceived as “communist left” or influenced by the communist left. Practical translation of this phenomenon to a new generation that is approaching political issues, suggests that the internationalist position in its evolutionary process is leading to counterrevolutionary positions.

It was in this context that Babak Kasrayi, an adviser to the Central Committee of the worker-communist party of Iran (WCPI), when giving reasons for his recent resignation, claimed that worker-communism belonged to the communist left but seemed to have been neglected by the working-class struggle on account of being ultra-leftist.<sup>261</sup>

According to the e-journal *Alternative*, an inappropriate and heterogeneous mixture of the varied tendencies of the political apparatus of capital, entered the political milieu with impact, before being silenced in a text which claimed that the roots of worker-communism should be sought in the communist left:

---

<sup>261</sup> Babak Kasrayi, a former adviser to the Central Committee, resigned his membership of the worker-communist party of Iran on 24 March 2011.

*“‘Worker-communism’ or the ‘communist left’? The first fundamental step of worker-communism was to distinguish between the classical Marxist tradition until the present (Marx, Engels, Lenin, Rosa Luxemburg, Trotsky and Gramsci), between the party and class, between self-striving and the self-spontaneous struggle of the working class on the one hand, while its struggle in the form of party activities and communist organizations (the communist movement) was established to crumble away and, in turn, a new plan was apparently devised to respond to this issue ... Providing ideas in this form, in the modern history of communism is Iran, could be new, but it has views and trends which are similar to the positions of [Mansoor] Hekmat, and of course at a much higher-quality level.*

*In the history of international communism, it is possible to trace where the problem lies - of course, not our problem, but Hekmat’s problem - which concerns the so-called blood enemies of Lenin and Bolshevism, who are basically portraying themselves as ‘anti-Bolshevik communists’! This is the same known current as the ‘communist left’, which, in the very early years after the October Revolution, separated its path from Bolshevism and became a major critic. Lenin in ‘Left-wing’ Communism: An Infantile Disorder engaged in a fierce controversy with [the communist left]”<sup>262</sup>*

---

<sup>262</sup> *Alternative*, Issue 11. The e-journal was a publication positioned on the new spectrum and younger wing of the left of capital, published from March 2010 to March 2012. In an article entitled “What Alternative? Alternative for?”, which prescribes the publication of the journal, describes itself as follows:

*“Alternative defines itself as being in a dialectical relationship between continuity and disconnection with the history of the communist movement and the existing groups and organizations (as the last product of this history). We stand, without doubt and proudly, on the brilliant path of this history; from social democracy and the Constitutional Revolution until today. From Haydar Amo-oghli [I] and Avetis*

---

Sultan-Zade [II] to Ja'far Pishevari [III] and Khosro Roozbeh [IV], from Bijan Jazani [V] and Masoud Ahmadzadeh [VI] and Hamid Ashraf [VII] to Taghi Shahram [VIII] and Foad Mostafa Soltani [IX] and Alireza Shokouhi [X], and from Hossein Riahi [XI] and Alireza Sepasi [XII] to Gholam Keshavarz [XIII] and Mansour Hekmat, along with other comrades who have devoted or sacrificed their lives in different periods of contemporary Iranian history in pursuit of communist ideals.”

[I] [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Haydar\\_Khan\\_Amo-oghli](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Haydar_Khan_Amo-oghli)

[II] [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Avetis\\_Sultan-Zade](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Avetis_Sultan-Zade)

[III] [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ja%27far\\_Pishevari](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ja%27far_Pishevari)

[IV] [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Khosro\\_Roozbeh](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Khosro_Roozbeh)

[V] [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bijan\\_Jazani](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bijan_Jazani)

[VI] [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Masoud\\_Ahmadzadeh](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Masoud_Ahmadzadeh)

[VII] [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hamid\\_Ashraf](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hamid_Ashraf)

[VIII] [Wikipedia](#)

[IX] [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Foad\\_Mostafa\\_Soltani](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Foad_Mostafa_Soltani)

[X] One of the founders of the Stalinist organization who was executed.

[XI] One of the founders of the Maoist organization who was executed.

[XII] One of the founders of the Organization of the Struggle for the Emancipation of the Working Class.

[XIII] One of the leaders of the Communist Party who was assassinated in Cyprus in August 1989.

The list itself expresses intellectual turmoil and the lack of internal consistency in the opinions of this publication. If the name of an internationalist, such as Sultanzadeh, was removed from this list, it would be more coherent than objecting to references to Sultanzadeh.

*Alternative* expresses its own opinion and, at the same time, its intellectual turmoil as below:

*“We believe that the Organization of Iranian People’s Fedai Guerrillas, in a specific historical period, namely in the 1960s and the first half of the 1970s, ... could play a very positive role in the evolution of communist struggles. This current was able to break with the Tudeh Party and its reformism and opportunism, while opportunism brought a new generation of the revolutionary left on the scene. This returned him to the affections of the left and restored the reputation of the left, which had been lost due to the performance of the Tudeh Party in 1953, at the expense of its blood and soul. In this way, the current course could determine such a hegemony for the left in the social sphere, which, after*

*Alternative* also suggested that the communist left believe in the self-collapse of capitalism, writing that:

*“The collapse of capital, in contrast to the expression of some Marxist tendencies (such as the communists left), does not take place in the form of self-collapse.”*<sup>263</sup>

Before the collapse of the Berlin Wall, Abdullah Mohtadi was the first General Secretary of the “only Communist Party” in the world, namely the Anti-communist Party of Iran. Then, following the metamorphic wave of Stalinist parties, after the collapse of the Berlin Wall, it became social democratic and abandoned the label of communism. Mr Mohtadi says that worker-communism has borrowed its positions from the communist left and thus, in his break with the radical phase of the left of capital and in his writings about social democracy, states:

---

*several decades of its repetition, has become a dream for all ... On the other hand, we commemorate the fact that Comrade Hekmat played an irrevocable role in distancing the communist movement from populist ideas by resolving the contradictions and issues created in the years following the February 1979 uprising. The intention here was to return communism to its real position, to allow for the expression of the protest of the working class against capitalism, etc., etc.: that is, the achievements that were a major step forward in influencing the establishment of the Communist Party of Iran (September 1983) ... Trotskyism can be regarded as the most important attempt to allow classical Marxism to persist into the 1930s, and especially in post-World War II conditions. It is also true that this tradition has many lessons and experiences to learn. We do not think that anyone doubts the fact that the most advanced part of the communist movement, internationally and in the Marxist theory of history, was historically formed in Western Europe.”*

<sup>263</sup> *Alternative*, Issue 11.



*“The viewpoint of ‘worker-communism’, which itself was borrowed from the extreme marginalized and martial currents of the European left, such as the [International Communist Current (ICC)] and others, represented a strong opposition to the trade unions ... The ICC ... was the name of a publication as well as a small melancholic left group in Europe in the 1970s and 1980s which opposed trade unions, calling them servants of the bourgeois, who are opposed to democracy, and arguing that it was the bourgeoisie’s trick to create illusions among the working class. They did not differentiate between democracy and fascism, and they rejected both [democracy and fascism] as various manifestations of capitalist rule, considered the participation of the working class in elections and parliament to be a betrayal, and knew that this was a taboo subject. They also considered national and liberation movements to be reactionary, the appendages of imperialism, and so on. There were many of these types of groups at that time.”*<sup>264</sup>

Definitely this list can be extended. None of those who have scrambled to show that the roots of worker-communism can be found in the communist left have attempted to offer a brief explanation of the communist left, nor have they, in their claim that worker-communism is influenced by the communist left, referred to the texts of the communist left. Before examining the charlatanism, lies and disgrace of these new leaders and scholars, a brief explanation or introduction to the communist left is necessary. Why an introduction? Because even a short introduction to the communist left requires a separate and serious article.

The advent of the wave of world revolution - and, with it, those problems that challenged the advance of world revolution - prepared the

---

<sup>264</sup> Introduction to the break-up and transition by Abdullah Mohtadi, February 2017.

material context for the communist left. The signs of the defeat of this wave of world revolution led to the isolation of the October Revolution, which soon showed signs of degeneration. The decadent process of the October Revolution had an impact on all communist parties and revolutionary currents. In such a context, the necessity for the existence of the communist left was more and more prominent. Internationalists from Bulgaria to Germany, from Russia to America, from Britain to the Netherlands, from Italy to ... rose to defend communist positions. But, in three countries where the Marxist tradition was strong, namely, in Russia, Germany and Italy, the communist left turned out to be strong and coherent. In short, the reaction of the communist left was a global response.

First of all, it should be emphasized that internationalists, until the last minute, tried to stay aligned to the currents that would lead to degeneration and defend proletarian positions, while never wanting to split. The revolutionaries who were shaped by the Communist Workers' Party of Germany did not split from the German Communist Party but were expelled from it. The same is true of the Italian left, and especially of Comrade Bordiga. The conditions for Russian internationalists were much harder than for others due to violent oppression.

With the victory of the Stalinist counterrevolution, which coincided with the start of the black anti-revolution era, the internationalists, in the form of a faction, defended communist positions. In the meantime, the Italian communist left faction was of great importance. Today, the communist left includes three major internationalist tendencies, but introducing every communist left tendency is not the purpose of this section. However, the main communist left tendencies are as follows:

- Internationalist Communist Tendency
- International Communist Current
- Bordigist currents (international communist parties)

To get to know each of these currents, see the links section on the International Voice website. As explained earlier, the communist left found it necessary to defend the basic positions of Marxism and the first signs of counterrevolution. The basic positions of the communist left are as follows:

- **Internationalism** - Internationalists believe that capitalism is a global production system which has spread itself to the gloomiest points on the globe. The bourgeoisie is a global class and consequently the proletariat is also a global class. Therefore, the communist programme and platform in the era of capitalist decadence and the era of imperialism can only be from an internationalist perspective.
- **Global socialism** - Internationalists believe in a global revolution, and consequently socialism is also a global community. This issue and the counterrevolutionary thesis of “socialism in one country” are discussed in detail in the previous section.
- **Rejection of parliamentarism** - Internationalists believe that, with the onset of the era of communist revolutions, any disturbing illusion in relation to parliament is a dirty punch in the eyes of the working class. Parliamentarism will be discussed in detail in this section.
- **Rejection of national movements** - With the advent of capitalism in the era of communist revolutions, national movements have become the infantry in imperialist conflicts and part of imperialist policies. National movements are discussed in detail in this section.

- **Rejection of trade unions** - Trade unions all over the world have become instruments of capital. The main task of unions is to control the working class and distort the class struggle of the workers. Unions are discussed in detail in this section.
- **The International and Internationalist Communist Party** - Internationalists believe that without the International and internationalist Communist party, it is not possible for communist revolution to succeed. Disagreements are about the nature, function, role and relationship of the party with class.

With the slightest explanation of the communist left, we find that none of those who have tried to suggest that the roots of worker-communism must be found in the communist left, nor have tried to show that worker-communism believes in the same positions as the communist left. First, let us look at the lies and spells of Mr Mohtadi, who is struggling to work round the clock in order to play the role of one of the region's gangsters in the sphere of imperialist politics, has long acted as a servant to the countries of the region. With the arrival of Trump and the intensification of imperialist tensions among the gangsters in the region, such mercenaries have become more successful. The black bands, as a band of toilers (Mohtadi's band), by attracting gunmen who have lost their social identity, in the camp sponsored by gangsters in the region, try to increase their chances of acceptability, following the developments in the region and at the threshold of the gangsters in the region. These innumerable hand servants to the gangsters of the area have become part of the policy of imperialism known as the concept of socialization. Talabani and Barzani have played such a role, with the campaigns of the US Army and the Iraq War bringing them to power, and now they have become the symbol of nationalist gangs. In the culture of subservience to which they belong, internationalists, such as the ICC, are called "super-marginal and Martian". Apparently, Mohtadi did not bother, before

commenting on the ICC, to at least visit the site of the current or to at least raise his awareness of the ICC, as that would have been overwhelming!

First, the ICC is the name of the current, not the erroneously translated name of the ICC. The name when translated into Persian was not inaccurate due to a grammar problem in the language; that is, “leader” was translated as “German ideology” in Persian.

Second, the ICC is the name of the current, not the name of the publication. Publications of the ICC use different terms, such as internationalism, world revolution, and so on.

Thirdly, it is quite natural that, in the menial culture of Mohtadi, which has a long history, internationalists are accused of being on the “melancholic left”. Still, they are creatures who still believe that Lenin was a German spy.

Fourth, Mohtadi resorted to falsehood on a clear day, writing: “It was the name of a publication and a small marginal leftist group in Europe in the 1970s and 1980s.” He used the past tense, that is, it no longer exists. Contrary to the hopes and desires of the left of capital, the ICC is still one of the beacons of the internationalist stance which defends proletarian positions.

We will return to the other slogans of Mohtadi in relation to the positions of internationalists, trade unions, national movements, parliamentarism, democracy and so on in this part.

Before proceeding with this discussion, clarifying a problem is necessary for those who are unfamiliar with the history and positions of the communist left. The “communist left” and “council communism” are two intellectual attitudes, with two completely separate historical traditions. In our opinion, the communist left is a defender of the proletarian positions and the continuity of the history of communism, while council communism is an idealist view of the evolution of historical events. The confusion probably explains why militants of the communist left are associated with the stagnation of the class struggle while the

domination of the counterrevolution is oriented towards “council communism”.

Let us see how accurate the *Alternative* journal comments are. This online publication was supposed to present a new alternative to Iran’s political milieu. It was not only for internationalists but also for every serious human being in the political space, as it clearly addressed the complexity of the political apparatus of capital, due to a lack of any theoretical coherence and the heterogeneity of the views held. Like a “shining meteorite and jumping fountain”, it entered the political milieu at a speed that tolled “the sound of death and desolation”.

Before continuing the discussion, referring to the classic Marxist tradition of the alternative to “Marx, Engels, Lenin, Rosa Luxemburg, Trotsky and Gramsci” is essential. This publication attempted to present Gramsci as being in the classical Marxist tradition. Gramsci had neither a theoretical nor a historic role in the Marxist tradition, as in the case of other names mentioned above. Gramsci’s reactionary and Stalinist positions on fascism, Gramsci’s role in undermining the left wing of the Italian Communist Party, and the united front of Gramsci (united with the democratic and bourgeois parliamentary faction), among other factors, explain Gramsci’s role and position. It was only after the beginning of the anti-revolution era that the Communist International (Comintern) pushed him from the margins towards the middle in order to confront the communist left, including Comrade Bordiga; for Gramsci, the Communist Party without Bordiga was meaningless. Gramsci, under the guidance of and pressure of the Comintern was placed in the leadership of the Communist Party, as the new conditions needed to be in Gramsci’s name.

As previously mentioned, the *Alternative* journal claimed that the communist left believes that capitalism will spontaneously lead to its collapse – or, in other words, the communist left is “deterministic”. A territorial translation of this idea is that the communist left does not interfere in the class struggle. This publication fails to give the slightest explanation of its claims, nor does it refer to the texts of the communist

left. Apparently, this has been understood from other texts. There is not the slightest truth in this: the famous slogan of the internationalists, “Communist Revolution or the Destruction of Humanity!”, expresses that, if the working class does not fulfil its historical decree, then the destruction of not only the working class but the whole of humanity is certain. Internationalists believe that any class mode of production consists of two historical periods. The first phase is the period of growth and prosperity; the second period is the period of degeneration and the disintegration of the mode of production. Capitalism been growing in the community for centuries; in the first period, it played a revolutionary role, symbolized by the great French Revolution, then entered the decadent period with World War I. Capitalism, with its degeneration, began the era of social revolutions. It was in this context that the era of communist revolutions began.

We return to an eloquent text from *Alternative*. Apparently, this e-journal underestimates human intelligence and looks on the bright day. Apparently, it does not understand that, in the era of electronic communication, any investigation into the authenticity of this lie takes only a few moments:

*“Some of these so-called currents are blood enemies of Lenin and Bolshevism, who are basically presenting themselves as ‘anti-Bolshevik communists’! This is the same current known as the ‘communist left’ which separated itself from Bolshevism in the early years after the October Revolution and became a heavy critic of it. Lenin was in a heated debate with them in the ‘Left-wing’ Communism: An Infantile Disorder.”*

*Alternative* did not hesitate to read the book ‘Left-wing’ *Communism: An Infantile Disorder* and pick up a pen, repeating the rumours and lies that opponents of the internationalists throw at the communist left, instead of at least becoming acquainted with the issues of

the communist left and the contexts in which the communist left was formed. No, *Alternative* merely repeated the lie that communist leftists are the ‘blood enemies of Lenin and Bolshevism’. Fortunately, **Lenin himself** responds to these embarrassing lies in *‘Left-wing’ Communism: An Infantile Disorder*, insisting the communist left “praises us Bolsheviks and admires us”:

*“The communist ‘left’ have a great deal to say in praise of us Bolsheviks. One sometimes feels like telling them to praise us less and to try to gain more knowledge of the Bolsheviks’ tactics”*<sup>265</sup>

Apparently, *Alternative*, despite its “leap of imagination”, has no knowledge of the history and positions of the communist left; indeed, its knowledge is based on a handful of second-hand writings of others and is not ashamed of repeating their lies. The communist left believed and still believes that the wave of world revolution began with the victory of the proletarian revolution of October 1917, which depended on the continuation and progress of world revolution. The internationalists believed that, with the new conditions, parliamentarism, trade unions and national movements had been barriers to the advancement of global revolution, in turn rising up to defend communist positions. Anton Pannekoek, in his book *World Revolution and Communist Tactics*, written in 1920, considered parliamentarism, trade unions etc. as preventing the progress of revolution around the world, not the bloody feud with Lenin and the Bolsheviks. He ends his book with the following statement, which does not require any additional explanation:

*“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*

---

<sup>265</sup> “Left-Wing” Communism: an Infantile Disorder - Lenin



*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.”*

That Pannekoek later on, under pressure from the counterrevolution and the weaknesses of the German-Dutch communist left, in relation to the organizational issue, was confused and metamorphosed himself towards ‘council communism’. This does not reduce the legitimacy of the positions contained in this booklet. It should be emphasized that Pannekoek, before metamorphosing into ‘council communism’, was a member of the Comintern, as well as active in the Communist Party of the Netherlands, the Worker-communist Party of the Netherlands and the German Communist Party.

Probably the authors of the *Alternative* journal read somewhere that the communist left was against the ‘Bolshevizing’ of the parties in the Comintern, as well as the lies that posited it as the enemy of Bolshevism. After Lenin’s death, and especially since 1925, the Stalinization of the parties of the Comintern under the banner of ‘Bolshevization’ was put onto the Comintern’s agenda, with the aim of turning the parties focused on the Comintern into part of the foreign policy of the Bolshevik Party, which was once again united with the state. The internationalists opposed the Comintern becoming part of the foreign policy of the new government.

*Alternative* put together extracts from the writings Abraham Ziegler who belonged to the tendency De Leonism, which it published as “Do Workers Need a Party?”, written as a critique of Pannekoek-Mattick, along with extracts from Pannekoek’s own article entitled “The Party and the Working Class”, written in 1936, the year in which he once considered himself a ‘council communist’, in order to prove that worker-communism is rooted in the communist left! This *Alternative* publication states:

*“The two main tendencies of the so-called ‘communist left’ are apparently on opposing sides: the Dutch-German branch of this current, represented by figures such as Anton Pannekoek and Hermann Gorter, is the tireless enemy of the Communist Party in its Bolshevik-Leninist model; in contrast, the Italian branch, based on the views of Amadeo Bordiga, essentially emphasizes the creation of a party organized by a minor revolutionary and the acquisition of power in this way (a similar view to Blanqui).*

*The commonality of these two currents, although apparently antagonists, permits them to use a common title, “communist left”. This is summarized by the fact that both of which, in a way and in practice, distinguish between economic struggle and the political struggle of the working class, while eliminating the differentiation and dualism of the party-class relationship in favour of one of the parties. Of interest here, which we will explain in this book, is that Hekmat’s work in practice is based on the same common ground, namely, to highlight and eliminate these dichotomies in the years after the discussion of the issues concerning worker-communism first, with his presentation of the early discussions of worker-communism (1989-1992), in the same way as the German-Dutch communist left, then, walking towards a dead end, jumping to the opposite side and, with controversial articles such as “The Party and Political Power” (1998), expressed ideas similar to those of Bordiga (Bordigism), without going beyond the framework of the so-called ‘communist left’. Here, we do not intend to describe or discuss the opinions of the ‘communist left’ (councilism), examine its controversy with Lenin and the Bolsheviks, criticize its views, and so on. Only a brief overview of the main views of the German-Dutch branch, especially in relation to the issue of the relationship between the party and class, can justify their high degree of resemblance to the views of Hekmat in the first period of worker-communism (1989-1992), when it appeared in a reasonable form.*

*To take a more careful approach in this regard and to avoid the adoption of arbitrariness, we will use the summary provided by Abraham Ziegler (a non-Leninist writer) in his discussions of the two major theorists of the German-Dutch current of the communist left, namely, Antoine Pannekook and Paul Mattick.*"<sup>266</sup>

Human beings are amazed the abilities and genius of the *Alternative* journal in its analysis, research and anatomy concerning the positions of the communist left! The journal did not strive to refer to the texts and positions of the communist left, nor provide evidence for its false claims that worker-communism is rooted in the communist left or other fictional claims regarding the communist left.

The separation of the political struggle from the economic struggle in the era of capitalist prosperity was the result of certain conditions. During the Second International, the political struggle was separated from the economic struggle whereby the unions were thought to be purely economic formations, while the political struggle was passed to the party, which would advance the struggle through parliament. With the outbreak of World War I, and the integration of the unions in the capitalist state, which coincided with the beginning of the era of communist revolutions, parliament lost its radical role. The new conditions changed the forms of struggle while the aforementioned separations lost its necessity. In the era of capitalist decline, there is just one type of class struggle.

By leaning on the basic positions of the communist left, we will show how claims that worker-communism is rooted in the communist left is no more than a lie. Just as Stalinism is not rooted in communism, worker-communism is not rooted in the communist left, but in Stalinism-Maoism, as thoroughly investigated in previous sections. We will also examine the historical process by which, at some point in time, the UCM sneakily pretended to converge with the communist left.

---

<sup>266</sup> *Alternative*, Issue 11

## Worker-communism and the Communist Left

As previously explained, Mansoor Hekmat has found that his anonymous group has become one of the main actors in the formation of an organization called the ‘Anti-communist Party of Iran’, declaring that it is part of a current which reflects of the historical need of the global working class! That current (the UCM) is not an Iranian or Kurdish current but part of a global movement. Demagogy, which has occurred in different countries, has made this phenomenon a necessity. This current will create the Communist Party of Iran, which in turn will create a new communist international. Hekmat reports:

*“We are part of a global movement. We are not an Iranian, Tehranian or Kurdish current ... our current [the UCM] reflects the historic need of the global working class, the need that has appeared in different countries in this period...Our current will create the Communist Party of Iran and the Communist Party of Iran will create the International.”*<sup>267</sup>

In pursuit of such goals, the activists of the UCM, together with Komala activists in Europe, have sought to contact, as well as facilitate discussion and debate with, European currents. In this regard, the journal *Communist Worker*, itself an organ of the UCM, published an interview with Farhad Basharat, a member of the UCM in Europe, which we will look at before continuing our discussion:

*“[Question] What are the closest currents and communist organizations to revolutionary Marxism in Iran? What do I need to count on with the prospect of creating a new and Leninist*

---

<sup>267</sup> Report by Mansoor Hekamt of the central committee of the Unity of Communist Militants to the first congress of the UCM.

*international? I mean, with the prospect of creating a new and Leninist international, what forces should be considered?*

*“[Answer] We have, so far, been able to engage with the currents in Europe which we consider to be attributable to revolutionary minorities inside the first, second and third international. We now have contacts with more than 15 currents belonging to this spectrum all over the world. In my reply to the previous question, I talked about the characteristics of these currents to a certain extent. On this spectrum, Italian communists are particularly important. The current that has shown most interest and sensitivity towards the communist movement of Iran and the UCM is the party known as the ‘International Communist Party’, which publishes the political organ **Battaglia Comunista** every two weeks. So far, it has published articles in more than six issues of its organ about the communist movement of Iran and the positions of the UCM. They have translated the pamphlet, **The First of May and the Duties of the Iranian**, from English to Italian and distributed it as a supplement to their publication among Italian workers. In Britain, there is a current with known as the Communist Workers’ Organization (CWO) which publishes a journal entitled **Workers’ Voice**. This organization works closely with the above-mentioned current. They have close ties with our comrades in the UK. In the defence and propaganda of the communist movement of Iran, the UCM and Komala have achieved a great deal ... Another current is the International Communist Current, which publishes a publication called **World Revolution**. This current for the first time published one of the declarations of the UCM in English and put us in contact with several other currents. But the complete ignorance of these comrades about the struggles of workers and working people in dominated countries, and the lack of any Leninist understanding of imperialism and the formation of the party, have*

*led to significant differences of opinion with the communist movement of Iran ... To the same extent, we see that there are many forces internationally which are associated with the creation of a new Leninist international”*<sup>268</sup>

Much of this section and later sections will revolve around defending the internationalist position. Our defence of the positions of the communist left and its intrinsic tendencies is neither blindly religious nor an exercise in scholastic adherence, but a defence of the proletarian position of the commonplace nature of the Marxist tradition. So, before we continue with our discussion, we wish to express our critique of the tradition we belong to, namely, the communist left. Lessons from such mistakes will light our way towards the future.

The common principles and traditions among internationalists are that they choose not to engage in the debate with the currents on the left of capital, namely, the left wing of the bourgeoisie. Internationalists have no criticism with the left of capital, as their critique of capital is only made through communist revolution. Internationalists see such currents as class enemies: on the one hand, some of these currents are highly radical, while, on the contrary, some of the tireless work by internationalists is about supporting the trends or intermediate circles that exist between proletarian and bourgeois positions, so that some of them can move towards proletarian positions.

According to the described principle, the publication of the UCM declaration by the ICC, as well as the ICC putting activists from the UCM in contact with other currents and holding numerous meetings with UCM activists, which is not mentioned in this interview, there is nothing to defend, which, being honest, is a position that must be seen as an error. The ICC, which is one of the communist left poles, was defeated in

---

<sup>268</sup> Interview with Comrade Farhad Besharat, a member of the Organization of the Supporters of the UCM abroad, January 1982.

defending proletarian principles at this point. We should learn from the ICC's mistake.

The publication of the texts of the UCM in the organ of the ICP (*Battaglia Comunista*), and the existence of any relations between the CWO and the activists of the UCM was also a violation of proletarian principles. We will return to this issue soon.

The intensification of the class struggle in the late 1960s and early 1970s brought new challenges to the internationalists: the need to leave behind absolute isolation and to prompt discussions that determined the tasks of the internationalists. In such a context, the ICP (*Battaglia Comunista*) understood the necessity of debate among the internationalists and took the initiative to hold internationalist conferences, as follows:

- First Conference, April and May 1977, in Milan
- Second Conference, November 1978, in Paris
- Third Conference, May 1980, in Paris
- Fourth Conference, September 1982, in London

There was no specific criterion for organizing the First Conference, but the general idea of the ICP (*Battaglia Comunista*) was that the invitees should be belonged to the Revolutionary Corps. But, after the First Conference and before the Second Conference, the following criteria were announced:

- The recognition of the October Revolution as a proletarian revolution.
- The recognition of the break from social democracy which was carried out by the First and Second Congresses of the Comintern.
- The unreserved rejection of state capitalism and self-management.
- The unconditional rejection of communist and socialist parties, namely, bourgeois parties.

- The orientation towards the organization of a revolution referring to the ideology and doctrine of Marxism as the science of the proletariat.

These conferences were necessary and important, and a valuable achievement for the communist left. Our critique concerns the Fourth Conference. After the Third Conference, a polemic between the ICC and the ICP (*Battaglia Comunista*) occurred, centred around the role and function of the party. Given the circumstances, the ICC failed to attend the Fourth Conference. Every until this point is acceptable, but opening the doors of these international conferences for internationalists to bourgeois and counterrevolutionary currents cannot be defended under any circumstances. Activists of the UCM, under the title the ‘Supporters of the Unity of Communist Militants’, in the process of communicating with the CWO and the ICP (*Battaglia Comunista*), were able to attend the Fourth Conference of the communist left. If holding meetings and publishing UCM texts were a mistake on the part of comrades from the ICP and CWO, the invasion of activists from a bourgeois current at a conference for internationalists was even more a departure from proletarian principles.

The entrance of a bourgeois current at the conference for internationalists became a subject of the polemic on the communist left. In such a context, the CWO wrote in its organ, *Revolutionary Perspectives* 6, that, after learning about the counterrevolutionary nature of this current, the invitation was a mistake.

In the process, the ICP (*Battaglia Comunista*) began to disclose the counterrevolutionary and bourgeois nature of this current (first, the UCM, and then the Communist Party of Iran). In this regard, a letter from the ICP, addressed to the Supporters of the UCM, also referred to the bourgeois nature of this current, as well as the economic debates of the UCM, the reactionary stance of the UCM in relation to the Iran-Iraq War, and so on. At the same time AS the metamorphosis of the UCM and



Komala into the Communist Party of Iran, the ICP criticized the programme of the latter and its democratic revolution. Regarding this situation, the ICP wrote:

*“We started a movement on our side in order to influence this current and actually contribute to the qualitative uprising centred on basic issues such as Stalinism and the democratic revolution”*<sup>269</sup>

Exposing the bourgeois and counterrevolutionary nature of the Communist Party of Iran from an internationalist perspective, was questioned by some of its activists. Those who, in the style of bourgeois propaganda, had scrambled to offer a strong image of the Communist Party of Iran, were now the activists in the party referring to its shaky foundations, saying:

*“One of the comrades of the spokesman on the tape [an internal tape of the Communist Party of Iran] says: ‘The Communist Party in the international arena, if not millions, has tens and hundreds of thousands (!!) of followers interested in it.’ Suppose this is the case, but does the size of a current indicate its legitimacy? Especially in the theoretical arena? In addition, all forces in the international arena have been deeply critical of the Communist Party of Iran such as Battaglia, the RPP, the CWO etc. Inside Iran, it should also be said that, although the conditions of repression do not allow us to have any news about these forces and circles, the pamphlets we have received here and there indicate that, inside Iran, critiques have been written of the Communist Party of Iran and its theories.*

---

<sup>269</sup> Communiqué issued by the International Bureau of the Revolutionary Party in relation to the Communist Party of Iran.

*In the case of abroad, among Iranians, there is no longer a need to acknowledge the fact that none of the critiques was answered.”<sup>270</sup>*

If we put aside the Goebbels-like lies of the Communist Party of Iran in relation to the tens and hundreds of thousands of followers who are interested in the party in the international arena, its activists in Italy have challenged the party. They have argued that, if the issues were opened up, then it would be seen as though the programme and theory of the Communist Party of Iran were proletarian, or conversely bourgeois:

*“If the content of the discussion is opened up, not only will the organization of its sympathizers be questioned, so will its claim to have proletarian and communist theory and programme? Comrade Abdullah Mohtadi, when Secretary General of the party, issued a report to the plenum, stating that the party’s knowledge of global currents was limited.*

*Further, he propounded alongside Trotskyism, the communist left, it [the communist left] needs to get out of the way. I am sure, if any supporters have questions about what the communist left means and its mistakes, they will not be answered”<sup>271</sup>*

This comment from Secretary General Mohtadi suggested that he was not fully aware of global currents either; but this was not because of his lack of knowledge, but because he was lying. That is, Farhad Besharat had not only announced the exact list of currents involved, but also published it.

---

<sup>270</sup> On the organizational changes to the Supporters’ Organization of the Communist Party of Iran abroad, pages 7 and 8.

<sup>271</sup> About the organizational changes of the supporters’ organization of the communist party of Iran in abroad, page 22.

This process had a profound effect on the Supporters' Organization of the Communist Party of Iran in Italy. The Supporters' Organization was plunged into crisis, publishing several articles, including "About the Changes to the Supporters' Organization of the Communist Party of Iran Abroad" and 'Summoning the Past to Justify the Present'. The crisis was so critical that the Communist Party of Iran was unable to fully restore the Italian unit. Former supporters, commenting on the internal atmosphere of the Communist Party of Iran and its theoretical debates, as well as their own perspectives, wrote the following:

*"We, internationalist communists, former members of the Supporters' Organization of the Communist Party of Iran, declare that there is no room for internal theoretical-political struggles in the Communist Party of Iran and its Supporters' Organization, and any protest should be confronted with suppression, expulsion and ridicule ... Our gathering of every colour, race, nationality and country will consign the bureaucratism and nationalism of the Communist Party of Iran to the same dustbin as Stalinism. This is the step we are taking"*<sup>272</sup>

Given the crisis and collapse of the Supporters' Organization of the Communist Party of Iran in Italy and the possibility of spreading the crisis to other countries, especially Britain, the leaders of the Communist Party of Iran chose to stop this happening by critiquing the political platform of the ICP (*Battaglia Comunista*). Responsibility for this was assumed by Hamid Taghvaei, one of the leaders of the Communist Party of Iran. It is important to note that Taghvaei represented the positions of the leadership of the Communist Party of Iran through its theoretical journal, *Towards*

---

<sup>272</sup> From a communiqué issued by the former Supporters' Organization of the Communist Party of Iran in Italy on 12 May 1985.

*Socialism*, which conveyed the official line of the party, and should not be associated with the current factions of worker-communism.

Those with insignificant knowledge are beholden to the second-hand positions of the political apparatus of the left of capitalist. As for internationalist communists, who have defended proletarian positions against the dawn of counterrevolution and bourgeois ideology for a hundred years, they claim that the communist left is unfamiliar with the theoretical principles of Marxism, writing:

*“At least we had the impression that the ‘communist left’ was a theoretical current, whose problem should be further explored in terms of not understanding the relationship between theory and practice, and not in the lack of familiarity with the theoretical rulings and principles of Marxism.”*<sup>273</sup>

Just the ideologues of capital, whose insignificant knowledge is beholden to second-hand Stalinism-Maoism, take up the theoreticians’ gestures by touching precious gold, those on the communist left are unfamiliar with Marxism and express themselves as the theoreticians of the left of capital, in other words they are theoreticians who don’t know Lenin is eatable or drinking phenomenon. Only the heroic speeches of the Italian communist left spokesman, Comrade Bordiga, during the sixth far-reaching executive meeting of the Comintern, held between 17 February and 25 March 1926, can be offered as valid defence of the communist left of Marxism. With his courage, sharpness and Marxist clarity, this spokesman, during the Comintern’s executive meeting, which had begun with a ‘united front’, a ‘workers’ state’, ‘Bolshevization policy’, the prohibition of factions in the Comintern etc. was condemned. We are talking here of an internationalist, who, in a personal meeting, astonished Stalin. Contrary to the vigour of bourgeois ideology, the communist left

---

<sup>273</sup> *Towards Socialism*, second period, Issue 2, page 45.

was formed in defence of the principles and the theory of Marxism, as well as in defence of proletarian internationalism, in defence of the global revolution, in defence of the global concept of socialism, in rejection of parliamentarism, in negation of anti-labour unions, in rejection of national movements which became part of imperialist struggles, in defence of ... Of course, the ideological bellwether of worker-communism, Mansoor Hekmat, states that Lenin's contributions to the critical discussion about Rosa Luxemburg and the debate in his book, *'Left-wing' Communism: An Infantile Disorder*, are critiques of non-social communism. Hekmat says:

*"In addition, the basis of these discussions involving Lenin, especially in writings such as "What Is To Be Done?" and "One Step Forward, Two Steps Back", can be seen in the critique of Rosa Luxemburg, while Lenin's later discussions in 'Left-wing' Communism: An Infantile Disorder is specifically about non-social communism."*<sup>274</sup>

Hekmat repeats the nonsense of his ex-comrade. Rosa Luxemburg is source of inspiration for the proletariat whom Lenin called 'Eagle' and the communist left is non-social, but the religion of worker-communism became social by becoming involved in society.

This ideologue of worker-communism, with his "critique" of the programme of the ICP (*Battaglia Comunista*), wants to reveal the non-proletarian positions of the communist left and clarify the degree of closeness or distance they have with 'revolutionary Marxism'. At the height of distraction, he writes:

*"But, given this distinction and the historical and theoretical-political independence of the current of the 'communist left', and, in particular, the 'Internationalist Communist Party' from this non-*

---

<sup>274</sup> Speech to the Marx Society by Mansoor Hekmat, 20 November 2010.

*proletarian perspective, to what extent is an expression of consistency and its proximity to revolutionary Marxism itself another issue? Above all, the study and review of opinions and demonstrable positions are required by this current and our goal of criticizing the 'political platform' is nothing but a clarification of this issue.*"<sup>275</sup>

When the crisis of "revolutionary Marxism" arose, the same ideologues stated that "revolutionary Marxism" itself was always a temporary intellectual and political framework for the two struggle traditions, namely, worker socialism and the radicalism of the non-worker left. The ideologue of the left of capital wants to compare the positions of the communist left, with its temporary intellectual framework of beliefs, and those of the left of capital, in our opinion. See how much this ideologue of the left of capital struggle to speak coherently, so much he struggles, so much he imagines better the swamp to which he belongs.

The ideologue of the left of capital grabs everything in order to pretend that the communist left does not have an inner coherence to its theories. His head, full of desperation, insists that all the platform of the ICP offers are opinions without a clear and comprehensive presentation:

*"Indeed, it can be said that the platform of the ICP [Battaglia Comunista], in terms of the form of regulations and the issues raised, is not a coherent political platform, nor is it similar to a party programme; rather, it is a diverse set of theoretical comments and political positions without displaying any clear and comprehensive political behaviour or offering any theoretical insight."*<sup>276</sup>

---

<sup>275</sup> *Towards Socialism*, second period, Issue 2, page 44.

<sup>276</sup> As above

Of course, the bourgeois “theoretician” does not show why the theories provided by the communist left are not coherent and why they have no internal cohesion. These statements only express the bankruptcy of the author of *Towards Socialism*, who grabs everything to pelt the communist left with. But the most ridiculous thing is to say that the political theories and positions of the communist left are not clearly expressed! In the black era of counterrevolution and in all social events, the communist left has defended Marxism. The ICP (*Battaglia Comunista*) is rooted in the internationalist faction of the Italian communist left which, from the very beginning of the outbreak of opportunism in the Comintern, was clearly defending proletarian positions. Incidentally, the clarity, transparency and sharpening of the internationalist faction of the Italian communist left in the class struggle, the role of the revolutionary organization, the evolution of capitalism, etc. were able to turn this internationalist faction into the main pole in defending proletarian positions. More than half a century after the magnificent achievements of this faction, the ideologues of the left of capital were still learning about second-hand Stalinism-Maoism.

Internationalists believe in a worldwide party. The same applies to the internationalist communist tendency, which, despite the fact that it has sections in different countries, does not consider itself to be a global party, but one with only one tendency. Previously it was known as the International Bureau of the Revolutionary Party. In contrast, the new name better describes the more principled nature of the internationalist communist tendency. The ICC is correctly opposed to the formation of a party with a Maoist style in one of the most remote Iranian villages, which has nothing to do with the working class and the class struggle. Of course, all these tendencies and currents believe in the party, as well as recognize that, without the International and ICP, there is no possibility of a victory for the communist revolution. One author from the left of capital writes as below:

*“This emphasis is on the perennial importance of the party, compared to other organizations on the ‘communist left’ such as the ‘International Communist Current’ ... which basically does not believe in the formation of a party, except under special revolutionary conditions and the era of the uprising; this is a positive point.”*<sup>277</sup>

Certainly, the left of capital, because of its class belonging, will have a different attitude to the internationalists in relation to the historical trend in the evaluation of the capitalist relations of production. It is the demagogues and liars on the left of capital who are accusing the internationalists of being ‘deterministic’. According to the internationalists, they speaking nonsense claiming that the growth rate of productive forces has made the duty of all tasks clear and without the need for a conceptual struggle. The aforementioned author writes:

*“Believing that the relations of production and the degree of growth in productive forces have paved the way for everything, such that any concrete battle and struggle does not directly and unswervingly target the entire capitalist system, is vain and futile. Take the European ‘communist left’ current and, specifically, the ICP, and the currents that begin with the global domination of capital and imperialism and end up with complete pacifism and inertia.”*<sup>278</sup>

It has been repeatedly explained that the internationalists believe that all class systems have undergone a period of growth and degeneration. Capitalism has also entered its decadent era, and so direct communist struggle is the order of the day. Instead of bringing the

---

<sup>277</sup> *Towards Socialism*, second period, Issue 2, page 49.

<sup>278</sup> *Towards Socialism*, second period, Issue 2, page 53.



proletariat together under the various banners of the bourgeoisie, we should be active in the class struggle. If the working class does not act on its historical verdict, the destruction of humanity is certain.

## **Worker-communism and Trade Unions**

What were the contexts of the formation of trade unions? After the victory of the French Revolution, which brought the bourgeoisie to political power, the bourgeoisie banned any community establishing itself in working-class society, claiming that it would be an attack on freedom and human rights. It was only after half a century of struggle that the workers were able to impose the legal existence of unions on the bourgeoisie.

When the mode of capitalist production was not yet in full swing across the entire universe and the bourgeoisie continued to play a progressive role in society, there was a separation between the political struggle and the economic struggle. Trade unions were thought to be purely economic, while the political struggle was passed onto the party which took its fight to parliament. Unions were schools for struggle, while struggle was a school for communism. Reforms were an opportunity for the working class to improve living conditions in capitalist society, which in turn could be more humane through daily struggles. Unfortunately, the separation of the political struggle from the economic struggle provided grounds for the integration of unions in the capitalist state.

With the outbreak of the World War I, which signalled the arrival of capitalism in its decadent era, this led to the integration of social democratic parties into the capital camp, while unions headed in the direction of recruiting and providing services to the capitalist state. The mobilization of workers by trade unions for the purposes of imperialist warfare in World War I indicated that trade unions were merged into the capitalist state, and were no longer worker organizations, but capitalist institutions in the workplace. In turn, and during the German Revolution as part of the global revolution, the role of trade unions in suppressing the struggles of workers is another bloody story that is remembered as an unforgettable lesson for the working class. In November 1918, the

German trade unions formed a counterrevolutionary guard to support Ebert, in an effort to suppress the workers by imposing a false illusion on the state of working class.

The permanent integration of unions in the capitalist state is of great importance to the bourgeoisie for the penetration of bourgeois ideology within the working class and the close contact between junior members of unions and workers in the workplace. Currently, in most countries, the duties of unions as official and respectable representatives of the 'working class' include providing necessary advice to the employer and the state, making necessary decisions and trying to present bourgeois laws in the workplace as acceptable to workers, as part of the function of the institution of the capitalist state. The tasks of unions, in concrete form, are to play the role of bourgeois advisers, to control the sale of the workforce, and to reduce the conflict between work and capital through controlling and limiting the class struggle.

Of course, the narrow sections of the bourgeoisie are still opposed to trade unions. This will help to provide a radical picture of unions. In capitalist dictatorship, in which unions are associated with the opposition, belonging to the state of capital takes on an obscure and vague form. But, even in these countries, the work of trade unions is to be accepted as a legal entity.

In times of crisis, unions direct negotiations towards the sole objective of fighting and depriving workers of their class identity, which is in contrast to the spirit of workers' struggle; and, if needed, planned strikes will undermine the revolutionary potential of workers.

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>279</sup>

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.

In the era of imperialism, trade unions have evolved into giant organizations, becoming part of the state apparatus, with employees who have all the tools of power, money, the news media advertising and so on. Unions, especially in metropolitan countries, are the main shareholders in companies and play an important role in exploiting the working class. The income of trade unions derives from the exploitation of workers to an astronomical extent. One of its former leaders, Reza Moghaddam, accused worker-communism of obtaining money from the state without transparency. Mahmoud Ghazvini, a worker-communist, replied in a statement that worker-communism has never received money from the

---

<sup>279</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:

<https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2017/apr/04/unite-officials-face-allegations-of-collusion-with-firms-that-are-blacklisting-activists>

state; however, **in just one case**, it received \$400,000 from the anti-war movement, which includes left currents and **unions**. Ghazvini wrote:

*“The jointly run TV channel of the Hekmatist Party and the Iraqi Worker-Communist Party, which, for a period, broadcast on a 24-hour basis, was fundamentally funded through leftist and anti-war currents in Japan and South Korea. The anti-war movement in Japan and South Korea, after the occupation of Iraq, stood behind the worker-communist party of Iraq. To start the project, **in just one case, about \$400,000** was contributed by the anti-war movement, which included left currents and trade unions in both countries; and, at the same time, we released a report. As far as I remember, the Hekmatist Party itself collected about \$150,000. Comrades from the Iraqi party and Comrade Aman Kafa from the Hekmatist Party travelled to Japan several times for the project.”<sup>280</sup> [Our emphasis]*

So, in just one cases, \$400,000 was made, not from Europe or North America, but from South Korea and Japan, where the union tradition is low to an organization of the left of capital. This case alone reflects the role played by unions in the financial oligarchy.

All the tendencies and attempts on the right and left of capital, apart from the criticisms about the form or leadership of unions, aim to depict unions as **worker organizations**. Of course, the radical phrase part of the left of capital has a dual role for the unions:

- Defend the interests of workers in periods of class struggle is at a low level
- Against the interests of workers in periods of class struggle is intensified

Such a view holds that the union is not against the working class but against the revolution. The bureaucratic structure and the domination

---

<sup>280</sup> [http://m-ghazvini.com/?page\\_id=319](http://m-ghazvini.com/?page_id=319)

of corrupt leaders in unions, as spoken by the radical phrase part of the left of capital, and even the possibility of the withdrawal of unions, reflect the bourgeois nature of unions. The metabolism of unions is not about the free activities of its members, but refers to their part in the administrative apparatus of state capital.

As we have seen, aspects of the radical phrase part of the left of capital highlight the double role of unions, defending the interests of workers when the class struggle is at a low level, and opposing the interests of workers when the class struggle intensifies. Now, worker-communism wants unionism to play a double role, not from the point of view of class struggle, but in geographic terms. In its view, trade unions in the metropolitan countries are reformers; but, on the peripheries of capital, they are the champion and defender of the economic interests of workers. According to *Towards Socialism*:

*“First of all, we must say that, methodologically, the same assessment of the status of all unions and, in principle, any existing trade-economic organization of the working class as a whole, and the adoption of a single and general position in relation to all these organizations, is basically contradictory to Marxism ... For example, can trade unions in Britain be equated with unions in Bolivia or those in US with those in India, and can we consider them to be an essential part of imperialist domination (regardless of the validity of this theory)? Surely not ... Even if we do not view this fact from an analytical perspective, given the limited familiarity with the history and activity of trade unions, for example, in Latin American countries, and how they compare with the functioning of European unions, it is enough to acknowledge the baseless and false adoption of a single position against unions.”<sup>281</sup>*

---

<sup>281</sup> *Towards Socialism*, second period, Issue 2, page 56.

Leaders of worker-communism want to give the communist left a lesson in Marxism. These leaders with their regalia and long hair should be reminded that the form of organizing workers is not arbitrary, nor is the will of workers themselves; rather, it arises from the development of capitalism. Capitalism, despite being a dominant global system, does not grow linearly in all countries. Consequently, the working class is also a global class, with different growth rates in different countries. The nature of unions comes from the evolution of global capitalism, although unions can take different forms in different countries. It is just as valid to state that unions are reformist in the metropolis and militant in peripheral capital; it is also just as valid to claim that the bourgeoisie is reformist in metropolitan capital and revolutionary in peripheral capital. In the era of imperialism, the bourgeoisie is counterrevolutionary everywhere, and unions in the era of imperialism are everywhere in the capital institution of the workplace.

The left of capital accuses internationalists of not seeing the reality of the struggle of the trade unions in peripheral countries, such as South Africa and Chile, against capitalism and imperialist domination, as this writer explains.

*“As far as trade unions in the dominated countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America are concerned, internationalists must have lost sight of the fact that, in many of these countries (such as Chile, Bolivia, South Africa etc.), trade unions are against capitalism while the imperialist rulers have repeatedly fought them. Even today, [trade unions] are engaged in such a struggle (only the weaknesses, mistakes and deviations of these unions are completely different). The fact is that the absence of a workers’ aristocracy in the dominated countries, the violent, public and openly confrontational response from the state to every strike and protest movement of the workers, and the close and often revealing economic and political issues in many of these countries are among*

*the causes that give rise to revolutionary tendencies in the workers' movement, which makes it difficult for compromise and reformism.*"<sup>282</sup>

Incidentally, referring to labour struggles outside the control of unions in the peripheral countries of capital helps to clarify the reactionary nature of trade unions. The heroic struggles of the Tekel workers in Turkey in 2009 not only took place beyond the control of trade unions, but protesting workers also occupied the office of their unions. Capital's police came to the aid of the unions. We have not forgotten the workers' screams that, if unions are there to support us, why are they not with us? The story of these labour struggles and, at the same time, of anti-unionism has been clearly described by the internationalists.<sup>283</sup> Another example is a strike by South African miners, which was declared illegal by the major trade unions, in which 34 miners were massacred<sup>284</sup> and where all the efforts of the unions to break the strike represented another response to the left of capital. This list can be extended. It is not far-fetched to state that, during workers' protests, when the struggle becomes more radical, workers organize themselves outside of their unions. Contrary to the various leftist tendencies of capital, which state that unions and syndicates, in Western Europe, because of the "workers' aristocracy", cannot play a radical role in labour struggles, but can fight in peripheral countries for the working class, the events in South Africa, Turkey etc. expose trade unions as institutions of capital in the workplace. The role of unions during these events once again proves the reactionary position of

---

<sup>282</sup> *Towards Socialism*, second period, Issue 2, page 57.

<sup>283</sup> For more information on the glorious struggles of the workers of Tekel against the state and the union, read the link below:  
<http://en.internationalism.org/icconline/2010/01/tekel-turkey>

<sup>284</sup> For more information on this topic, see "Developing Worker Strikes in South Africa After the Massacre of Workers and the Role of Trade Unions as part of Capital Institutions" on the website of Internationalist Voice.



the left of capital and the legitimacy of the positions of internationalists, who claim that trade unions throughout the world have become capitalist organizations. The main task of unions, whether on the peripheries or in the metropolis, is to control the working class and to deflect the class struggle of workers.

Worker-communism calls on internationalists to apply a policy of neutrality towards trade unions. What demagoguery! What impartiality! Internationalists declare that unions are integrated into the state of capital and part of the capitalist state, while the duty of internationalists is to defend proletarian positions and expose the bourgeois nature of unions within the working class. The defence of the left of capital of unions does not concern their blindness to the realities but the alignment of their class belonging with the capital camp. In *Towards Socialism*, they write:

*"They are not only seeking to establish, support or even adopt a neutral policy towards existing unions and the union movement, but also using all their power to crush any kind of mass worker organization. The opinion of the 'Internationalist Communist Party' on trade unions is false and unfounded in most of the countries of the world ... In these countries, on the one hand, the struggle concerning economic demands and trade unions is a major aspect of the workers' movement, and the union plays a decisive role in the labour movement as an appropriate container of, and organization to advance, these struggles. In the first industrialized countries of the world, the history of the labour movement and the union movement has been interwoven; a large cohort of workers has long been organized in their trade unions and alliances, while the forms, traditions and methods of union struggles have become part of the culture and the general understanding of workers."*<sup>285</sup>

---

<sup>285</sup> *Towards Socialism*, second period, Issue 2, page 57.

The position of the communist left regarding unions is based not only on a theoretical basis but also on its class belonging in relation to the labour camp. Certainly, the internationalists are not neutral, but their duty is to defend the interests of the class they belong to. The nonsense from the left of capital is that unions are massive organizations of workers. But, unions are as much a form of labour organization as social democratic parties are labour parties. In other words, they are the same as those who slaughtered Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht.

They use demagoguery to claim that unions, as a form of labour organization, have played a decisive role in advancing the struggle of the labour movement. If the purpose of the left of capital relates to the time before the merger of unions in the capital state before the World War I, then this might be true; but, after that, unions as an organ of capital at work have engaged in the suppression of the class struggle. Given the level of membership of atomized workers in them, unions are not proletarian by nature; meanwhile, the membership level of atomized workers in social democratic parties is high. Does the high percentage of atomized workers in social democratic parties lend them a proletarian nature? Absolutely not. Such an argument would insist that social democratic parties are workers' party: in other words, when social democratic parties hold political power, the state is also a workers' state! In all imperialist wars, workers dressed in military uniform and were sent to carry out imperialist assassinations. Yet, the participation of atomized workers in imperialist wars does not mean that such wars are proletarian either. The nature of the working class is a class phenomenon, not a sociological discussion.

The left of capital complains that internationalists do not interfere in unions to radicalize them, accusing them that their pacifist position provides the scope for compromising and opportunistic leadership of unions:

*“Not supporting the struggle to change the status of unions and avoid creating new unions actually means accepting and confirming the current situation. The pacifist position of the [ICP], except for supporting the compromising and opportunistic policies of union leaders and abandoning the fate of workers’ economic struggles, has no other consequence.*

*First of all, we must continually pursue proletarian alternatives, policies and the functions with regard to unions, whether in general terms or in dealing with any strike and struggle, and ensure that the level of concrete practical guidelines can be adopted by the masses of the working class, that the political deviations and weaknesses and organizational constraints (such as bureaucratic buildings, the inability to organize the unemployed) of existing unions can be criticized and disclosed, and that leaders of the labour movement can be equipped to overcome these deviations and weaknesses.”<sup>286</sup>*

The internationalists are not demagogic, while the conquest of labour unions by proletarian forces is as valid as the conquest of those social democratic parties that were once labour parties. This is an illusion; social democratic parties and unions are well aware of how to control and channel any opposition before it becomes dangerous. In the exact same way that the capital state must not be regarded as a tool in the service of the communist revolution, but destroyed, trade unions as part of the capitalist state should not be tolerated. Trade unions are the first frontier that the proletariat must conquer in the communist revolution. Labour power (the dictatorship of the proletariat) is possible only through global councils.

---

<sup>286</sup> *Towards Socialism*, second period, Issue 2, page 60.

Contrary to the demagogy of worker-communism, the influence of bourgeois ideology among the workers in metropolitan countries is not only because of the presence of a workers' aristocracy, but also because of the poisonous nature of democracy. We will further explain the poison of bourgeois democracy as a continuation of wage slavery in the context of democracy<sup>287</sup>. Against the demagogy on the left of capital from a Marxist perspective, due to high labour productivity in metropolitan countries, workers in the metropolis are exploited more than their class sisters and brothers in peripheral capitalism. One capitalist ideologue writes:

*"It is a fact that existing unions are the gateway to the infiltration and influence of bourgeois reformist and opportunist policies within European workers' movement, given that this stems from the aristocracy of workers in these countries and their domination of unions. European trade unions have historically been made an essential part of the economic struggle of workers and, under today's conditions, the cause of their existence is nothing more than this ... It would certainly have been more desirable for the bourgeoisie, which was not, in principle, confronted with organized and united workers in unions, if workers were deprived of these existing unions in their economic struggles."*<sup>288</sup>

This view is not only due to a lack of knowledge about Marxism on the part of the bourgeois 'theoretician', but also a result of his class belonging, which states that trade unions have historically emerged as an organization of economic struggle, while, today, they are the cause of their existence. Only in a period of capitalist history were unions an organization of the economic struggle of the working class. Another

---

<sup>287</sup> In order to better understand the influence of bourgeois ideology on the working class and the role of bourgeois democracy in it, see Anton Pannekoek's book *World Revolution and Communist Tactics*.

<sup>288</sup> *Towards Socialism*, second period, Issue 2, page 58.

aspect of the statements on the left of capital is that, due to the existence of a “workers’ aristocracy” in metro-politan capitalism, the working class in this context has become reformist, rather than seeking revolution, compared to the working class in peripheral capitalism, which is revolutionary. In other words, this time, the periphery capitalism will be of the revolutionary vanguard.

Most disgracefully, it is a great lie that the bourgeoisie is faced with unified and organized workers in unions. Workers are not organized in unions; rather, workers are members of unions in the form of atomized workers who lack any class unity. What decision of a union is a collective decision? What decision of a union is based on the general assembly? Unlike the demagogy of worker-communism, unions, as institutions of capitalism, are especially important for the far-sighted bourgeoisie, because they play a significant role in securing production and industry.

Finally, the bourgeois theoretician, out of desperation and helplessness, is lobbing mud at the internationalists, while insisting that the ICT has no clear understanding and cognition in terms of either the struggle or Marxism, as explained below:

*“Anyone who does not understand the above points, basically has no clear understanding and cognition of the real-life struggle between the bourgeoisie and the workers, nor of Marxism as the practice of science and revolutionary intervention in this struggle; and, unfortunately, this applies to the ICT. Its incorrect assessment and analysis of the issue of unions have made the ICT a fatalistic and completely passive actor.”<sup>289</sup>*

It is nonsense to claim that the communist left, including the ICT, has no clear understanding of the class struggle, to that it is unfamiliar with Marxism; only a secretive sect would have members who do not

---

<sup>289</sup> *Towards Socialism*, second period, Issue 2, page 59.

know whether Lenin is an eating or drinking phenomena. The communist left has been the true continuation of communism since the decline of the Comintern and the only true defender of Marxism. Incidentally, the position of the ICT is not passive but has actively challenged the idea of unions as a capital institution in the workplace. The passionate defence by the ICT of Marxism stems not only from its search for the ideals of the communist left, but also from its support for the class struggle of the proletariat. The extent of the ICT's defence of Marxism has been much greater than the scale of ideologues from the sphere of worker-communism.

Mansoor Hekmat appears as the "foresighted" adviser of the peripheral bourgeoisie and states that if they allow unions to be formed, workers in peripheral capital will not sell their workforce cheaply. Hekmat writes:

*"The UCM from workers' point of view criticized, and the position was that, if the situation stays as it is, this is because workers in such a country will sell their workforce cheaply. As a result, the lack of democracy, of a free press, and of a progressive cultural relationship represents the framework in which workforce costs are kept low. If unions are allowed and political parties are allowed, in a country where workers are in such a situation, workers are organized and forced to work to improve their economic situation by seeking higher wages and reduction in their hours of work. As a result, the economy does not profit from this level of technology and this level of capital accumulation ... If unions exist on a wide scale, low wages cannot be easily imposed."*<sup>290</sup>

Calling for wage increases, in other words, is the struggle for a more expensive workforce, the struggle for the right to organize, the

---

<sup>290</sup> Oral History of the UCM, Mansoor Hekmat

struggle for improving working conditions, etc. Although this is against the bourgeoisie's interests, it is within the framework of the capitalist system, not against it. Most importantly, for foresighted capital, the early depreciation of the workforce is not economical, while, in the long term, it will lead to a reduction in capital accumulation. The metropolitan bourgeois is well aware of this issue, and Hekmat calls for such a "recovery" for the workers of peripheral capital. These workers have sent messages to unions under the guise of being organizations of workers. Meanwhile, the workers of Iran state that they do not have any unity surrounding their struggles except trade unions:

*"If, today, the representatives of Iranian labour organizations are not with you, if, today, you do not hear the message of solidarity from Iranian workers' organizations about your struggles, this is because any attempt to unite and organize the workers of Iran is suppressed by the Islamic Republic. This is because Iranian workers lack their public and mass organizations. Iranian workers in their fair and rightful struggles have no unity except you."*<sup>291</sup>

The Iranian workers in their battles require class solidarity with their own chained class sisters and brothers from all parts of the world. The workers' struggle anywhere on this planet will have its impact elsewhere, but Iranian workers do not need solidarity from the capitalist organization in their struggles. All of these efforts are only aimed at securing legitimacy for unions as a form of labour organization among workers. The political apparatus of the left of capital is doing what it needs to do. Everywhere, due to the radicalization of the workers' struggle, trade unions are the first to be challenged by the working class.

---

<sup>291</sup> Messages and notifications from the First Conference of the Overseas Organization of the Communist Party of Iran.

With the growth and evolution of capitalism, the form of the struggle of the working class evolved. The First International has had another form than the Communist League. Then, with the evolution of capitalism, the Second International was reliant on reform, because the era of communist revolutions had not yet begun. With the arrival of capitalism in its decadent era, and with the advent of the era of communist revolution, the Third International was formed. In the present era, there is only one type of class struggle.



## **Worker-communism and the National Question**

When capitalism played a progressive role in society and the bourgeoisie, as a progressive and revolutionary class, continued to struggle with the chains of feudalism, the creation of new nations was a step in the development of productive forces. This meant that the new nations were able to develop in the social context, in the global market. Therefore, communists and proletarian internationalists often supported national liberation movements. This support emanated from the left of capital as a response to the era of capitalist decadence.

The irrefutable fact is that the historical stage of capitalist development underwent a complete process in the world. The capitalist world cannot be divided into different parts or areas of history: one part of capitalism is aging and old (metropolitan capitalism) while the other is young and dynamic (peripheral capitalism). Like any other class system, the capitalist mode of production is an integrated and uniform system which has periods of growth and decadence. Above all, capitalism has entered its decadent era.

The state and the capitalist-free nation cannot exist during the period of capitalist decadence. Each new state that evolves must integrate itself into the mode of capitalist production and participate in the global market. This means that new nations emerging from national movements will become imperialist countries, regardless of their size or their economic and military power.

In the era of imperialism, the “National Liberation War” is part of the imperialist policy of large and small gangsters and their conflicts. Defending national liberation movements in fact means defending an imperialist power against another imperialist power using national or “socialist” terms. Only in a socialist society, in a classless society, does the exploitation of man by man become obsolete. In turn, the oppression of smaller ethnic groups will not be meaningful, while the unfettered

growth of any popular group will be the condition of the growth of all popular groups.

But Mansoor Hekmat believes that, since the proletariat has not completed all its growth stages in peripheral capital, it stands shoulder to shoulder with the democratic bourgeoisie, of course, by exposing the bourgeois disengagement in the National Liberation War:

*“In the war, whose purpose is national liberation, the tactic of participating in this war, not because of its nature, but rather unconditionally, involves the relations between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. The proletariat, which has not yet completed its stages of development, must fight in the war against tyranny and national oppression, along with the democratic bourgeoisie, by exposing the discontinuity of the bourgeoisie and propagating the principled hostility it has with it.”*<sup>292</sup>

Of course, over time, Hekmat has evolved his views on the national issue. He believes that the liberation movements are the reserve force and the potential components of the socialist revolution for the proletariat. This ideologue of the left of capital writes:

*“Therefore, movements and democratic revolutions and liberation in dominated countries, such as the revolutionary struggles of oppressed nations around the world for self-determination, are all, in the current era of reserve power, potential components of the global socialist revolution of the proletariat.”*<sup>293</sup>

As we have seen above, according to Hekmat, the proletariat, which has not yet completed its growth, stands shoulder to shoulder with

---

<sup>292</sup> *Towards Socialism*, No:3 - Anarcho-Pacifism, Mansoor Hekmat

<sup>293</sup> *Programme of the Communist Party of Iran*, First Edition, page 12.

democratic bourgeoisie when participating in the National Liberation War. Given the development of Hekmat's positions in the present era, during the era of imperialism, the liberation movements of the reserve force and the potential of the socialist revolution will emerge. The logical consequence of the Hekmat's argument is that the democratic bourgeoisie is also a potential force of the socialist revolution. In other words, the bourgeoisie, against its class interests and against its class demands, participates in the socialist revolution (the demands of the class of the proletariat). Probably, for the purposes of Mansoor Hekmat, the "socialist revolution" equates to the "people's revolution of China" or, more precisely, the gravediggers of the proletarian revolution of China, which was drowned in the blood of the workers of Shanghai and Canton. These nonsensical delusions come from someone who was taken the title of the Marx of his time.

The left of capital is dissatisfied that the communist left does not send workers to the imperialist massacre, in contrast, it insists on the independent queue of the proletariat.

In the attitude, thought and culture of the political apparatus of the left of capital, defending proletarian positions is a prescription for struggle. On the subject of turmoil, *Towards Socialism* states:

*"‘The Internationalist Communist Party!’ Indeed, for a party that has existed for more than 30 years, with its own avowal ‘explicitly, decisively and clearly’ calling on workers to fight against fascism, while opposing oppressed people’s liberation, boycotting national liberation movements and breaking away from democracy, a more irrelevant name than this cannot be given.”*<sup>294</sup>

The Italian section of the ICT does not want workers to be cannon fodder in imperialist conflicts, while highlighting the independent nature

---

<sup>294</sup> *Towards Socialism*, second period, Issue 2, page 63.

of proletarian positions. Further, it considers bourgeois democracy as the corollary of the influence of bourgeois ideology, which is a barrier to the development of a class struggle and views liberation wars as part of the imperialist policy of large and small gangsters. Given such positions, it hangs the glorious medal of internationalism around its neck. The ICT is rooted in the Italian communist left faction, which, during World War II, evaluated the war as imperialist and saw both sides of the war as reactionary. Contrary to Stalinism (the ideological origin of worker-communism), the ICT from a Marxist perspective took account of the formation contexts and progress of fascism and persisted with the independent struggle of the working class, which continues to this day.

According to the “theoretical” publication, *Towards Socialism*, with its intellectual bankruptcy, the left of capital grabs everything in order to give minimum coherence to its dispersed positions. The left of capital, however much scrambling it does, with every effort, it sinks more into the slime, while smearing Lenin’s name too:

*“Of course, the ICT is basically opposed to the Leninist critique of its positions or does not think it applies to today’s conditions; but, in any case, one thing is certain: it is a continuation and the current representation of the views of Kievsky and the tendency of imperialist economism of the early iterations of European social democracy. Further, along with the breakdown of ‘democracy, anti-fascism and liberation movements’, it is actually disconnected from Leninism ... In the aftermath of the World War, liberation and nationalist struggles (in particular, the struggle against national oppression in the context of a country and, more generally, the democratic/anti-imperialist revolutions in dominated countries) did not subside and stop; rather, they have greatly increased in range and number. The anti-imperialist movements and revolutions of the dominated nations throughout Africa, Asia and Latin America (from India and Algeria to China and Vietnam, from Mozambique*

*and Angola to Iran and Nicaragua), as well as the decades of struggles in Ireland, Eritrea, Basque Country, Palestine, Kurdistan etc. ... bear witness to our claim to have solved the national problem and gained self-determination.*"<sup>295</sup>

Lenin was an internationalist who believed that the fate of the October Revolution was tied to world revolution, not to national liberation revolutions. Contrary to the views of the left of capital, Marxism is neither a sect nor a religion that cannot change; rather, it is fluid and has evolved along with the evolution of capitalism. Great Marxists like Lenin have tried to enrich it. But internationalists believe and the hundred years of experience have shown that Lenin had ambiguities in relation to the national issue, while Rosa Luxemburg's perception of the national issue was a Marxist conception.

With the arrival of capitalism in the era of communist revolution and the formation of the Comintern, the proletariat's task was to conquer state power. Therefore, any attempt to form a new state would remove the proletariat from its goals and be against communist revolution. After the imperialist Second World War, and especially the Cold War, when imperialist tensions intensified, the liberation movements became part of the imperialist policy of gangsters.

On the Marxist horizon and with the arrival of capitalism in its decadent era, the era of imperialism, national movements and liberation lost its revolutionary character. Each of these movements, in the event of a victory and the formation of a state, becomes an imperialist state, even if it is a weak imperial state. In other words, the nature of liberation movements is derived from the evolution of capitalism and, consequently, from the evolution of the class struggle. But, for the left of capital, the nature of these movements results from dictatorship, domination etc.:

---

<sup>295</sup> *Towards Socialism*, second period, Issue 2, page 64.

*“But have these movements lost their revolutionary and progressive character? Did the history of these movements end in this concept?*

*Certainly not!*

*The fact is that many national and liberation movements in our era have not only lost their revolutionary and democratic character; but, because of the expansion of the influence and domination of imperialism and the escalation of exploitation, dictatorship, and the political and economic lawlessness of the masses in dominated countries (as we see in most countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America), more than ever, they have also been radicalized in terms of purpose and their objective content. The sovereignty of both concept and political content for the proletariat in dominated countries is nothing but reactionary, unbridled violence and dictatorship: it is not a form of political suppression that can best guarantee the profitability and accumulation of capital in these countries. And it is precisely for this reason that the national and liberation movements in these countries, in terms of their subjective and objective outcomes, have to go further than the feudal and bourgeois-liberal critique of imperialism, and their democratic and revolutionary character is more and more visible and prominent.”<sup>296</sup>*

In the previous sections, we responded to the prattling of worker-communism on issues such as the relationship between dictatorship, profitability and capital accumulation, and there is no need to repeat them. It is nonsense to say that liberation movements have become more radical and their revolutionary character has been significant and prominent. Can they use an example? The Kurdish part of Iraq has become the autonomous region for the national Kurdish movement due to imperialist

---

<sup>296</sup> *Towards Socialism*, second period, Issue 2, page 65.

tensions. Has the Kurdish region of Iraq brought a bouquet of flowers to lay before the working class? What has it done except suppress workers and serve regional gangsters? The Palestinian movement was once a model of a campaign on the left of capital and a liberation movement, but now where is it? Apparently, these movements do not value their own words.

The internationalists are accused of having an economistic understanding of imperialism and being unable to understand the domination of imperialism around the world. First, let us see how the left of capital has interpreted the dominance of imperialism. According to *Towards Socialism*:

*“The ICP can, because of its economistic understanding of imperialism, and the failure to understand the meaning and political consequences of the ‘imperialist rule over the world’ - which is probably the only consequence of the imminent occurrence of World War III! - close its eyes to reality. It does not recognize the national liberation movements of our era nor deny the revolutionary and progressive nature of these movements; but the fact is that more than half of the world’s people, given the real conditions of their lives, cannot stop the revolutionary struggle against imperialism. As long as imperialism exists, there will also be national liberation struggles and movements; and, as long as there are reaction and violence and naked dictatorship, which are the requirements for the rule of imperialism, the existence of revolutionary-democratic movements against imperialism is also a historical imperative. The era of wars and revolutionary movements against imperialism can only end with imperialism itself.”*<sup>297</sup>

---

<sup>297</sup> *Towards Socialism*, second period, Issue 2, page 66.

First, apparently, the UCM well understood the domination of imperialism, and it was its correct understanding which assessed the criminal Khomeini as anti-imperialism, while internationalists evaluated him at the same time as reactionary.

Secondly, unlike the left of capital, from the Marxist point of view, imperialism is not a major economic, military and oppressive power, such as the US or Britain. The Marxist definition of imperialism is based on a proper understanding of the development and evolution of global capitalism and the degeneration of capitalism, which can never be limited to actions of the state or particular states, and no country alone can escape this global system. Imperialism is a way of life for the capitalist system in the era of capitalist decadence. With the arrival of capitalism in its decadent era, all major gangsters, such as America and Britain, or small gangsters, such as Iran or Pakistan, are imperialist.

Thirdly, the left of capital in states that contain half of the world's population cannot oppose revolutionary struggles against imperialism due to the control exercised over their living conditions. The ideologue of capital reduces the antagonism between work and capital to the antagonism between peripheral and metropolitan capital, in the same way that the struggle of oppressed people (peripheral capitalism) against imperialism (metropolitan capitalism) is a historical imperative. For communists and internationalists, because all countries are imperialist, the anti-imperialist struggle means the anti-capitalist struggle, whether on the periphery of capital or in metropolitan capitalism.

The theoretician of *Towards Socialism*, due to the intensity of his desperation and getting into trouble, states that the lack of unconditional support for national liberation movements reduces the internationalists to the level of the most reactionary bourgeois parties:

*“‘The unconditional support of national liberation movements and the boycott of participation in them’ is a summary of the position of the ‘Internationalist Communist Party,’ which has strictly avoided*



*being 'on the political ground of the bourgeoisie' and adopted the position of the most reactionary bourgeois parties.'*"<sup>298</sup>

The left of capital has understood the reality of the positions of the communist left. National movements are the political ground of the bourgeoisie and participating in them does not represent compromise with the bourgeoisie, but a conversion and a connection on the bourgeois front. The ICP, by defending proletarian positions, will not fall into the positions of the most reactionary bourgeois parties, such as worker-communist parties, but remain among the vanguards of Marxist positions. But, what about the positions of the one of the most reactionary bourgeois parties on this issue, namely, the Communist Party of Iran? How did the party play an appendage role in the imperialist tensions? After the ceasefire in the Gulf War (the US's first war with Iraq), we witnessed protests in Iraq along with the torture, massacre and displacement of millions of people. Putting aside the political leadership and compass of struggle, among the main tasks of the party, the only Communist Party the world (the 'anti'-communist party of Iran) could not even give out a simple statement about the events. Mansoor Hekmat replies to this question:

*"The reason why the statement was not issued, indeed, the reason for the lack of official reaction from the political bureau to this day, is the fact that this event was a practical burden on the Kurdish organization of the Communist Party. Our organization in Kurdistan has been in the context and at the centre of this turbulence and conflict. Any response from the political bureau, which would be a fait accompli for the Kurdish organization of the party and, from above this organization, put it in a new practical position in relation to the parties involved in the region, would be irresponsible. The lack of rapid communication with Komala*

---

<sup>298</sup> *Towards Socialism*, second period, Issue 2, page 67.

*comrades in Kurdistan following the war in the region prevented us from being able to timely coordinate ourselves with these comrades and publicly declare the official position of the party. In addition, there is still a basis for using the Kurdish organization of the party to locate facilities on Iraqi soil, without interfering in the internal affairs of this country. In addition, it is independent from everyone's perspective in the case of recent events, which restricts the scope of official comment by the Communist Party.”<sup>299</sup>*

The main force of the party, under the guise of Komala, has become part of the imperialist tensions. Understanding this issue and digesting it were initially difficult, for the simple power of Komala, which in the name of liberty and socialism, had become partisan (Peshmerga). One of the former partisans of Komala, when recalling the humiliation and insult of the partisan forces, provides a good illustration of how Komala became an infantry amid the imperialist tension.<sup>300</sup> Accepting this issue was

---

<sup>299</sup> “The Consequences of the Middle East War - The Events in Iraqi Kurdistan - Interview with Communist No. 61”.

<sup>300</sup> “At this time, we had no choice but to retreat to Iraqi soil. At this time, as almost all of the central facilities of Komala were in Alan, they had to be moved ... with the transfer of the central headquarters of Komala to the village of Maluma In Iraq, we were still in the newly formed Dalahu battalion, and our bevy continued to operate under the command of Selah Khebat in this battalion. The Dalahu battalion was located on the slopes of the ‘Beh mo’ mountain range, and the Iraqi security forces were also nearby. We stopped at the Iraqi checkpoint when we arrived at the ‘Beh mo’ gate. Our guide said we should wait until an Iraqi officer arrived. Each of us was supposed to give him our name and our father’s name. I, Selah Khebat, Hamid Bavryz and martyr Sediq (known as Sadiq RPG), were sitting in the first car. In the same car was Mohammad Nabavi, the mediator between Komala and the Iraqi forces. The other units were in a mini bus. In a matter of minutes, Iraqi forces pulled two of our comrades out of the car and kicked one of them. I could not tolerate this scene and I could not watch an Iraqi mercenary beat my comrade. On their bases, there was no qualitative

difficult for Komala forces early on; but, over time, it became not only a bitter reality but a tragedy. Many times, the Iraqi state punished Komala by bombing its headquarters and, each time, some of Komala's partisans died. This meant that, as Komala remained within the sights of Iraqi foreign policy, it could not make the slightest mistake. The most prominent and elite partisans of Komala in the Shawan battalion died in the Iraqi chemical bombing raids. The theorists of worker-communism must explain why these people were the victims of imperialist tensions and what policy was responsible for sacrificing these people.

Mansoor Hekmat, in connection with the bombing of Komala's camps by Iraq, and how 23 of the most militant and elite partisans of Komala were victimized by such a policy, says:

*"The camps were gradually transferred to the depths of Iraqi Kurdistan and the Iraqi military control areas. Military transfers were really only allowed with Iraqi permission and the freedom of the organization was restricted to sending troops to Iran ... Military activity came to a standstill. The financial dependence of the*

---

difference with the Islamic revolutionary guards and the Iraqi security forces. I said to Comrade Mohammad Nabavi: they beat our comrades. Without waiting for his answer, I went down and took my gun out of the holster and walked 40 yards towards a bastion of Iraqi soldiers. They were all shocked. The Iraqi forces, who were about 100 in number, directed their weapons at me. Comrade Nabavi was also surprised and nervous. In Arabic, a few sentences were exchanged between him and the soldiers of Iraq which I did not understand. He also called me to drop my gun and go back to the car. It went to my pride, but returned to the car again. As soon as I reached 'Beh mo' I wrote a protest letter to the Central Committee asking them to stop this type of humiliation and insults as soon as possible and express my opposition to diplomacy at any cost, and I emphasized that I had taken weapon on the road to liberty and socialism, and nothing else."

From the memoirs of Khaled Ali Panah, which appear on his blog.

<https://foolad.wordpress.com>

*organization increased, allowing the deployment of camps, while financial facilities and equipment were placed higher on the list of demands of Komala [from Iraq] than weapons and ammunition. At the hands of the Iraqi regime and the Iraqi Army, the organization came under pressure ... Maintaining the balance and the policy of non-interference in the 'internal affairs of Iraq' became much more difficult. As an example, only to intimidate Komala and separate it from the Iraqi Kurdish opposition, the Iraqi regime bombed our camps on several occasions. In only one case of chemical bombardment of the central camp of Komala, 23 of our most prominent and oldest activists lost their lives ... The relationship with Iraq (in fact, being vulnerable to Iraqi retaliation) imposed silence on Komala and the Communist Party of Iran, which politically was no longer possible.”<sup>301</sup>*

The US, in line with its imperialist interests in Syria, has trained and armed Kurdish troops under the name of “People’s Protection Units”. This has annoyed one of the main American allies in the region, Turkey. The strengthening of the Kurdish national movement in Syria strengthens the Turkish Kurdish movement, which is not welcome for Turkey. In order to address Turkey’s concerns, the US informs the Turkish authorities each month of the list of weapons provided to the People’s Protection Units; more importantly, it guarantees Turkey that weapons and equipment will be collected as soon as it defeats the Islamic State. In this regard, note the references to former US Secretary of Defence, James Mattis, below:

*“James Mattis also said in a letter to the Turkish Minister of Defence that the US produces a list of weapons made available to the ‘People’s Protection Units’ in Syria each month and issues it to*

---

<sup>301</sup> Mansoor Hekmat - “diplomacy” or political choice?

*Turkish authorities. The US Secretary of Defence said that the exact number of weapons delivered to the Kurds is specified, adding that this equipment will be collected as soon as victory is declared over the Islamic State.”*<sup>302</sup>

The Secretary of Defence is openly telling his Turkish counterpart that the People’s Protection Units are aligned with the imperialist interests of the US. When the US achieves its goal, the People’s Protection Units will lose their necessity and the weapons will be collected. It is valuable for the US to turn the partisans of the People’s Protection Units into cannon fodder, instead of their own soldiers, to pursue their imperialist interests.

The different tendencies on the left of capital, with the titles of “Rojava socialism”, “Kobani’s resistance” and so on, are defending the Syrian National Movement for Kurdistan, which currently plays an infantry role in the American-led Western-Arab bloc. All the sects belonging to worker-communism also not only recognize the Syrian Kurdish movement, but also support and defend Rojava and Kobani’s resistance, and all see the fate of Kobani’s autocracy. But the interview with Salih Muslim, one of the main figures of the Rojava, poured cold water on the left of capital. In the interview, he stated that the US, as a supreme global power, aims to strengthen democracy around the world, and the Kurdish people are prepared to have a solid relationship with the US.

---

<sup>302</sup> <https://www.radiozamaneh.com/346619>

## **Worker-communism and Independence for Kurdistan**

We have already explained that imperialism is a step in the life of capitalism; and, since capitalism is a global production system, no country can be outside this system of production. In the era of capitalist decadence, all states, regardless of their economic and military power, are imperial. Each new state will be also an imperialist state. One particularly objective example contributes to the comprehension of the subject: worker-communism wants to form an independent Kurdish state in Northern Iraq. If such a state is formed, then the Kurdistan state will be an imperialist state, and a weak imperialist state at that. This means that worker-communism supports Kurdish imperialism, which will be formed in the future, against Arab imperialism (Iraq). The result will be that worker-communism will try to deflect or degrade the class struggle in the region. These remarks in the political space on the left are capital are full of “disbelief” and offer a verdict which sounds like evil poetry.

The necessity for the independence of Iraqi Kurdistan was introduced by Mansoor Hekmat in 1995 with his call for a referendum on “separation”. The Iraqi worker-communist party approved this proposal from Hekmat to solve the problem. Much later, the Kurdish region in Iraq announced that, on 25 September 2017, Iraqi Kurdistan would hold a referendum on the establishment of an independent state. It also announced that a referendum would be held in Kirkuk’s oil-rich province. Other than the result of the referendum, the Kurdish region of Iraq has strived to join with Kirkuk in Iraqi Kurdistan.

All the sects belonging to worker-communism have welcomed this referendum, which was part of their demands after Hekmat put forward his plan in 1995. All branches of worker-communism have emphasized the provision of conditions for a free referendum, and appeared as Barzani advisers. They call for the thief's nest (UN) not to withdraw from this referendum and should recognize this referendum like any referendum in another country, and they say:

*“From today, we should say no to the first fraud in the referendum! No one, and in the first instance, the Kurdish region of Iraq, is entitled to the outcome of the referendum subject to anything other than the free will of the people! The United Nations has no right to withdraw from this referendum! We have to force them [the UN] to recognize this referendum in the same way as a referendum in any other country and commit itself to it!”<sup>303</sup>*

Who makes decisions in the thieves’ nest (the UN)? The fact is that the decisions are taken in line with the imperialist interests of the gangsters themselves. Forcing the UN to recognize the referendum is just more demagogy and only serves to legitimize the thieves’ nest. The thieves gathered in the UN only vote on resolutions that are in line with their own interests. Worker-communism has portrayed two scenarios for holding a referendum in Iraqi Kurdistan. In the first case, a referendum would be held under the leadership of worker-communism and, in the second case, worker-communism would be in the opposition in Kurdistan. We examine both modes. What happens if the referendum is led by the worker-communists? They will argue that Iraqi Kurdistan would immediately face socialism:

*“A referendum in Iraqi or Iranian Kurdistan is another example of the Leninist and Hekmatist methodology of a non-socialist movement. Obviously, we want the state that is formed after the referendum in Kurdistan to be a more democratic, liberal and modern state. As long as this state is freer, it will be in the interests of socialism and the working class. If the referendum is conducted with our leadership, the most liberal state will be established in Kurdistan, and we will quickly form councils and mass*

---

<sup>303</sup> Soraya Shahabi - Kurdish region of Iraq and self-made independence trap.

*organizations from above, mobilize the vast masses of the workers and toilers behind us and bring about socialism without delay.”*<sup>304</sup>

This story cannot be accepted even by primary schoolchildren. If a referendum is conducted with the leadership of worker- communism, the most free state possible will be established in Kurdistan. Will Kurdistan be the “freest” state in the world by holding a referendum under the leadership of worker-communism? What if the outcome of the referendum is negative? The nonsense about “the most liberal state” in Kurdistan is just propaganda before the referendum. The most liberal state is just a dictatorship. They want to form the council from **above** and go straight to socialism. Such distortions are not caused by the unconsciousness of the worker-communism writer about the basic positions of Marxism, but derive from the expression of bourgeois class demands in Marxist clothing. They are just laughing at their own intelligence.

The second case would be not holding a referendum under the leadership of worker-communism. Even holding a referendum in this case would put worker-communism in a better position to advance the socialist revolution:

*“The day after the referendum about the independence of Iraqi Kurdistan, we are not supposed to be the opposition while the others are in the government. If someone says that, in the Iranian-Iraqi Kurdistan, we have a referendum on determining the fate of Kurdistan, this does not mean that, after the referendum, the communists and the working class must form the opposition, while Talabani and Barzani and the Democratic Party take power. It is clear that we have to have a programme after the referendum. Now, we have to say what characteristics the state that comes after*

---

<sup>304</sup> The populism of Hamid Taghvai and the Charter for the Overthrow of the Worker-communist Party, Hekmatist (Mahmoud Qazvin).



*the referendum should have. This does not make us much less supportive of socialism.*

*For Iraqi Kurdistan, we have to define the interim government after the referendum and put it in place. This will put us in a much better position after the referendum to advance the socialist revolution in a state that [only] seeks to refer to the referendum, but gives the result of it beforehand to others.”<sup>305</sup>*

A referendum on the survival of Iraqi Kurdistan (or Iranian Kurdistan) is in the framework of the current state or whether Kurdistan will be an independent state. It is the same as holding a referendum in a country about joining the EU or, conversely, holding a referendum about leaving the EU, such as in the UK in 2016. In 1995, a referendum was held in the Province of Quebec on seeking independence from Canada, which is a kind of referendum Iraqi Kurdistan is scheduled to hold. The Quebec referendum had no impact on Canadian class forces.

But worker-communism wants to determine the profile of the future state by introducing a referendum on Iraqi Kurdistan and putting it to the community. The Iraqi Kurdistan referendum will put worker-communism in a better position to pursue a socialist revolution. These falsehoods and nonsense can only be expressed in sects such as worker-communism.

---

<sup>305</sup> The populism of Hamid Taghvai and the Charter for the Overthrow of the worker-communist Party, Hekmatist (Mahmoud Qazvin).

## **Worker-communism and Parliamentarism**

As noted earlier, in the era of capitalist prosperity, unions were merely an economic formation, as the political struggle was passed onto the party, which, through parliament, would advance the struggle by imposing reforms. The working class was still not prepared to create its own organs to guide society and establish its dictatorship; the workers' councils did not yet have a conception. In spite of the awareness of parliamentary constraints, and in line with the demands of workers and the imposition of reforms on the centre of power of the bourgeoisie, the communists went to parliament. Communists were aware that parliament divides the working class into different countries, while the task of representing parliament is to defend the interests of its nation, which is in contradiction with proletarian internationalism.

With capitalism entering its era of decline, the era of communist revolutions or imperialist wars began. In the era of imperialism, the imposition of sustained reforms on the bourgeoisie lost its meaning. Increasing non-productive costs, increasing the cost of military and arms recaptures, increasing the cost of the state apparatus, and ... the impossibility of sustained reforms in the epoch of capitalist decadence have made this become a reality, in turn making it impossible to manoeuvre and introduce sustainable reform. The myth of improving living conditions, the reproduction of labour in modern conditions, is only to ensure the continuity of exploitation and wage slavery.

With the victory of the October Revolution, as part of the wave of global revolution, and in the process of forming the Comintern, new conditions were imposed on the proletariat. The Comintern emphasized the conquest of power by the proletariat and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat through the workers' councils, declaring:

*“The immediate task of the proletariat is now to conquer state power: the conquest of state power means the destruction of the*

*bourgeois state apparatus and the organizing of a new proletarian power system.”*<sup>306</sup>

The communists who gathered at the Second Congress of the Comintern - and, in accordance with the new conditions, the arrival of capitalism in the era of decadence and dismay, and the era of imperialist wars and communist revolutions, not the age of parliamentarianism - wrote:

*“Parliament has become a tool for lying, deceiving, violence and a tedious nagging. With looting, destruction, invasion, militarism and imperialist destruction, parliamentary reforms without any sustainable gain have lost any meaning to masses of workers.”*<sup>307</sup>

After the Second Congress of the Comintern, any illusion that the proletariat can achieve power through parliament, or reduce the burden of crises through parliamentary intervention, or any distracting illusion about the electoral theatre and the parliamentary circus, only serves to strengthen the illusions of bourgeois democracy and throw dirty soil in the workers’ eyes.

With the slightest explanation about the position of the communists in relation to the issue of parliament in the era of decadent capitalism, we return to the position of worker-communism in this regard. All tittle-tattle on the left of capital about the revolution and the destruction of the state machine is only demagogy. The left of capital wants to play a role in the game of political power. We will discuss in Section 10, taking political power from the standpoint of worker-communism, here we are just referring to the parliamentarism of worker-communism. Mansour Hekmat

---

<sup>306</sup> From: Invitation to the First Congress of the Comintern, 24 January 1919.

<sup>307</sup> Theses on parliamentarism from the Second Congress of the Third International.

claims that, through elections, the chances of worker-communism winning political power are greater:

*“If we come to power at elections, we have to assume that they are going to plan a coup tomorrow. I will not discuss it now, but the very essence of the electoral process is the greater chance it offers of bringing communists to power.”*<sup>308</sup>

Hekmat, about 100 years after the statement of communists in relation to the nature of parliament, repeats the same rubbish from the left of capital. He rants that, in the electoral process, the chances are greater for communists to take power.

It is in the shadow of such statements that the ideologues on the right wing of capital speak of the “communist” states of North Korea, Cuba, China and so on. Contrary to such a thirst for the power of capital, from the Marxist point of view, neither the communists nor the party of the working class alone, but the entire working class through soviets will apply its dictatorship. Hekmat says that if he is given three months to campaign and if elections are held freely, his party will become the largest party in parliament:

*“There are two conditions, in my opinion, where the chance of us coming to power is strongest. One involves democratic and electoral conditions, and the other involves revolutionary conditions. In both of these conditions, we are going to get power. In both of these, worker-communism comes to power. That we should first be present in order to come to power will be discussed later. Suppose this force has been able to bring itself to a free electoral scene in a country that is not an Islamic republic. In a democratic election process, if there were to be such a process in*

---

<sup>308</sup> *Is it possible to achieve communism in Iran? - Mansoor Hekmat*

*Iran, we would get power. The Worker-communist Party, in my opinion, will gain the highest number of votes from among people who have been freely able to go to the ballot boxes. I do not think monarchists have this chance. It is a mistake to think that elections will be in their favour [monarchists] and that only the revolution will come to our advantage. The election is in our favour too. And precisely because of this, I think they will not go to the elections unless they are forced to. If there is a process for electing a free parliament, a process for holding free parliamentary elections, and for introducing candidates in different areas and counting the votes of all the people, the worker-communist party will come to the parliament as the largest party in the country. It may not be the majority, but if they let it run a free election campaign for three months, it would be the largest political party in the country.”<sup>309</sup>*

Free elections are the discoveries and demagogy of Mansoor Hekmat. In his version of free elections, a worker has one vote, but do the media and advertising companies also has a vote? The election is as free as the sale of labour by workers, with huge corporations engineering public opinion. Let us just refer to one item. Recently, ideologues and journalists from capitalism announced that Facebook played a significant role in regulating and managing the “Brexit” referendum and the US presidential election. They also uncovered millions of donations to Facebook. Worker-communism can enter the electoral campaign as the left wing of capital with monarchists as the right wing of capital, which would set the electoral campaign alight. This is essential for the legitimacy of parliament, but propagating nonsense in the name of Marxism should not be allowed. Better still, you cannot use Marxist terminology and throw dust and soil in the eyes of the working class.

---

<sup>309</sup> *Is it possible to achieve communism in Iran? - Mansoor Hekmat*

Following the developments of 1979, using the parliamentary tribune, the left of capital introduced the candidates in the election or, more specifically, defended their preferred candidates. The most radical phrase if the right election conditions are available to them, will be the elections. For example, when Nahid Riazi, a member of the Central Committee of the Hekmatist Party, was a candidate in the Danish parliamentary election in 2005, the party institutions, under the slogan “Support Nahid Riazi’s candidacy for the Danish parliamentary elections”, entered the campaign.

In parliamentarism, parliament is not at the service of communism, but communism is used to legitimize parliament. In parliamentarism, parliamentary representatives play a major role, and the working class plays the role of the infantry for parliamentarism. Parliamentarism is reinforcing the illusion among the working class that others are able to advance struggle on their behalf. This is what worker-communism preaches. Worker-communism wants to participate in the interim government, and organize people (who includes people?) in the councils and from **above**. Its supporters write:

*“We also want to participate in the interim administration and organize people in councils on a large scale ... The interim government is a tool for advancing the working class from above. Anyway, we even want an assembly of people’s deputies, who have been elected directly, and to freely vote for a constitution for a better world. The struggle for the most advanced and modern laws and regulations and the totality of a better world will be a struggle within the interim government from above and with pressure from the bottom-up.”*<sup>310</sup>

---

<sup>310</sup> The populism of Hamid Taghvai and the Charter for the Overthrow of the worker-communist party, Hekmatist (Mahmoud Qazvin).

There are no borders for the bankruptcy of the authors of worker-communism. They want to create councils for the people from above; such councils will be no better than the “German Labour Front”<sup>311</sup> or Islamic councils.

About a hundred years ago, in 1920, the first Communist Party of Iran, unlike the left of capital, 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*

---

<sup>311</sup> The Nazi regime in Germany in 1933 set up a workers’ organization known as the “German Labour Front”, which was aimed at controlling workers and luring them towards Nazism.

*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."*



## Worker-communism and Democracy

The bourgeoisie itself has been the product of a process of evolution in the mode of production and exchange. The economic growth of capitalism and its transformation into a productive ruling relationship required a social and political relationship, in which citizens have equal and identical rights, according to the law, and freely venture to buy or sell the workforce. It was in such a context that bourgeois democracy replaced feudalism. Democracy has a class load. Lenin describes this clearly:

*“It is constantly forgotten that the abolition of the state means also the abolition of democracy; that the withering away of the state means the withering away of democracy.*

*At first sight this assertion seems exceedingly strange and incomprehensible; indeed, someone may even suspect us of expecting the advent of a system of society in which the principle of subordination of the minority to the majority will not be observed—for democracy means the recognition of this very principle.*

*No, democracy is not identical with the subordination of the minority to the majority. Democracy is a state which recognizes the subordination of the minority to the majority, i.e., an organization for the systematic use of force by one class against another, by one section of the population against another.”<sup>312</sup>*

The fact is that bourgeois ideologues, as part of the superstructure of the class society, have a duty to champion the legitimacy of the upside-down society. In light of ideologues and immeasurable possibilities, the ruler’s idea is the idea of the ruling class. Marx explains this as follows:

---

<sup>312</sup> *The State and the Revolution* of Lenin

*“The ideas of the ruling class are in every epoch the ruling ideas, i.e. the class which is the ruling material force of society, is at the same time its ruling intellectual force. The class which has the means of material production at its disposal, has control at the same time over the means of mental production, so that thereby, generally speaking, the ideas of those who lack the means of mental production are subject to it. The ruling ideas are nothing more than the ideal expression of the dominant material relationships, the dominant material relationships grasped as ideas; hence of the relationships which make the one class the ruling one, therefore, the ideas of its dominance. The individuals composing the ruling class possess among other things consciousness, and therefore think. Insofar, therefore, as they rule as a class and determine the extent and compass of an epoch, it is self-evident that they do this in its whole range, hence among other things rule also as thinkers, as producers of ideas, and regulate the production and distribution of the ideas of their age: thus their ideas are the ruling ideas of the epoch.”<sup>313</sup>*

In the most democratic countries, the dictatorship of capital is applied, because the means of the production of materials and public opinion are in the hands of the bourgeoisie, while the workers and the deprived masses have no involvement in the affairs of society. The most democratic and free election is a kind of demagoguery against the working class, and it prevents workers from exercising their power. The most liberal parliamentary elections seek to undermine the class struggle and lead the class struggle towards legal channels in order to sterilize it. The most democratic and transparent parliamentary election aims to create a dispersal of class consciousness.

---

<sup>313</sup> Marx's *German Ideology*

But, for the ideologue on the left of capital, Mansoor Hekmat, contrary to Lenin's doctrine of democracy, the solution to the question of democracy is the precondition of the mobilization of the working class for socialism. In this context, he writes:

*"We said that the solution to the question of democracy is itself the pre-condition for the independent and extensive mobilization of the working class for socialism."*<sup>314</sup>

We have already explained that democracy is poisonous for the working class in the evolution of the class struggle. This issue is particularly important in Western countries, with their established tradition of bourgeois democracy. Bourgeois democracy has a bearing on the evolution of capitalism in these countries. Capitalism first began to grow in Western European countries; bourgeois revolutions first took place in Western Europe; and, consequently, bourgeois culture in these countries has an established tradition. This tradition and established culture have also been transmitted by Europeans to North America or Australia. This culture has played a crucial role in influencing bourgeois ideology in the working class through literature, art and so on. In bourgeois ideology, individualism, national ownership etc. play an essential role, precisely in conflict with proletarian internationalism.

Again, we return to the democracy of Mansoor Hekmat, who once believed that it would be a mistake not to expect revolutionary democracy to come from the political figures in the non-proletarian classes, but from anti-imperialists, such as Khomeini. For example, he points to the "non-proletarian revolutionary democracy" attitude by Sheikh Ezzedine Hosseini (a cleric opposed to the regime of the Islamic Republic who supported the Kurdish national movement):

---

<sup>314</sup> The Iranian Revolution and the role of the Proletariat (Theses) Hamid Taghvaie & Mansoor Hekmat

*“The parties, groups, forces and political figures of the non-proletarian classes (and thus Khomeini, the clergy, the students of the Imam [Khomeini], and so on), they are only to that degree and extent anti-imperialists who move in the political struggle alongside the proletariat and its political organizations ... The claim of being ‘anti-imperialist’ and suppressing workers and communists is demagogy. The service of imperialism is behind the scenes; and, if we imagine that, ‘well, you cannot expect anything else from non-proletarian democracy’, we are hardly at fault and ... as an example of the attitude of ‘non-proletarian revolutionary democracy’ among communists, let’s look at the positions of Sheikh Ezzedine Hosseini.”*<sup>315</sup>

Hekmat considers and complains about the degree of anti-imperialism in the case of Khomeini to be low. Meanwhile, he considered the convergence of one of the Kurdistan mullahs with the nationalist movement of Kurdistan to be an example of the attitude of non-proletarian revolutionary democracy. This nonsense is written by somebody whose eloquent and expressive speeches have led him to be called the ‘Marx of our epoch’.

In the journal *Towards Socialism*, they accuse internationalists of being decisively and clearly disconnected from democracy and complain about internationalists who reject participation in bourgeois movements:

*“The ICP is decisively and clearly disconnected from democracy. To be specific, it believes that, in our time, we need to support democracy and the struggle for democracy, fight for the realization of democratic demands and rights (women’s liberation, state-church separation, the right of nations to determine their own fate,*

---

<sup>315</sup> Prospects of adversity and new advancement of revolution thesis about the political importance of the economic crisis

*freedom of opinion and expression etc.) and stand up against the violation of these rights by the bourgeoisie by supporting and participating in democratic movements and revolutions - all of this is denied and condemned.”*<sup>316</sup>

Internationalists, including the ICP, proudly embrace this entire accusation and decisively declare that they do not believe in bourgeois democracy and bourgeois movements. The internationalists are fighting for the communist revolution, and this is possible only through class struggle. But, apparently, teaching by the left of capital about ‘Marxism’ to the internationalists does not end. They preach that a working class without democracy and without training in democracy can never destroy capitalism and establish socialism, and they say:

*“Everyone who is familiar with the most basic principles of Marxism knows that a working class without democracy and a struggle for democracy, and without training in the process of this struggle and taking advantage of its achievements, will not be able to overthrow the capitalist system and establish socialism. We know that the working class needs democracy, because the democratic conditions provide the best grounds for deepening the class struggle and its clear and free expansion.”*<sup>317</sup>

The emphasis by the left of capital on democracy and the teaching of democracy to workers only reflects the class demands of the left of capital, which uses Marxist language to gain more power. The ‘theorists’ on the left of capital should remember that, rather than democratic conditions, the capitalist crisis offers the best grounds for deepening the class struggle.

---

<sup>316</sup> *Towards Socialism*, second period, Issue 2, page 70.

<sup>317</sup> *Towards Socialism*, second period, Issue 2, pages 70-71.

For internationalists, dictatorship capitalism and democratic capitalism are two sides of the same coin. The political superstructure of capital can take different forms, according to the needs of capital. In France, in the cradle of bourgeois civilization, in the cradle of democracy, following the defeat of the Paris Commune, the same civilized barbarians massacred more than 50,000 workers within a week. In Germany, capital according to its own needs took on the form of dictatorship, leading, in the late 1930s and early 1940s, to the massacre of millions of people. Later, it took on the form of democracy. Many examples can be noted. But the perception of this problem for the ideologues of worker-communism is upside-down logic. They claim we must fight along with the democratic bourgeoisie against capitalist dictatorships, as happened during the Second World War, when Russia fought alongside America and Britain to defeat fascism and Nazi Germany. The realistic logic of worker-communism is as follows:

*“Indeed, that is upside-down logic. It is the logic of someone who does not understand that the era of imperialism is the era of decline and the rottenness of **capitalism**, and not the decay of the **struggle against reactionary and dictatorial capitalism**. ”*<sup>318</sup>

The left of capital accuses internationalists (including the ICT) that they do not recognize the war against imperialists and, consequently, turn their back on democratic revolutions, anti-imperialist struggles and democracy, which leads to the collapse of the socialist revolution, as explained in *Towards Socialism*:

*“The ICT does not understand that our era is not the only war **between** imperialists, it is the era of revolutionary wars **against the imperialists** too, the era of democratic anti-imperialist revolutions*

---

<sup>318</sup> *Towards Socialism*, second period, Issue 2, page 71.

*that provide the context and preconditions of the socialist revolution ... The ICT, by breaking with democracy, has not only turned its back on democratic revolutions, it has also disconnected itself from the proletariat and socialist revolutions.*"<sup>319</sup> [Original emphasis]

It is not conceivable, given the logic of the left of capital, how it is possible not to believe in democracy and democratic revolutions, and so on, while belonging to the proletarian camp and fighting for a socialist revolution. It was not the communist left that broke away from the proletariat and the socialist revolution; rather, it was the left of capital (worker-communism), which, in line with its class and bourgeois demands, committed crimes with, among others, Khomeini, a petty bourgeois and anti-imperialist, while, during the Marxist phrase, transformed workers into black army for the Islamic bourgeoisie. We never claim that worker-communism broke away from proletarian positions or betrayed the proletariat; but we emphasize that you belonged to the capital camp from the very beginning.

Sometimes, it is believed that the *Towards Socialism* writer is not able, in a rational way, with solid internal consistency, write a few pages against the internationalists. In his bankruptcy, he intends to smear. The more he scrambles, the more he becomes delirious. But the fact is that there is nothing under the author's feet. It is not possible to build a fortress in the sand. At the height of the distraction, the *Towards Socialism* writer states:

*“‘Training and guidelines’ are summarized in this sentence: Desist from the class struggle in any real and concrete form possible! ‘The Marxism of ICT’ does not interpret the world, but it doesn’t show how to change it either! It is a Marxism that has been*

---

<sup>319</sup> *Towards Socialism*, second period, Issue 2, page 72.

*caricatured in which, in its critique, man has to persistently prove the obvious, such as why we should fight, why we need a revolution and what it is, why democracy is desirable, why fascism is bad, and so on ... 'Imperialist economism' is the most appropriate name which can be applied to this 'caricatured Marxism'.*"<sup>320</sup>

Unlike the lies of worker-communism, the Marxism of the communist left not only proclaims the need to change the world through communist revolution, but also fights in that direction. The communist left has declared that the destruction of humanity is certain if the working class does not fulfil its historical mission.

The communist left has no critique of the left of capital. This is not rational; nor does the communist left need to be reminded of Marxist axioms and the lexicon of class struggle when talking about the political apparatus of the left of capital. Because these obviously allow for the expression of the class and social demands of the two classes facing each other.

Eventually, the leader of worker-communism, Mansoor Hekmat, reveals his heart and his main demand: the formal acceptance of capital - in other words, the legalization of worker-communism in Iranian society:

*"If we were legal, if our party had an office in Tehran, when the people wanted to speak, we would answer them. Our meeting would only be a street away and people could come and hear our answers ... but this is not the case in this country. The people are silenced, killed and beaten."*<sup>321</sup>

---

<sup>320</sup> *Towards Socialism*, second period, Issue 2, page 73.

<sup>321</sup> Mansour Hekmat in discussion with Kiyomars Navidi, *Didar* 23 (21 February 1999).



## **Background to the faction of worker-communism**

We have discussed in detail in the preceding section that the roots of worker-communism should not be traced back to communist left but to Stalinism-Maoism. None of those who has claimed or are claiming that worker-communism is rooted in the communist left or that worker-communism is influenced by the communist left is capable of concretely demonstrating this root and influence; rather, they only offer some of the heterogeneous generalizations. None of the “critics” of worker-communism, who claim that it is influenced by the communist left, is able to show how it emerged from the basic foundations of the communist left, from internationalism, from world revolution, from the anti-Marxist thesis of socialism in a country. It has been influenced by the rejection of trade unions as institutions of capital, the rejection of national movements as infantry forces in imperialist strife, the rejection of a united front, the belief in direct communist work, and so on. Demonstrate and prove this effectiveness in the theory and practice of worker-communism. Such claims first of all show a lack of seriousness of the part of those making them.

The formation of a political tendency is a reflection of the historical situation which intellectually produces it. We return to this issue in the formation of Marxism as a theory of workers’ emancipation. In Section Six, we examined the need for the formation of revolutionary Marxism (the term that ideologists of worker-communism put into their ideology before the transformation to worker-communism) stemmed from the reconstruction of Line 3. Postponing the crisis of Line 3, through its restoration under the name of revolutionary Marxism (a restoration of Stalinism-Maoism), gave revolutionary Marxist scholars the opportunity to declare that “revolutionary Marxism”, with its expensive and crystallized backing in the Communist Party of Iran, will this time be the driving force behind the successful revolution of the future. They wrote:

*“This tremendous support, thanks to the conscious proletariat and its Communist Party ahead of this movement, could be the starting point and the driving force for the coming successful revolution.”*<sup>322</sup>

The Iran-Iraq War and the role of Komala as part of the infantry in Iraqi imperialist politics enabled the activities of Komala and the so-called Communist Party. The end of the Iran-Iraq War and military activity by the Iranian opposition based in Iraq and their commitment to military inactivity imposed new conditions on the Iranian Communist Party. The majority force of the party under the title of Komala, who were stripped of their social status, had by now founded a campsite. It was not possible to continue this situation in the long run.

On the other hand, the migration of much of the party leadership to Western countries, and the opportunity to get acquainted with European currents and Western life, made it necessary for some of these leaders to reconsider their views. Part of the main body of activists of the Unity of Communist Militants (UCM), who had now assumed leadership of the Communist Party, were former students in Western countries. Before returning to Iran at the end of 1978, Mansoor Hekmat was a doctoral student and fluent in English. Certainly, mastering the English language and living in England gave him the opportunity to study the views of others which could be used in the reconstruction of the ideology of revolutionary Marxism which was now in crisis and in discovering an alternative to worker-communism. The opinions of others did not take the form of a systematic influence; rather, they were reflected in the way in which the heterogeneous opinions of Mansoor Hekmat were restored or updated.

---

<sup>322</sup> *Communist*, No. 16

Given the metabolism of Communist Party, its future and, most importantly, the fate of its force which led to its isolated campsite status, party leaders were forced to adapt to the new conditions. A former leader of Komala and worker-communism says:

*“The main focus of the dispute between the Executive Committee and Mansoor Hekmat was about arrangements for the leadership of Komala, its combat force, camps and, in general, its continued operations in all areas of Komala’s activities after the end of the Iran-Iraq War ... Transferring the political organization and the main centre of Komala’s leadership to Europe was intended to remove this centrality from the hands of the Ba’athist regime. The project was completed by reducing the number of camps, transferring children, the elderly and the injured from the war with the Islamic Republic to Europe, transforming residential camps into camps for Komala’s military forces, which had several combat units and some leadership inside Iran... If the political centre of Komala was elsewhere, units and camps based on the border would have more security and the continuity of Komala would be guaranteed.”<sup>323</sup>*

Since the Second Congress of the Iranian Communist Party, “revolutionary Marxism” has shown signs of crisis, and these can be seen in Mansoor Hekmat’s inaugural address to the Second Congress and its related issues. Finally, with the serious onset of the crisis of “revolutionary Marxism”, the same leaders declared that it was a temporary intellectual and political framework for the two struggling traditions of workers’ socialism and non-workers’ left radicalism. Another circus and another show should be implemented. The necessity to

---

<sup>323</sup> Evaluation of battles and branches of the worker-communism in Iran, part 4, Majid Hosseini

overcome the crisis of “revolutionary Marxism”, the alienation of the working class from the Communist Party, the inefficiency of the so-called Communist Party, the dilemmas arising from the Iran-Iraq War ceasefire, the dilemma of people living in camps and their social status etc. created the background to the emergence of the ideology of worker-communism: in other words, the crisis of revolutionary Marxism, and how it came about, raised the need for an alternative to worker-communism.

The Third Congress of the Iranian Communist Party was held in January 1988. At that congress, Mansoor Hekmat referred to worker-communism. In the process, part of the party leadership (Mansoor Hekmat, Iraj Azarin, Reza Moghaddam) formed the centre of worker-communism in order to advance its foundations. In turn, the 15th Plenum of the Communist Party adopted the following two decrees in order to achieve the goals of the centre of worker-communism:

- Agreement over Komala’s activity in the cities
- Facilitate workers’ membership of the Iranian Communist Party

Agreement over Komala’s activity in the cities was supposed to be a response to the new conditions and the adaptation of the main force of the party, namely, Komala, to the new political situation. Mansoor Hekmat understood the new situation and tried to oust Komala, who represented the party’s main force, as an isolated camp that posed numerous threats to the other camps and to adapt to the post-ceasefire conditions following the Iran-Iraq war. In other words, he sought to transfer the leadership and centrality of Komala to Europe and reduce the burden on the camps and the ability of Komala to operate in the cities as a political force.

In the process of continuing the disillusion of the Iranian Communist Party and also to silence some circles and activists inside the country, the willingness inside Iran to support the Party was in practice meaningless, while correspondence and others communications were minimized as well. On the other hand, due to the camp status of Komala

after the end of the war, the activities in this area achieved nothing. In such circumstances, the party proposed the facilitation of workers' membership of the Iranian Communist Party, which had more internal traction. Accordingly, any worker who identified himself or herself with the common goals of the party was considered a member of the party, even though he or she was not able to express it publicly. The party's argument was that, because of suppression, workers would not be able to join the party. Further, if this suppression was to be lifted one day, workers would rush to the party, as was the case with the social democratic parties in Europe. The social democratic concept of the party, both in revolutionary Marxism and in worker-communism, is not our focus here.

The formation of factions has been one of the necessary and well-known tools within the communist movement. We clearly explained the issue of factionalism from the Marxist perspective in Section Six. Usually, a faction comprising a minority within a revolutionary organization, while the official policy and position of the relevant current is transitioning to a counter-revolutionary position, defends the proletarian position against the official policy of the related current in order to save the revolutionary organization.

Meanwhile, the opposite was true for the faction of worker-communism: activists in this faction occupied leadership positions on the main committees and organs of the organization, which were the main determinants of party politics. But the same leaders claimed that, despite their instructions being formalized as a supreme organ of the party, in the later process of implementation, something else came out. Mansoor Hekmat writes:

*"For a long time between the Second and Third Congresses, I was the Secretary of the Central Committee and, with comrades Reza Moghaddam and Behrouz Milani, we were the party's Executive Committee. So, what was later called 'worker-communism' was*

*actually at the head of the party. During this time, it became clear to us that the machine we were officially in command of was in fact moving towards a different mechanism. All our actions and instructions as the supreme organ of the party were officially endorsed. Then, in the process of action, something else emerged.*”<sup>324</sup>

Mansoor Hekmat with typical demagoguery says that the machine that he had been steering was being operated by another mechanism. Due to his political charlatanism, the crisis of his failed ideology, thrown on the shoulders of others, failed to take responsibility for the failure of this ideology. By updating the heterogeneous positions of Line 3 and aggregating forces into the Iranian Communist Party, the ideology of “revolutionary Marxism” is now in crisis.

The ideologist of the left of capital does not say what he said a few years ago about this aggregation (the Iranian Communist Party) and the counter-revolutionary ideology of “revolutionary Marxism”. If Mansoor Hekmat pretends he has Alzheimer’s, then historical memory is alive. At one time, this aggregation (the Iranian Communist Party) defeated bourgeois and petit bourgeois illusions and revisionist ideas with the ideology of “revolutionary Marxism” while raising the independent banner of the communism of Marx, Engels and Lenin. In a statement, the founding congress of the Anti-Communist Party wrote:

*“The Iranian Communist Party is formed in the wake of the victorious struggles of revolutionary Marxism against the bourgeois and petit bourgeois illusions and revisionist ideas that had engulfed the Iranian left movement. Revolutionary Marxism ... raised with strength the independent banner of the communism of*

---

<sup>324</sup> Notifications on the formation of the worker-communist faction in the Iranian communist party

*Marx, Engels and Lenin. The formation and rapid growth of revolutionary Marxism in Iran were the political and organizational reflection of the objective presence of the Iranian working class at the scene of the revolution: the class that needed its revolutionary theory and its leading political organization to advance and liberate itself; the class that, at the same time, with its active involvement in the revolutionary struggle, had provided the material conditions conducive to transforming this revolutionary theory into a social material force and the political and organizational strengthening of its leading forces and organizations.*”<sup>325</sup>

The undeniable fact is that the “Communist Party” was neither a party, even in a bourgeois sense, nor a communist one. Once, Mansoor Hekmat indulged in demagoguery when the same party strongly raised the independent banner of the communism of Marx, Engels and Lenin, but then he declared that party was not responsive to the priorities of worker socialism. However, with that aggregation breaking down because of its intrinsic and internal contradictions, Hekmat smartly burdened that aggregation further with the meaning of political tendencies. The task of strengthening and promoting a new ideology, namely, worker-communism, was delegated to the centre of worker-communism. Mansoor Hekmat writes:

*“The centre was a collective whose goal was to strengthen worker-communism, both inside and outside the party. The focus was primarily on explaining our differences with other tendencies ... This party with its current status was not responsive to the needs and priorities of worker socialism. We thought we should start*

---

<sup>325</sup> Statement by the congress of the founding congress of the Iranian communist party, September 1983

*again if necessary. The centre was the result on this assessment.*”<sup>326</sup>

Party leaders and officials who were in command of the party stated that the party’s performance was not in line with the orders of these leaders. First, the party leadership formed the centre of worker-communism, then the same leaders, who made up the majority of the party’s leadership and cadres, metamorphosed the centre into the faction of worker-communism, in order to intervene in the fate of the party. Mansoor Hekmat writes:

*“The faction is, in a sense, a continuation of the work of the centre. In the centre, we have come to the conclusion that we must actively participate in the fate of the party ... The faction of worker-communism was constituted as a means to facilitate our active organizational involvement in the fate of the Communist Party.”*<sup>327</sup>

As mentioned before, a minority in the revolutionary organization, in defence of its proletarian positions while being against the official organizational policy of pursuing counter-revolutionary positions, created the faction. In relation to worker-communism, they not only occupied leadership roles on the main committees and organs of the organization, which were the main determinants of party politics; they also claimed to represent about 85% of the party’s force. So, you can’t give into this show, this political concept of factionalism. The fact is that Mansoor Hekmat, as a political charlatan, was trying to present a new alternative to the crisis of revolutionary Marxism, known as “worker-communism”, albeit with a radical turn of phrase and apparently with left positions. It was in this context that, according to their own literature, the left were

---

<sup>326</sup> Notifications on the formation of the worker-communist faction in the Iranian communist party

<sup>327</sup> As above



referred to as supporters of worker-communism and of Kurdish nationalism within the Iranian Communist Party. A former leader of Komala and the Communist Party writes:

*“Flagmen of the right wing had no place on the main committees and organs of this communist organization. Following those two political famous lines, left and right in Komala and the Iranian Communist Party lined up against each other. The great majority (about 85%) of the left were under the leadership of the faction of worker-communism, who were opposed to nationalism and its supporters on the left. The left practically took over at the helm of the Komala organization.”*<sup>328</sup>

Mansoor Hekmat had chosen the main members of the worker-communist faction not on the basis of these individuals' positions which defended the same “faction of worker-communists”; rather, he relied on the backwardness of bourgeois tradition as well as political self-interests, even if the same person did not believe these positions. Hekmat was familiar with shifting positions and displacements in the bourgeois tradition and he had grasped that tradition. He would gather forces and eventually assemble the princely “tribal heads” so that the tribe members would follow them. One of these tribes was the Modaressi tribe. One of the former leaders of worker-communism, a disciple and platonic lover of Hekmat, who is currently experiencing a period of isolation, writes:

*“Koorosh Modaressi, during this period, was one of those who initially associated themselves with the nationalist and right-wing leadership ... Koorosh Modaressi persisted with his right-wing position until he went to Europe to attend the 16th Plenum and met*

---

<sup>328</sup> Evaluation of battles and branches of the worker-communism in Iran, part 4, Majid Hosseini

*with Mansoor Hekmat. Koorosh Modaressi did not adopt this position because of his nationalism; he was among the dissatisfied leftists who opposed the worker- communist movement under the leadership of Komala and the party [who] were selected as the main members of the faction of worker-communism ... Mansoor Hekmat was gathering power ... while all the documents and texts of that period were written by him, while faction members [of worker-communism] put their signatures at the foot of these documents. None of the three other members of the faction wrote or published any entries that approved of the factions.*"<sup>329</sup>

The faction of worker-communism was formed in August 1988 to transform the foundations of worker-communism into the foundations of the party. In turn, with the approval of the Central Committee of the Iranian Communist Party, a four-person politburo (Mansoor Hekmat, Iraj Azarin, Koorosh Modaressi and Reza Moghaddam) practically took over the party leadership. It is important to note that the worker-communist faction had four members; now, the same four founding members of the politburo, in other words, the faction, were the party leadership. Mansoor Hekmat discusses the helm of the party being taking over by the faction as follows:

*"If you want to form your own party without giving up the party you have, without wanting to abandon all that has been achieved with this party, then you are setting up a faction. It is necessary in the Iranian Communist Party to take over the helm of the party by this process."*<sup>330</sup>

---

<sup>329</sup> Evaluation of battles and branches of the worker-communism in Iran, part 4, Majid Hosseini

<sup>330</sup> Dialogue on the formation of the worker-communist faction in the Iranian communist party

Mansoor Hekmat regarded the Communist Party as a machine for organizing and powerfully propagating for its own purposes; he never intended to abandon the Communist Party. The party was to be conquered by the faction's goals and by its activists. Hekmat explains the reasons for this:

*"I do not forsake a party that is already there; and, even now, it is a relatively powerful organizing and propaganda machine, even in comparison with radical labour organizations in Europe and the US. It can be a very effective tool in our effective involvement in the socialist labour movement, both in Iran and in the rest of the world. In my opinion, an Iranian communist and worker who wants to have a material and tangible impact on the world of his or her time cannot renounce the Iranian Communist Party."*<sup>331</sup>

On the one hand, the implementation of the decisions and policies of the leaders within the party faced difficulties; on the other hand, the occupation of Kuwait by Iraq and the subsequent Gulf War and changing regional conditions posed serious problems to the faction of labour communism. The labour communist faction did not intend to split, but sought to conquer the party during the Fourth Congress, with a clear 15% of outsiders from their ranks, and become a monopoly party, believing that 85% were in favour of worker-communism. Even the timing of this settlement had been marked, namely, the date of the Fourth Congress. We put this issue aside for now, other than to state that the prohibition of the right to build a tendency and a faction within a political current became both a convention and a norm after the defeat of the October Revolution, and that the attempt by Stalinist counter-revolutionaries to silence any opposition and create a monotheistic party characterizes Stalinism. On the

---

<sup>331</sup> As above.

conquest of the party and the refinement of other tendencies during the Fourth Congress, Mansoor Hekmat writes:

*"I have said before that the communist party of Iran (CPI) is a multi-base party which, in our view, must be turned into a single-base party of worker socialism in Iran. This means struggling to set the other tendencies in the party aside even if they may agree with all the resolutions and statements of the worker left in the party... We want the CPI to be the party of the worker socialism of Iran; we want it to close its "radical left" chapter altogether. The CPI should become a single-base and a single-trend party. Its programme, leadership, traditions, cadres, preoccupations, daily practice, and so on, should totally reflect such a position in society... The fate of the various tendencies in the party should be decided by the time of the Fourth Congress. The Congress itself is an occasion when we want the victory of worker socialism in the Communist Party of Iran to become official - with its programme, leadership and everything else."*<sup>332</sup>

The lack of capacity and efficiency in the faction and among its supporters and, most importantly, the developments in the region, meant that the course of events did not go as Mansoor Hekmat had predicted. In other words, the necessary conditions and the necessary power to conquer the party did not come as Mansoor Hekmat had hoped:

*"The faction, which was supposed to unite itself, to implement policies of worker-communism throughout the party, in its four-month activity, found little opportunity to align the various aspects of the party's activities with the policies of worker-communism or adapt to the US invasion of Iraq and the events in Iraqi Kurdistan,*

---

<sup>332</sup> *Our Differences* - Mansoor Hekmat

*which also exposed differences ... Rahman Hosseinzadeh, who was a member of the Komala Leadership Committee at the time, made at least three speeches in defence of the benefits of the American war for Iraqi Kurdistan in the Komala camps.*”<sup>333</sup>

The first Gulf War and its aftermath for Iraqi Kurdistan, whose main force in the party, named Komala, had been captured in Iraqi Kurdish camps, virtually eliminated the possibility of a party conquest. Mansoor Hekmat knew that, in the context of the post-Gulf War conditions and rising Kurdish nationalism, in an armed encampment in Northern Iraq, the most sensible approach was withdrawing forces, not conquest. Any unconsidered collisions could have led to a bloodbath at an armed camp in Northern Iraq. With the disappearance of the party’s conquest scenario from within, the faction of worker-communism practically lost its meaning. Under these new conditions, for Mansoor Hekmat, the withdrawal of his supporters from the party in the camp in Iraqi Kurdistan was on the agenda. Most of them left for Europe and North America in 1991 through Turkey, later forming the body of worker-communism. About the troubles experienced by his supporters who are trapped in the camp, Mansoor Hekmat says:

*“My main concern is the question of the Kurdistan organisation. If we didn't have military camp, radios and etc, if some of our best comrades were not living there, I would not have considered this transition process necessary... But the situation of comrades in Kurdistan, exactly because of their contractual and unconventional social conditions is an important issue which needs attention.*”<sup>334</sup>

---

<sup>333</sup> Arbitrary Historiography: A Narrative of the Iranian Communist Party’s Past - Part 2: Reza Moghaddam

<sup>334</sup> Explanation to the 20<sup>th</sup> Plenum on the decision to leave the Communist Party of Iran

Mansoor Hekmat, who once sought to determine the fate of other tendencies at the Fourth Congress by forcing them to proclaim the victory of worker socialism, faced new conditions. Given the military space of the camp and the conditions of Iraqi Kurdistan, recommending individual separations was the wisest way in which he could avoid group divisions and, worse still, purging the party of other tendencies. As a political manoeuvre, he describes the conditions that had been created for him to “leave the scene very calmly” rather than purge the party:

*“Meanwhile I don't believe purging is constructive. If we were to do this, there is a big market for throwing mud at communists "who purge other lines." I cannot fight this propaganda...If we were to purge some and they would seek help from the society which sympathises with them and would try to overthrow communism in this miniature corner of the world. I will calmly leave the scene in front of them. The route to confront these tendencies is not organisational, but social. Thus, leaving is a right historical decision.”*<sup>335</sup>

It is said that a liar has poor memory. So, was the party to be conquered during the Fourth Congress and become a monotheistic and single-base party, which would purge itself of outsiders. Individual resignations and the non-conquest of the party from within created conditions for Mansoor Hekmat to argue, with his trademark political charlatanism, that the question of worker-communism is not a question of purging the most backward trends from within the communist party, but of regarding worker-communism as the socialist movement of the global worker. Mansoor Hekmat writes:

---

<sup>335</sup> Explanation to the 20th Plenum on the decision to leave the Communist Party of Iran

*“The discussion of worker-communism was not a discussion of purging the most backward tendencies from within the party. This debate is not even fundamentally addressed to the party as a given organization. We want to give the socialist labour movement a political and intellectual framework, even beyond Iran. Our counterparts in society are the main bourgeois tendencies that pose real obstacles to the communism of the working class.”*<sup>336</sup>

In light of this brief explanation of the background to the formation of the worker-communist faction and the process of eliminating its existential necessity, the central question that arises is, what at all is worker-communism?

---

<sup>336</sup> From the book *On Party Activities in Kurdistan*, page 64

## What is worker-communism?

We have repeated many times that a political tendency does not emerge from the sky. Even for religions, the material conditions for their emergence were already available, as in the case of the Abrahamic religions; otherwise, they would have remained small sects. The formation of a political tendency is a reflection of the historical situation which intellectually produces it. The question is, what historical conditions produced worker-communism? Before examining worker-communism, let us first discuss the historical conditions of the formation of Marxism (communism), which is actually a reflection of particular historical conditions.

The concept of communism goes back to ancient Greece, where communism depicted a myth or a utopian view of a society in which private ownership had no meaning and the people in society lived happily and peacefully. In modern times, it is possible to refer to the Levellers as the first communist movement. The Levellers were an egalitarian movement of stubborn 17th-century communists in Britain who sought to distribute society's wealth equally among its members. This movement was cruelly suppressed by the Democratic Republic of Cromwell. Another who speaks of the utopia of communism is Etienne Cabet, who, in his book *The Voyage to Icaria*, depicts an idealistic society in which communist relations prevail. There is no talk of private ownership or corruption, or crime having no meaning, while there is full equality between men and women.<sup>337</sup> The characteristic of all these communists was that they were idealists, a material force and a social class (the proletariat) with no historical task to undertake. How did the material conditions for the rise of a social class and consequently scientific communism come about?

---

<sup>337</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The\\_Voyage\\_to\\_Icaria](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Voyage_to_Icaria)



Since the 16th century, when capitalism began to flourish, the concept of communism has been put forward in different forms. With the invention of the steam engine, which, in turn, influenced the whole of industry, the Industrial Revolution gained momentum. The Industrial Revolution which started in England in the early 18th century quickly spread to other European countries: on the one hand, the means of production was concentrated in the hands of a particular minority in society, namely, capitalists; on the other hand, this led to the formation of a new social class called the proletariat.

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. A major thinker on the proletariat has described this functioning of the proletariat as a product of the birth of the working class:

*"At first the contest is carried on by individual labourers, then by the workpeople of a factory, then by the operative of one trade, in one locality, against the individual bourgeois who directly exploits*

*them. They direct their attacks not against the bourgeois conditions of production, but against the instruments of production themselves; they destroy imported wares that compete with their labour, they smash to pieces machinery, they set factories ablaze, they seek to restore by force the vanished status of the workman of the Middle Ages.*”<sup>338</sup>

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.

In the face of all sorts of socialism (petit bourgeois socialism, utopian socialism, bourgeois socialism), which marked the genesis of the working class, the material background to communism (Marxism) was provided. This required the emergence of a new social class, the proletariat, in order to present the theory of its conditions of liberation, namely, communism. The distinguishing feature of communism (Marxism) from utopian, petit bourgeois or bourgeois forms of socialism and so on was formed around basic socialist debates. These notions, which are the foundations of communism, were at the core of the working class (not the working mass), in the sense of social revolution, in the concept of capitalist system, in the dictatorship of the proletariat (transition from capitalism to socialism), and in the global sense of communism (socialism), among other factors.

The publication of economic texts, *Theses on Feuerbach*, *The Holy Family*, *The Condition of the Working Class in England* and other debates

---

<sup>338</sup> *Manifesto of the Communist Party*

indicated that a particular type of theory of the conditions for the liberation of the proletariat was emerging. The publication of *The Poverty of Philosophy* was the culmination of the formation of Marxism (communism), written as a critique of the petit bourgeois socialism of French anarchist, Pierre-Joseph Proudhon. In this book, Marx exposed the philosophical and economic foundations of Proudhon's contradictory fantasies and instead described the historical growth of the capitalist mode of production. Marx dialectically criticized the benefactor thinkers who sought to eliminate the negative aspects of capitalism within the framework of capitalism while keeping wage labour, in line with utopian socialists who demand the continuation of wage slavery. Marx revealed the baselessness of such fantasies and clearly showed that they did not embody an understanding of the growth of capitalism. In *The Poverty of Philosophy*, he critiqued the idealistic and metaphysical worldview of Proudhon from a materialist perspective. This book represented a complete break with the young Hegelians. Unlike the young Hegelians, in *The Poverty of Philosophy*, Marx fully explains the role of productive forces in the evolution of society, the relations between productive forces, means of production and their interactions, and the dialectical relationship between labour and capital in capitalist society. Above all, the class struggle in its evolutionary process will replace capitalist productive relations with higher productive relations, namely, socialist productive relations.

The publication of the manifesto reflected the emergence of the workers as a social class. This class, coupled with the theoretical coherence of communism, chose to fight the barbaric capitalist system as well as offer an alternative to capitalism, the socialist mode of production.

The publication of *The Communist Manifesto* reflected the emergence of the working class as a social class: a class that, with its theoretical coherence, presented its theory of the struggle against the capitalist barbaric system as well as its alternative to capitalism. With this publication, Marxism also became the theory of the conditions for the

liberation of the proletariat. 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. For communists, socialism and communism have the same meaning and represent a society in which the mode of production is socialist, while the difference between socialism and communism lies in distribution. Communism is not a religion with predetermined dogmatic principles but is fluid and enriched by the experiences of class struggle.

Although, for communists, socialism and communism have the same concepts, in the history of the labour movement, the most radical and progressive part of the working class has always associated itself with communism. In such a context, the thinkers of the working class did not hesitate when they chose to name their defining platform as *The Communist Manifesto*. Engels, in the preface to the 1890 German edition of the manifesto, says:

*“Nevertheless, when it appeared, we could not have called it a socialist manifesto. In 1847, two kinds of people were considered socialists. On the one hand were the adherents of the various utopian systems, notably the Owenites in England and the Fourierists in France, both of whom, at that date, had already dwindled to mere sects gradually dying out. On the other, the manifold types of social quacks who wanted to eliminate social abuses through their various universal panaceas and all kinds of patch-work, without hurting capital and profit in the least. In both cases, people who stood outside the labour movement and who looked for support rather to the “educated” classes. The section of the working class, however, which demanded a radical reconstruction of society, convinced that mere political revolutions*

*were not enough, then called itself Communist. It was still a rough-hewn, only instinctive and frequently somewhat crude communism. Yet, it was powerful enough to bring into being two systems of utopian communism – in France, the “Icarian” communists of Cabet, and in Germany that of Weitling. Socialism in 1847 signified a bourgeois movement, communism a working-class movement. Socialism was, on the Continent at least, quite respectable, whereas communism was the very opposite. And since we were very decidedly of the opinion as early as then that “the emancipation of the workers must be the task of the working class itself,” [from the General Rules of the International] we could have no hesitation as to which of the two names we should choose. Nor has it ever occurred to us to repudiate it.”<sup>339</sup>*

For the first time in human history, a class was formed, capable of carrying out a communist revolution to end all human exploitation. This social class is the only social class in human history that is both exploited and revolutionary, and again the only social class that cannot liberate itself unless it liberates the whole of humanity. Marxism declared that the working class was a class against capital; but it is not yet a class for itself, and must become a class for itself. Marxism considers the evolutionary process of history and the development of capitalism to be the precondition of a socialist society. Capitalism must grow and concentrate its productive forces while simultaneously creating its own gravedigger, the proletariat. However, it was only the Paris proletariat that entered the revolution of 1848 with its clear class demands. Meanwhile, 23 years later, in 1871, it organized the first proletarian revolution in history, known as the Paris Commune. Although the revolution of the proletariat was bludgeoned to death in 1848 and in 1871, if it had not been slaughtered, it would not have been possible to establish socialism. As

---

<sup>339</sup> *Manifesto of the Communist Party* -Preface to the 1890 German Edition

capitalism had not yet entered the era of imperialism, the era of its decadence was still in its flourishing state. Engels says in this regard:

*“Everywhere that revolution was the work of the working class; it was the latter that built the barricades and paid with its lifeblood. Only the Paris workers, in overthrowing the government, had the very definite intention of overthrowing the bourgeois regime. But conscious though they were of the fatal antagonism existing between their own class and the bourgeoisie, still, neither the economic progress of the country nor the intellectual development of the mass of French workers had as yet reached the stage which would have made a social reconstruction possible. In the final analysis, therefore, the fruits of the revolution were reaped by the capitalist class.”*<sup>340</sup>

We believe that it was the proletariat who were able to establish Marx as a communist thinker, not that Marx himself invented communism for the working class. Without the rise of the working class as a social class, Marx could only have been a historical genius like thousands of other historical geniuses; better still, we can say that communism is the product of the rise of the working class as a social class in recent centuries. Without the proletariat, communism would only be a myth.

This communism found itself in the League of Communists, the First International, the left wing of the Second International, the Third International, and in particular the left wing of the Third International, and the factions that took on the big task of defending the communist and proletarian positions against the degeneration of the Third International. Today, the communist left is the only real defender of Marx’s proletarian and communist positions.

---

<sup>340</sup> *Manifesto of the Communist Party* - Preface to the 1893 Italian Edition

Let us now examine the rise of worker-communism. As we have explained, the rise of the working class as a social class led to Marxism as its theory of emancipation, but the opposite is true for “worker-communism”. In other words, “worker-communism” is the mental secretion of a political activist and an ideologue of the left of capital in response to an aspect of his own political life. Here, we could be talking about Mansoor Hekmat’s daily ineffectual practice in his belief in the fate of the workers of his generation. As he says:

*“The discussion of worker-communism is the result of more than three years of my own reflection on this aspect of my political life and the political activity that I consider myself to be a part of ... Honestly, the first thing that convinced me that there are still important and new questions to be answered was that I had embraced communism as an ideal of workers, and spent six or seven years of my active practice as a cadre of the Iranian communist movement, and I saw that my daily practice had no impact on the fate of the working generation that is living with me, as well as my course. It is contemporaneous with me.”<sup>341</sup>*

So, Mansoor Hekmat came to the conclusion that his political life had no effect on the working-class generation that ran alongside; well, that’s up to him. But, in the real world, as an ideologist of peripheral capital, he played an important role in consolidating bourgeois positions. When workers became cannon fodder in the imperialist Iran-Iraq War and when workers were slaughtered in Kurdistan in the name of the National Movement, along with revolutionary Marxism, the critique of the left of capital was extinguished by restoring and reconstructed Stalinism-Maoism

---

<sup>341</sup> Mansoor Hekmat - Foundations of worker-communism – worker- communism Seminar

under the title of communism among the political milieu, with Hekmat playing the biggest role in sliming proletarian ideals and values and so on.

We argued that the rise of the working class as a **social class** raised the necessity for scientific communism (Marxism). But, unlike Marxism, the starting point for worker-communism was the response that Mansoor Hekmat himself had received. Apparently, he had discovered a new “elixir” with which to skilfully resolve, albeit temporarily, the crisis of revolutionary Marxism or, more likely, to postpone it again. He succeeded in transmitting the crisis of revolutionary Marxism to worker-communism, which then manifested itself in the crisis of worker-communism. The crisis and the collapse of worker-communism in circles and sects will be examined later. Mansoor Hekmat, on the starting point of the worker-communist debate and the necessity for this discussion, goes on:

*“Worker-communism ... is the answer that I have come up with. This is the starting point of the worker-communist debate. Worker-communism responds to a real vacuum in the social movement of communism which is quite straightforward and undeniable ... So, the first thing that attracts attention in the study of communism today is the gap between the communism that practically exists at all levels and the communism that Marx intended.”<sup>342</sup>*

Marx, with his greatness, never claimed that communism was the response he had arrived at. Hekmat, meanwhile, is the ideologue of the left of capital who regards the barbarism of state capitalism in the Eastern bloc as the practical manifestation of communism. What better slimes the name of communism than this? After dragging communism through the mud, he argues that there is a gap between practical forms of communism

---

<sup>342</sup>Mansoor Hekmat - Foundations of worker-communism – worker- communism Seminar



and Marx's communism and that he has been the saviour seeking to bridge that gap. We explained earlier that Marxism marked the rise of the working class as **a social class**. The basic question that arises is, what social and historical conditions produced worker-communism? Worker-communism is a product of the activities of Iranian workers in the 1979 revolution as well as the product of land reform in Iran, in which workers became the **main stratum** and not the main class of the exploited. In other words, in spite of internationalist hangers-on, according to the ideologue of worker-communism, Mansoor Hekmat, worker-communism is a product of the particular conditions of Iran, an issue to which we will return. First, let's look at the essence of Hekmat's remarks regarding the historical context of the formation of worker-communism:

*“Worker-communism is thus the product of the activities of Iranian workers after the 1979 revolution and during the 1979 revolution. It is also valid to claim that it is the product of ‘land reform’. It is a product of the land reform of the 1960s in Iran, during which workers became the main exploited stratum.”*<sup>343</sup>

Mansoor Hekmat argues that, because of the 1979 revolution and the intervention of Iranian workers in the revolution, worker-communism was able to gather a force around itself, demonstrate the capacity of the working class and show that workers are ready for the struggle. In his opinion, in England, since the revolution has not taken place, the working class has not been able to respond to the bourgeoisie's attacks. There are 50,000 workers among the UK's unemployed, and the working class was unable to come to take on the struggle. Mansoor Hekmat writes:

---

<sup>343</sup> Mansoor Hekmat - Foundations of worker-communism – worker- communism Seminar

*“But the real reason that this debate [on worker-communism] was able to be won in Iran and kept so many people united in the region, in particular, in Iran and Iraq, is because behind it was a widespread revolution in which the workers took on the [struggle]. In England, the workers work at home. Just yesterday, BMW and Rover put 50,000 people out of work, and these [workers] can’t do anything at all. They can’t do anything except write slogans on the walls of their homes. In the Iranian Revolution, workers took up the [struggle] and it became clear that ‘God himself is a worker’. And it turned out that Muslims were pro-worker. It was found that the workers were the ‘strong leader of the revolution’. The potential and capacity of the working class have emerged.”<sup>344</sup>*

The first question is that, if worker-communism is the product of the 1979 revolution, instead of the ideology of revolutionary Marxism, why did worker-communism not appear from the start? Why did it take 10 years for Mansoor Hekmat to present his seminar in March 1988 as the basic foundations of worker-communism? This shows that the liar has a poor memory and that he has forgotten that, in his pamphlet *Our Differences* on the metamorphosis of revolutionary Marxism into worker-communism, he stated:

*“Let me also add that the distinction between the views of today and the intellectual framework of the past is not something which we have come to understand at once. Today, we recognize that these are different intellectual traditions, but we have not necessarily understood from the outset the theoretical scope and social depth of these differences.”*

---

<sup>344</sup> Mansoor Hekmat - Foundations of worker-communism – worker- communism Seminar

Another moment of demagoguery from Mansoor Hekmat occurred when he said that, after the land reform, the workers became the main stratum of the exploited, meaning that, before the land reform, the workers were not the main exploited stratum. In other words, according to Mansoor Hekmat, Iranian society was not capitalist before the land reform; rather, it was feudal. To be sure of his point of view, we refer to the programme of the Iranian Communist Party that he had formulated. About that programme, Hekmat writes:

*“The land reform of the 1960s had completed the long and slow transformation of the Iranian mode of production from a feudal to a capitalist one.”*<sup>345</sup>

Contrary to Mansoor Hekmat’s Maoist vision, even before the land reform in Iran, the workers were not the main stratum but **the main class of the exploited**, because the dominant mode of production in Iran was the capitalist mode of production. The reconstruction amid the ruins of World War II created an economic boom throughout the capitalist world. Although Iran suffered very little damage from occupation by the British and the former Soviet Union, it had much potential, especially because of its vast oil resources. At this point, we witnessed the growth of the Iranian oil industry, the modernization of industries and particularly the growth of the manufacturing industry. With the growth of constant capital, the need for variable capital (labour) also increased. The continued accumulation of capital required the release of variable capital from the countryside and the migration of workers to the cities. It was in this context that the capital state facilitated this release under the name of land reform.

Mansoor Hekmat, at the height of speaking delirium, estimated that worker-communism could be traced back more than 200 years, stating that, in *The Communist Manifesto*, even Marx referred to this term! The

---

<sup>345</sup> The Program of Communist Party of Iran

First International, the October Revolution, and even the British miners' strike were examples of worker-communism, as he eloquently explains below:

*“The context of the emergence of worker-communism is that working-class socialism goes back more than 200 years and that even Marx, in **The Communist Manifesto**, refers to this term. Worker-communism as a social reality is the conscious movement that is formed within the working class against capital. This struggle has its moments. Many of the moments of this worker-communism have been the same as those of the communist movement. The October Revolution is undoubtedly one of those moments which drive this movement. But worker-communism is not limited to such realities and developments. As I said, the course of worker-communism is an inevitable and permanent one in the 20th century. To this tradition of worker-communism, I also add the one-year strike by British miners ... this was worker-communism.”*<sup>346</sup>

Mansoor Hekmat presented the basics of worker-communism not through a text (theoretical, even at the party level) but in a seminar, orally; the seminar was more like a party agitation than a theoretical one. He knew to which collective he was offering the seminar, with disciples knocking their socks off and regarding at such nonsense as an elixir or a miracle that was going to work out in the dream world of the religion of worker-communism. This signified such a level of acceptance by such disciples of such ridiculousness that Mansoor Hekmat said that people were gathering around worker-communism who didn't know that Lenin is

---

<sup>346</sup> Mansoor Hekmat - Foundations of worker-communism – worker-communism Seminar

an eating and drinking phenomena and that this was a sign of the success of worker-communism, saying:

*“Thousands honorable man rounding up to the party that they don’t know Lenin is eatable or drinking [phenomena] and Marxists and senior workers in the party should not indicate this as their less esteem but see that their own success.”<sup>347</sup>*

Earlier, it was argued that the beginning of the discussion of worker-communism was a discussion that Mansoor Hekmat himself had started, who claimed that the revolution of 1979 and land reform had prepared the ground for worker-communism. How did Mansoor Hekmat come to worker-communism from the revolution of 1979 and the land reform? For the moment, we put aside the contradictions and inconsistencies of Mansoor Hekmat in order to answer this question; the answer that can only be convincing to the apostles of worker-communism is as convincing as Christ’s ascension before his apostles without explanation. We look at Hekmat’s observations in this regard.

*“When you looked at the communist movements, they were usually very marginal and without influence. Not only were they not in the government, they were less influential in the political structures of those countries, they had no influence on the protest movements, and, overall, they were in no position at all. This is the first observation that makes a communist think, what is the issue? Communism, whose purpose is to change the world, putting the world on its feet and removing its inversion, in no country, has this position.*

*The second observation, from an intellectual point of view, about the beginning of the discussion of worker-communism is to see the*

---

<sup>347</sup> Mansoor Hekmat in his article “Goodbye, comrade” on 20 April 1999

*differences, contradictions and gaps between the ideals of communism and the realities that existing communism truly represents in our time.*

*Communism, as we have mentioned before, is a liberation movement, while the countries that claimed to be socialist and governed by communist parties were not free countries. Communism is a moral and cultural liberation movement, while (existing) communist movements are among the most constrained, ethical and in a sense the most restrictive social movements in their own country. Communists were not a faction of so-called intellectuals and free thinkers in many countries.*<sup>348</sup>

Mansoor Hekmat claims that communist movements were very marginal and without influence. His political charlatanism and his slinging of communism demand several explanations:

First, the ideas of the ruling class are, in every epoch, the ruling ideas, and it is only in the revolutionary situation that this rule breaks down and the ruling ideas become the ideas of the revolutionary class. In the course of World War I, if we exclude the Bolsheviks, the number of those who remained loyal to the proletarian position can hardly be said to have been more than double the number of fingers on a pair of hands.

Secondly, Hekmat uses the past tense of the verb and writes “were”. After starting the discussion on worker-communism, were the communist movements that Mansoor Hekmat hoped for no longer marginal but shaped by events or were they influential?

Thirdly, what about communist movements in the government? Communists are not a class; the working class is a class. The dictatorship of the proletariat is the dictatorship of the working class through workers’ councils, not the dictatorship of communists. Such nonsense helps the

---

<sup>348</sup> Mansoor Hekmat - Foundations of worker-communism – worker-communism Seminar

bourgeois propaganda system embody the barbarism embodied in the state capitalism of the former Eastern Bloc, China, Cuba etc. as characteristic of the communist state and call the crimes of capitalism the crimes of communism.

Fourthly, Mansoor Hekmat speaks in a disgusting way about existing forms of communism, as if he has seen the difference and contradiction between the ideals of communism and the communism that really existed with his own insightful eyes. Such observations were observed not only by Hekmat, but also by the pro-Russian and pro-Chinese currents, and their attempt to close the gap over time. So, there is no fundamental difference between Hekmat's observations and the pro-Russian and pro-Chinese currents. Contrary to Hekmat's observations, the communists (internationalists) have been defending communist positions for nearly a century and historically declared the victory of the counter-revolution over the ruins of the October Revolution. Mansoor Hekmat's "authentically existing communism" celebrated its victory on the bones of bloodied communists. The necessity of the communist left, unlike worker-communism, not only during the 1979 revolution but also in the defeat of the tide of world revolution, as well as its socio-historical necessity, was determined a century ago to defend communism and Marxism; since then, it has proudly defended proletarian positions.

Fifth, who said that "communism is a liberation movement"? This only serves to muddy communist goals. Communism is not even a movement for justice. The slogan of a socialist society is "to each according to his or her work", which expresses a kind of justice that is inconsistent with the concept of communism and communist society. Thus, in a communist society, equal rights must be transformed into unequal rights in order to apply the communist principle of "From each according to his or her ability, to each according to his or her needs".

Now the question is, how does Mansoor Hekmat want to close the gap between ideal communism and communism that really exists? Unlike the pro-Russian and pro-Chinese currents that wanted to gradually

eliminate the gap between communism and authentically existing communism, Hekmat, in order to eliminate this gap all together, has called for the social transition of communism. It should be emphasized that discussing society would consequently take forward the social class. The saviour wants to transmit the social benefits of one social class to another. So, what is this social class? Aren't social classes the material forces of social change? Hekmat describes this social transition of communism as if touching precious gold:

*“The first thing we came up with in this debate, and I think that is of great theoretical importance, is that we abandoned the discussion of revisionism and anti-revisionism and talked about the social transition of communism. We said that movements in the name of communism, which were activated or isolated or defeated, were essentially other social movements. I’m not saying this because we now need to consider the word ‘workman’ in terms of identity criteria. But, if we say who was worker-oriented and who was not, then you have failed because you were not worker-oriented. This is our objective observation.”*<sup>349</sup>

This nonsense from Mansoor Hekmat could be music to the ears of his apostles, not only for the communists and the internationalists but also for serious human beings involved in a social class (in our case, the working class) who are the driving force behind social events, it is not the will of even the most revolutionary of individuals.

We discovered the context of the formation of worker-communism from the language of its founder, Mansoor Hekmat. Now, another key question concerns the nature of the ideology of worker-communism? Mansoor Hekmat replies as below:

---

<sup>349</sup> Mansoor Hekmat - Foundations of worker-communism – worker-communism Seminar



*“Primarily, worker-communism is a social reality ... It is social, it is objective, outside of parties and organizations, even if there is sometimes associated with them. Thus, one meaning of worker-communism is the workers’ communist movement or the workers’ communist social movement. It is the struggle in society that can be called worker-communism. This worker-communism, as an objective phenomenon, is a historical phenomenon and a reality that has been constantly present, which is material and has its own history, historical moments and events, and person-alities. Worker-communism is also a comprehensive system of thought and a critique of practical manifestations of existing socialism as well as a historical examination of contemporary socialism. Therefore, it is a theoretical-critical movement ... Worker-communism is also a party movement that looks to a different party future for communism. Worker-communism is a campaign for the creation of communist parties on the basis of these views, programmes and policies. Finally, worker-communism is a definite recall to the Iranian Communist Party: the call to adopt a certain attitude and methods of action.”<sup>350</sup>*

This long, elaborate quote provides an abstract version of a sort of general description of worker-communism. The leader, like a religious authority, provides a playful description of the religion of worker-communism. This description, if appealing to the disciples of worker-communism, offers nothing new to any other human being seeking a better understanding of worker-communism. Mansoor Hekmat, the political charlatan, claims that worker-communism is the Marxism of the end of the 20th century, forgetting that the First, Second and Third

---

<sup>350</sup> Mansoor Hekmat - Foundations of worker-communism – worker-communism Seminar

Internationals even included British miners who were part of worker-communism. If we accept Hekmat's forgetfulness and admit that worker-communism is indeed the Marxism of the end of the 20th century, then the question arises, how is Marxism represented in the 20th century by Hekmat? Let's first look at his description of worker-communism:

*"Worker-communism is Marxism. As a thinking system, it is comprehensive and widespread, because it is the same as Marxism, and is a comprehensive and widespread form of Marxism. In this sense, the worker-communist tendency or the worker-communist perspective, theoretically, emphasizes the orthodoxy of Marxism and insists on the validity of Marxism; and, the only thing I add here is what worker-communism was trying to put it into practice at the end of the 20th century ... That the intellectual apparatus of worker-communism was, at the end of the 20th century, Marxism for our time."*<sup>351</sup>

Mansoor Hekmat does not specify here how Marxism was represented before 1989, when he first organized the seminar on worker-communism. We are only confronted with a claim, without any serious or positive arguments made about the validity of its claim. He claims that worker-communism is the only real Marxism of our age. This claim is as valid as the claim of the ascension of the Muslim Prophet or the resurrection of the Christian Messiah. Mansoor Hekmat says:

*"My claim is that worker-communism is the only real Marxism of our age. I claim that what we are talking about as the anti-revisionist movement of revolutionary Marxism is socially still at another class pole ... so there is a gap between worker-communism and the current of 'revolutionary Marxism', in the sense that we*

---

<sup>351</sup> Mansoor Hekmat - Foundations of worker-communism – worker-communism Seminar

*are talking about anti-revisionist parties. This is a deep gap. It is a deep social gap.*"<sup>352</sup>

Apparently, Stalinist historiography diminishes in comparison with the historiography of Mansoor Hekmat, who claims, yes, he only believes that worker-communism existed before Marx, that is to say, Marx was a worker-communist. Mansoor Hekmat writes:

*"But, for us, the debates on worker-communism are not debates that have taken place over several days, because worker-communism is not my and your creature; it existed before Marx and is a tendency within the working class that considers itself to be Marxist, and separates itself from other tendencies within the working class."*<sup>353</sup>

Hekmat even makes the claim that, if we republish the manifesto, we will name it *The Worker-communism Manifesto*. Given that worker-communism has published dozens of worthless books and pamphlets which have carried a heavy price for worker-communism, the question arises then as to why not publish a version of *The Communist Manifesto* under the title of *The Worker- Communist Manifesto*? Mansoor Hekmat writes:

*"If we want to republish **The Communist Manifesto**, I will name it **The Worker-Communist Manifesto**. I will explain later that this is a manifesto of worker-communism from 130 years ago, and that*

---

<sup>352</sup> As above.

<sup>353</sup> "The discussion about the 'working class and being a communist party' is a licence to unite with the non-working left!" Reza Danesh

*present-day worker-communism of today needs a new explanation and establish a policy for today's world.”*<sup>354</sup>

We have discussed the issue of trade unions in the previous section, but it is necessary to point to an even better depiction of the ideology of worker-communism. If Mansoor Hekmat and his apostles, before they repeated the critique of the radical left of capital with regard to trade unions, made a judgement that no one has the right to dismantle the two bricks that workers have set up in their current struggle, then no one would be able to demand the dissolution of unions. Would it be better to dust off the eyes of workers and prevent the independent organization of workers, in the name of Marxism, while, in practice, appearing as a lawyer for the institution of capital? Mansoor Hekmat writes:

*“As long as your organization is not a real and available alternative, as long as it is not a real organization available to workers who can handle and answer the same questions, calling out unions seems to me to be an anti-worker effort ... No one has the right to dismantle the two bricks that workers have put together in their current and predominantly defensive struggle, with such arguments that this is not democratic, or not enough left and radical, and so on. Our attitude towards trade unions cannot be of the same sort as our attitude towards religious or state institutions. No one can demand the dissolution of unions.”*<sup>355</sup>

Worker-communism echoes the same satire of the left of capital in relation to the economic and social reforms of capitalism, as we have discussed in the previous section. This helps us to better understand the discussion. Worker-communism, while attacking the communists, declares that the theory behind “capitalism cannot reform” merely

---

<sup>354</sup> Mansoor Hekmat - Foundations of worker-communism – worker-communism Seminar

<sup>355</sup> Fundamental Characteristics of the worker-communist Party

expresses pretensions to revolutionism; otherwise, the characteristic feature of the worker-communism of Marx (yes, Marx was also a worker-communist!) was the imposition of reforms on the bourgeoisie. Mansoor Hekmat, in his distinction between worker-communism and other communists, writes:

*“A distinctive feature of worker-communism is the question of the attitude towards economic and social reforms and the economic struggle of the working class...For us, workers’ continuous economic struggle to improve their conditions by forcing political and economic reforms upon the bourgeoisie is an inseparable part of working-class struggle and constitutes one of the fundamental premises of this struggle...The statement ‘capitalism cannot reform’ became a basis for their pretensions to revolutionism...We want both a workers’ state and a rise in the minimum wage... In Marx’s words, a distinctive feature of worker-communism is that it strives ‘to push forward the whole class movement’ in all its moments and stages.”*<sup>356</sup>

Such eloquent words are not due to a lack of understanding about the evolution of capitalism, as if capitalism had been frozen in time in 1850, but rather due to belonging to the camp of capital. The left wing of capital has defended its interests in the form of Marxism. The Iranian Communist Party once raised the independent flag of the communism of Marx, Engels and Lenin. Further, through the political and organizational reflection of the objective presence of the Iranian working class at the scene of the revolution, albeit alongside the crisis of the ideology of revolutionary Marxism, the Iranian Communist Party and other parties like it have not become an appropriate container for workers’ activity. This time, the party that will be built in the future, that of worker-communists, will become a

---

<sup>356</sup> *Our Differences* - Mansoor Hekmat

workers' party and a suitable container for workers' activity. In the following sections, we will see that, even this party, as its founder claims, is out of synch with worker-communism. The question that arises for every serious person concerns which of the radical phrase currents of the left of capital do not refer to "interference in the class struggle", "workers' combination" etc. in their propaganda? Which of the parliamentary candidates does not have a great say during the election campaign? Mansoor Hekmat writes:

*"Let me not spend too much time, only an embodiment of the kind of party and parties that can be referred to as the worker-communist party. In my opinion, for such a party, the social movement, the class movement, and the daily and permanent struggle of the working class against capitalism take precedence. That is to say, the focal point of its formation, the focal point of its growth, is within the class. Much of its energy is spent there, encompassing all the issues of this struggle. And its activists are the activists of this struggle. Its leaders are well-known leaders in this struggle, no matter how small or big, are involved in pushing back and forth this social struggle. In terms of its combination, it is a workers' party. Includes elements of the working class ... Our party (the Iranian Communist Party) and a hundred other parties like us are not the right place for the activity of workers. But the worker-communist party must be a natural and appropriate container for workers' political activity."*<sup>357</sup>

Mansoor Hekmat refers to the characteristics of the worker-communist party that will be built, mentioning, among other things, the propaganda of the workers' revolution, while even announcing that we

---

<sup>357</sup>Mansoor Hekmat - Foundations of worker-communism – worker-communism Seminar

have replaced the slogan of the revolutionary republic with that of workers' rule. He writes:

*"The worker-communist party is the party that speaks of the workers' revolution in its propaganda. It directly calls for the communist revolution. We have taken steps in this direction, putting the slogan of the workers' government in place of the slogan of the revolutionary republic and so on."*<sup>358</sup>

First, the radical phrase part of the left of capital, from the Maoists to worker-communism, from the Stalinists to the Trotskyists, etc., speak, in their propaganda, of the workers' revolution and the communist revolution. Most are also aware that this is a propaganda issue.

Secondly, workers' rule or the workers' state is only a manifestation of the capitalist state in terms of workers. Unlike Mansoor Hekmat, who has just come across the phenomenon of workers' rule, the internationalists exposed the bourgeois nature of such states about a century ago. In the six large executive sessions of the Communist International held between 7 February and 6 March 1926, the communist left spokesman, Amadeo Bordiga, criticized the bourgeois nature of the "workers' state" during large meetings of the Comintern, with courage, prudence and Marxist transparency.

Thirdly, unlike worker-communism, the internationalists do not believe in "workers' rule" or a "workers' state" but believe in the dictatorship of the proletariat. The dictatorship of the proletariat is the dictatorship of the whole working class through the councils, not party dictatorship, even by the most communist party.

Contrary to internationalist gestures, worker-communism was a distinctive campaign within Iranian society and within the Iranian

---

<sup>358</sup> Mansoor Hekmat - Foundations of worker-communism – worker-communism Seminar

Communist Party. The Gulf War and its effects on the region's conditions and subsequent events forced worker-communism activists to carry out the project of worker-communism outside the Iranian Communist Party. Mansoor Hekmat says:

*"The last thing I need to talk about here is worker-communism being a distinctive campaign within Iranian society, within the Iranian left and within the Iranian Communist Party."*<sup>359</sup>

The Communist Party finally formed, Hekmat resorted to lies and deceit, claiming that communism is associated with the worker-communist party and that no one outside the worker-communist party believes in a communist society. Outside of worker-communism, no one propagates a socialist and communist society. Mansoor Hekmat addresses his supporters as follows:

*"This situation seems to me to have occurred to a certain degree, especially in recent years in Iran. They associate communism with the worker-communist party. In a sense, the communist party has also become the flag of communism, as an idea, as an alternative and as a kind of society. Outside of us, no one believes that we should bring about a communist society. Given the current state of propaganda, it is not that we should bring about a communist or socialist society, and that is the line taken by worker-communism."*<sup>360</sup>

Ideologies of worker-communism have attempted to imply that worker-communism is an ideology of internal coherence; they consider its sudden emergence as an Abrahamic religion, not a kind of historical

---

<sup>359</sup> Mansoor Hekmat - Foundations of worker-communism – worker-communism Seminar

<sup>360</sup> Mansoor Hekmat - Is Communist Victory in Iran Possible?



phenomenon, but a continuation of Marx's communism. Radical words, noisy propaganda, controversy, actionism, an emphasis on movement, etc. are characteristic of the radical phrase part of the left of capital. Through our investigations, the statements of those who claim to be the roots of worker-communism must be traced back to the communist left or influenced by the communist left, which only indicates that such claims are not serious. Rather, they are allegations that only serve to offer illusions to worker-communism.

## **Worker-communism and workers' dilemma**

As noted earlier, in the era of capitalist prosperity, unions were merely an economic formation, as the political struggle was passed onto the party, which, through parliament, would advance the struggle by imposing reforms. With capitalism entering its era of decline, the period of communist revolutions or imperialist wars began. At this juncture, and with the outbreak of World War I, the vast majority of workers' parties joined the bourgeoisie forever, and the workers were ensnared in imperialist massacres. Only a very small minority, including the Bolsheviks, remained loyal to proletarian positions. The evolution of capitalism and the era of imperialism showed that proletarian organizations could only survive as revolutionary minorities in a non-revolutionary situation, and only in a revolutionary situation where this balance was broken and the workers hurried to the Communist Party. That is why internationalist currents and trends, despite having units in different countries, call themselves currents, trends and so on, not parties.

The worker concept of a party and a current was not based on the algebraic sum of atomized workers in a bourgeois party or in the name of the worker that the current followed; rather, its authenticity was derived from the function, practice and programme of a party or current. The concept of worker is not a sociological discussion, but a class discussion. The key question is whether a political current, from the point of view of the interests of whichever social class, looks at social events and which social class interests it defends.

Before continuing the discussion, a brief explanation of the attitude and grounds for the emergence of workerism (operaism) is necessary. Workerism is the attitude that emerged in Italy following the "hot autumn" of 1969, which dominated the political milieu in Italy in the early 1970s, then expanded elsewhere. According to this attitude, the contradiction of labour and capital becomes mechanically more important in the production process, and the factory is considered the most important

base for class struggle. This attitude was also expressed, and its current defenders argue that the left has nothing to do with the interests of the working class. The defeat of world revolution and the subsequent rise of the counter-revolution, the counter-revolutionary nature of the “communist” parties, the formation of guerrilla movements, the rise of Maoist radicalism, the anti-war movement, and so on, while being irrelevant to the working class and simply used to slime the name of communism, were important factors that set the stage for this attitude. The workerism attitude then expanded rapidly from Italy to other countries. Although not as strong as it used to be, it is still found in the political arena. Of course, the main theorists of this intellectual attitude revised their theories in the wake of the subsequent developments of the 1970s, replacing the concept of “social workers” with “industrial workers”. They also argued that capitalist exploitation takes place on a wider social scale, with social groups such as students or any layer that feels the hegemony of capital being considered to be part of the working class.

In the political milieu of Iran, after the developments of 1979, workerism showed itself in what was known as “Line 5”. The same factors that set the stage for the growth of workerism in Italy somehow set the stage for the formation of Line 5 in the Iranian political milieu. Their character was antithetical to the “intellectuals” and the emphasis on workers’ membership. The two most popular currents in Line 5 in Iran were the Mashvarat (Consultation) and the Red Workers’ Organization of Iran.

The mechanistic and sociological understanding of this current of the proletariat and the working class gives the impression that, the more manual the work, the more radical and revolutionary is the worker. This attitude prevents the proletariat from forming itself as a social class and the formation of the world party, so as to prepare itself for its historical task, the communist revolution.

Worker-communism was not influenced by “workerism”; however, it did, or even still does, adopt an upside-down attitude, that is, a social

democratic understanding of the working class and party. Mansoor Hekmat claims that worker-communism has sought to mass-socialize maximalism and communism since the Bolsheviks. The Bolsheviks, only in the context of a world class struggle that was becoming more radical every day which, in its way, led to a wave of world revolution that could have resulted in a mass party. The Bolsheviks, after the defeat of the 1905 revolution, could only survive as a weak faction. But Mansoor Hekmat wonders whether the class struggle was or is very defensive at the national or global level about making communism a mass, social force. He writes:

*“We are among the few communist organisations since the Bolsheviks who want to become mass parties on the basis of our radicalism and maximalism; indeed to turn maximalism and communism, our communist goals and the idea of communist revolution into a mass and social force; our last word on religion into society's discourse. We believe we must turn this undiluted communism into a mass and social force.”*<sup>361</sup>

We continue our research to see how worker-communism, after the Bolsheviks, has sought to become a mass party on the basis of our radicalism and maximalism. According to the ideologies of worker-communism, social democratic parties and parties like them are considered to be labour parties due to the concentration of atomized workers within them. Mansoor Hekmat, the ideologist of worker-communism, says:

*“This is your own party and tomorrow you can go to the centre of Tehran, to the party's headquarters, join the party and unite with other party members in your neighbourhood, factory and city; you can take responsibility from that day on. Comrades, we want to*

---

<sup>361</sup> Party and Society: From a pressure group to a political party

*give the working class the right to choose communism ... Comrades, victory over the bourgeoisie must be done on their land; we will not win any seats in our congress, we will not gain political power in our camp, so we must go to their land, and we are going to their land. We have to prepare ourselves for this role.*"<sup>362</sup>

It may seem at first glance that the ideologists of worker-communism have a "mass party" understanding that was prevalent in the boom of capitalism; but the notion of worker-communism stems from its class affiliation with the left of capital. Understanding worker-communism, on the one hand, is a social democratic understanding of the labour party; on the other hand, as we shall see in the context of gaining political power, it is an adventurous one, which is a hallmark of bourgeois parties. Since Mansoor Hekmat believed that a dictatorship was ruling in Iran and that the workers could not go to the party offices to sign up to worker-communism, they facilitated workers' membership of the Iranian Communist Party. After the collapse of worker-communism, in all worker-communist parties, they adopted the same decree. We read in one account from a worker-communist party about workers' membership the following:

*"According to our policy of organizing, every worker and labour activist who associates himself with the Hekmatist Party and who is active in the labour movement is considered a member of our party, regardless of whether this can be officially announced for security reasons."*<sup>363</sup>

---

<sup>362</sup> Is Communist Victory in Iran Possible?

<sup>363</sup> Working Class and Communist Party or Working Class and Left Coalition Organization - Rahman Hosseinzadeh

The leaders of worker-communism in their interviews provide a better understanding of how worker-communism wants to become a mass movement, based on its radicalism and maximalism. The disproportionate dimension and the lack of a basis coherence in these interviews are not our concern here, but the form of massification from the perspective of worker-communism is. We read:

*“The party and the worker are two categories and two separate phenomena in the mind of the left who are not communist. From the perspective of Hekmat, the party and the worker are one. None would be without this. The party without the worker, no matter how high its communist dose, is not workerist. And the worker, without his own political party, its struggle will remain at the level of the trade union struggle and, at most, at the level of reform, rather than gaining power ... The other aspect of these currents and parties, which are workerist, concerns the parties’ and workers’ struggle to share power with the bourgeoisie. This current, although workerist, wants the worker to vote for his or her party to enter bourgeois parliaments, in coalition with or in opposition to other bourgeois parties in power. In the name of the worker, and even of communism, he or she seeks reforms for the working class and wants part of the surplus value that the worker produces to be returned to the workers and for capitalism to remain in place ... In Iran, the Tudeh Party was a workers’ party of this type. The European left and social democratic parties had and continue to have the same role.”<sup>364</sup>*

More than this, we are talking about demagogues here: while the Tudeh Party of Iran was formed as part of Russian foreign policy in the

---

<sup>364</sup> On the occasion of Mansoor Hekmat Week - interview by Ismail Weiss with Mozafar Mohammadi

interests of Russian imperialism and supported by Britain during World War II, it assumes the concept of a workers' party! European social democratic parties take on workers' identity because of the number of atomized workers. According to the left of capital, their comrades in powerful positions in European countries are in labour governments. The key question for any truth seeker concerns worker parties of course: from the point of view of worker-communism, what reforms are desired for and by the working class? Apparently, the radical phrase wing of the left of capitalism has abandoned its radical phraseology and speaks in the conventional language of the bourgeoisie, and what disgusting talk!

To better understand the positions of the left of the capital, look at the words of its vice leader, Koorosh Modaressi, who, after the death of Mansoor Hekmat, became the leader of worker-communism and later resorted to seclusion during the crisis of worker-communism. The leader's delusions and meanderings are not because of his lack of knowledge and history concerning communist positions but his belonging to the political apparatus of the left of capital, as the vice leader's demagoguery reveals below:

*“The left cannot understand, through this method, why, in its time, anarchists, syndicate activity and syndicates who were not communist at all, or perhaps even Bakunin, opposed the communist and Marxist formulas and classified themselves as worker parties, appearing alongside communists in the First International and utopian socialists, real socialists, German socialists etc. in the ranks of the bourgeois and reactionary parties ... Non-communist currents within the working class, far more than left parties, are workers' party. The workers' parties in Iran cannot, given their limitations on the horizon and more importantly their public character, nominate themselves as a party. But if naming is not our point of reference, and if the interactions they form in society and in the working class are the reason for their definition, then they*

*are no more or no less party-oriented more than any other left party in society.”*<sup>365</sup>

It is a fact that the anarchists and the syndicalists were considered as the labour movement in the First International, and that Bakunin, as long as he was not pursuing anti-worker campaigns, was a member of the International before being later fired. But to say he himself retired as a demagogic leader simply conceals the truth. The anarchists, syndicalists and various socialists had not yet been integrated into state or capital institutions during the First International. The retired leader at the height of his rant claims that the workers’ parties in Iran (not the party, but the parties) cannot identify themselves as party due to their horizons and more importantly because of their public nature. Unfortunately, he fails to name which parties were the workers’ parties in Iran, but his comrade refers to one of these workers’ parties, the Tudeh Party of Iran. He writes:

*“The working class of Iran has been deprived of its real worker parties for more than half a century. The only workers’ party a few decades ago when was worker, not communist, and the communists did not become workerist after that.”*<sup>366</sup>

Finally, one of the worker-communist activists claims that no communist party in Iran has been or is a workers’ party, that is to say, the parties that were or are working under the name of worker-communism were or are not worker and, most importantly, the party institutions and organs did not specify the priority of becoming worker-oriented for the party cadres. The platform of becoming worker-oriented, according him, was never practical and institutionalized. This is how it reads to us:

---

<sup>365</sup> Koorosh Modaressi - The Working Class and the Communist Party

<sup>366</sup> On the “Communist Committee Movement” by Muzaffar Mohammadi



*“My claim is simple: if it was the Labour Party, neither the workers’ situation nor our situation would be the way it is now. The dilemma in the relationship between the communist party and the working class in the arena of organizing, neither then nor now, has been practically settled to a conclusive degree. Anyone who thinks we have pursued Mansoor Hekmat’s way without becoming worker-oriented must think twice and address the contradictions I have mentioned. It is not possible. Hekmat said it all: you have digested what has been said and this is your situation, that is how it is now!”<sup>367</sup>*

Finally, it is admitted that the worker-communist party emerged not as a labour party but as an anti-regime party abroad. The party was unable to handle the routine struggles of the working class. Most importantly, it is admitted that Mansoor Hekmat failed to transform his party in his time into a party of worker-communists. We will see in the discussion on the collapse of worker-communism how “the Marx of our epoch” confessed to this failure. One of Mansoor Hekmat’s disciples admits the following:

*“Some people think that this development took place with the formation of the Iranian worker-communist party. No, the magnificent image of the Iranian worker-communist party at the Berlin Conference symbolizes the magnificent activity of a relatively large public party abroad, which appears glorious in its protest of the Islamic Republic of Iran abroad. But this glory is absolutely not equal to the power, expertise and skill of the current in organizing the routine struggle of the working class within Iran and in the main focus of power in society ... Mansoor Hekmat never said that our party had become a workers’ party. He said we had to be a workers’ party, criticized us night and day, and encouraged*

---

<sup>367</sup> Mohammad Jafari - No communist party in Iran is or became worker!

*and persuaded us to become a workers' party. So, today, it is not difficult to admit that, despite all the additions to Marxism and despite all the achievements in the public sphere of the communist movement in Iran, neither he [Mansoor Hekmat] nor Koorosh Modaressi succeeded in transforming the party of their time into a worker-communist party.*"<sup>368</sup>

---

<sup>368</sup> On the "Communist Committee Movement" by Muzaffar Mohammadi

## Worker-communism and the acquisition of political power

Throughout human history, the exploiting class has always come to power to reorganize and direct class exploitation. At the same time, the exploitative classes gradually grew within society, becoming economically powerful and, in the process, the political superstructure of society changed. The exploited never had and could not have access to an alternative to the system that exploited them. Only one social class has existed in the history of mankind which, given its material conditions, has been able to present an alternative to the system that exploits it, namely, the proletariat and the communist system. For the first time in human history, the exploited class has been able to gain political power without becoming the dominant economic class, in turn leading to the collapse of the state.

Before continuing the discussion, it is necessary to explain that, within the labour movement, the idea that a small minority of the working class will gain power instead of the whole working class is referred to as a deviation known as Blanquism. As the revolution is the historical function of the working class, it is the class that is trying to gain political power, but not by some coup d'état - this is an insult to the working class. If a small section of the working class attempted this, it would lead to individual dictatorship, not total dictatorship. Engels explains this:

*“From Blanqui's assumption, that any revolution may be made by the outbreak of a small revolutionary minority, follows of itself the necessity of a dictatorship after the success of the venture. This is, of course, a dictatorship, not of the entire revolutionary class, the proletariat, but of the small minority that has made the revolution, and who are themselves previously organized under the dictatorship of one or several individuals.”*<sup>369</sup>

---

<sup>369</sup> The Program of the Blanquist Fugitives from the Paris Commune

From the teachings of Engels, it can be concluded that the victory of the communist revolution cannot lead to a party dictatorship, even that of a revolutionary party, but to the dictatorship of the whole revolutionary class of the proletariat. The working class has gained political power only twice in human history. We will review each of these two very briefly in order to learn from their experiences, and those experiences to occur in the future. Further, we will also show that Mansoor Hekmat's understanding of how worker-communism could gain political power is completely alien to the tradition of the labour movement and conforms to the bourgeois tradition.

On the 18th of March, 1871, armed Parisian workers, carrying red flags and crying the slogan "Long live the Commune!" stressed the importance of hoisting the Red Flag over Paris, and claimed "the old world writhed in convulsions of rage at the sight of the Red Flag". Communards rose up to destroy wage slavery and to set up a new world. Capitalism, in its cradle of civilization, was under the attack of the proletariat. The bourgeois, who until the day before had relied on their God-given powers, were on the run like miserable creatures in their luxurious coaches. After a bloody battle, the Communards heroically pulled down the capitalist system in Paris and began to set up a new system.

The Commune of Paris occurred in a situation where capitalism was still in its period of development, and had not yet entered the period of its decline. In other words, the Commune of Paris occurred in historic conditions where the capitalism was still able to develop its productive forces in a progressive way and the material conditions were not yet ready for world revolution, the proletariat was still in its infancy.

In other words, although the barbarians' 'civilized' brutal massacre of the Communards in the cradle of bourgeois civilization did not lead to

their suppression, the Paris Commune was not able to transform the international community into a communist society. However, the ideas and lessons of the Paris Commune are not forgettable and act as a beacon for the future.

With the outbreak of World War I and with the entry of capitalism into its period of decadence, the era of the communist revolution began and the working class is the only class which, through its world revolution, challenges the bourgeois world and, the working class cannot liberate itself unless it liberates the whole of humanity from the sinkhole and dirt of capitalism. The Communist Revolution is not only possible but it is also a vital necessity for the survival of the human race.

With the onset of world revolution between 1917 and 1923, the proletariat was able, for the second time, to gain political power. The bourgeoisie has always asserted that the Bolsheviks seized political power through a coup to muddy the October Revolution. That is to say, it was not carried out by the working class, through workers' councils as part of world revolution, but rather as a coup d'état, secretly conspired to gain political power. Lenin was even accused of Blanquism and anarchist understandings by other political tendencies.

In spite of the bourgeois propaganda, the workers gained political power in Russia publicly and collectively. The February 1917 uprising in Russia led to dual power. On the one hand, the working class organized in the workers' and soldiers' councils wanted to exercise their class power; on the other, the bourgeois class, represented by the interim government and backed by the Mensheviks and the social revolutionaries, were still at work.

Both the Bolsheviks and the working class were ambivalent about the transitional government in the February 1917 developments. The working class had an illusion of Petrograd's labour councils concerning issues such "peace" and "eight hours of daily work". The class struggle led the Bolsheviks and, above all Lenin to conclude that the old Bolshevik programme had become obsolete. Lenin opened up a new horizon for

world revolution with his *April Theses*, emphasizing that workers' councils were the political power of the proletariat. At the same time, Lenin stressed that, as long as we are in the minority on the councils, we should criticize and explain the mistakes of the councils to the masses and underline the necessity of transferring all power to the workers' councils. He wrote:

*"The masses must be made to see that the Soviets of Workers' Deputies are the only possible form of revolutionary government, and that therefore our task is, as long as this government yields to the influence of the bourgeoisie, to present a patient, systematic, and persistent explanation of the errors of their tactics, an explanation especially adapted to the practical needs of the masses. As long as we are in the minority we carry on the work of criticising and exposing errors and at the same time we preach the necessity of transferring the entire state power to the Soviets of Workers' Deputies, so that the people may overcome their mistakes by experience."*<sup>370</sup>

With Lenin's *April Theses* and with the slogan "All power to the Soviets", the Bolsheviks played a central role in orientating the working class, and the working class realized that the Bolsheviks were the only party standing with them. The ambassadors of foreign countries witnessed the influence of the Bolsheviks; in particular, the French ambassador wrote in his notes:

*"Lenin's influence has increased tremendously in the past few days."*<sup>371</sup>

---

<sup>370</sup> *The April Theses* – Lenin

<sup>371</sup> The Revolution of 1917 in Petrograd

Factory committees in Petrograd were heavily influenced by the Bolsheviks. The working class gradually came to the conclusion that the Petrograd Council had become an instrument in the hands of the interim government. In July 1917, the bourgeoisie tried to stage an early uprising in Petrograd, before massacring the proletariat and the Bolsheviks. In response to the Duma's proclamation, the proletariat of Petrograd, after arming itself, came up with the slogan, "All power to the Soviets". The Bolsheviks had already warned the working class of the consequences of early action: when the Bolsheviks confronted an armed demonstration of 500,000 workers, they tried to be at the head of it and say it was a peaceful move, so as not to fall into the trap of the bourgeoisie. The same night, the proletariat realized its early action and, the next day, the working class did not come out at the request of the Bolsheviks. The bourgeoisie did the same in Germany: the early rise of the proletariat in 1919 and 1923 led to the bloody repression of the proletariat and the communists. Particularly, the early uprising of 1919 dealt the greatest blow to world revolution; there was no realization that sheer mental will was an insufficient condition for the victory of the working class. The events of July 1917 exposed the false legend of the coup by the Bolsheviks, echoed by bourgeois ideologues. After the July events, the repression of the working class and the Bolsheviks began, with rumours spread that the Bolsheviks were spies of the Germans. Lenin went into hiding and Trotsky was arrested.

The Russian bourgeoisie resorted to a new trick to suppress the revolution, deliberately surrendering the city of Riga to the Germans to put Petrograd at the forefront of war and under martial law. Consequently, under martial law, it could have been easier to suppress the proletariat.

In September 1917, Kornilov launched a coup to defeat the revolution, which failed. Not only were the French and British military officers on the Russian front unopposed to the coup, but they also hoped that it would restore law and order to the Russian Army. The *London*

*Times* well reflected the positions of the British bourgeoisie, when, on 8 September 1917, it published the following:

*“Must put an end to committees and debates, to shameful councils of unrestrained workers and soldiers. Must put an end to their talk about utopia.”*<sup>372</sup>

The radicalization of the workers and the soldiers indicated that the class consciousness of the workers had greatly increased and this was evident in the large demonstrations and public assemblies. The Bolsheviks’ readiness to take on the necessary tasks and their success in carrying out these tasks were due to the fact that, as a proletarian party, they had real roots and considerable influence in the ranks of progressive workers’ leaders.

As society evolved, a large proportion of workers and soldiers no longer had illusions about the interim government, and this coincided with the increasing influence of the Bolsheviks, especially in the workers’ and soldiers’ councils in Petrograd and Moscow. This paved the way for political power, and the uprising was on the agenda, as Lenin explained:

*“There were no objective conditions for the victory of the uprising at that time. The class vanguard of the revolution was not still with us. We still did not have a majority among the workers and soldiers of the two capitals. But now there is such a majority on both councils ... But now the situation is completely different. The majority of the class, which is the vanguard of the revolution and the vanguard of the people, capable of taking the masses with it, is with us.”*<sup>373</sup>

---

<sup>372</sup> The Revolution of 1917 in Petrograd

<sup>373</sup> *Marxism and resurrection* - Lenin



Contrary to the bourgeois media gossip that the Bolsheviks seized power through a coup, the decision was taken publicly and collectively by the Soviets in which the Bolsheviks had a leading role. Even the Mensheviks accused the Bolsheviks of setting a date for the revolution, destroying the legend of the coup.

Despite its disagreements regarding the uprising and the stubborn opposition to it from Kamenev and Zinoviev, the Central Committee of the Bolsheviks adopted the agenda of the uprising on 10 October, politically rather than militarily, by a majority. Kamenev and Zinoviev published the process for the preparation of the uprising, as well as the reasons for their opposition, in the *Novaya Zhizn* Menshevik magazine. Lenin demanded that they be expelled from the Central Committee for exposing the uprising in this magazine, which was not approved by the Central Committee.

Importantly, the Bolshevik Central Committee never decided and could not decide on the time and day of the uprising, but it was the Military Revolutionary Committee that carried out the final uprising and attack. On 22 October 1917, the workers and soldiers chanted “All power to the Soviets”. On 23 October, the Revolutionary Military Committee captured the Peter and Paul Fortress and, on October 24, the Central Bank, along with a takeover of the telephone network. On October 25, the Provisional Government’s Winter Palace was occupied. The social revolution is the least dangerous means to change the social system. The number of deaths during the October uprising was negligible. The number of deaths increased after the victory of the revolution and during the onslaught of the White Army and the famine caused by the economic siege and, later on, World War II.

The symmetry of the October uprising with the Second Congress of Councils indicated that the entire working class gained power through the councils. The congress represented different political tendencies, and this was quite natural. With the fall of the Winter Palace, the congress

announced the transfer of power to the workers' and soldiers' councils as a result of the revolution.

With a brief review of the two cases of political power gained by the working class in human history, we examine the acquisition of political power from the perspective of worker-communism. Mansoor Hekmat first declared that his party was in favour of political power and wanted to gain political power. So far, no problem: dozens of bourgeois parties in the four corners of this globe are plotting for political power every day, and Mansoor Hekmat's party could have been one of them. But this political charlatan claimed that the only way to seize political power for the working class is to gain power through his party, writing:

*"The first point I want to say that might seem blasphemous is that this party has an eye for political power and wants to take power. This not only does not contradict [the concept of] seizing power by the working class, but this is essentially the only way for the working class to take political power, that is, to take power through its party. Indeed the fact that taking power by the party might not result in taking power by the class depends on the characteristics of the party."*<sup>374</sup>

As we have seen, Lenin insisted that, as long as we were in the minority, we were criticizing and explaining the mistakes of the workers' councils, while at the same time promoting the necessity of transferring all power to the workers' councils. But Mansoor Hekmat claimed that a workers' party, despite being a minority, can gain political power and become a majority. He was acquainted with the political power gained by the bourgeois parties and the formation of a minority state, usually with the relative support of other bourgeois parties, and sought to gain power in

---

<sup>374</sup> *Party and Political Power* - Mansoor Hekmat

this way. He described the mechanism of his party's acquisition of political power thus:

*"A worker party, despite being a minority among the workers, can shape the movement of the majority of workers, rise up, seize power and keep it; after all it is this way that [the party] can become the majority...A worker party which has a minority, a real force among the class; a worker party which has a real and significant force among the class which gives it the possibility of a revolutionary and radical action in society, can attract the rest of the class through this radical and revolutionary action. The mechanism for getting close to political power by the party in relation to the working class is this... Does taking power depend on the degree of our influence among the working class, that is, any time we reach a certain level, if we wish we can take power? My answer is: No... The worker-communist party will be able to take power, if it has a significant part of the working class, a minority, but an influential, powerful and active minority on its side...Otherwise it cannot gain political power... we have to move from margin of politics to the centre of society. We must be one of the few main actors in dividing the share of power and the political situation in the society... Even if we cannot take the whole power, we must be a force in the bourgeois society that is taken into account and seen as "a source of danger.""*<sup>375</sup>

Mansoor Hekmat knew that, if his own party gained political power, this would raise many questions in the political arena, so he would explain in advance whether anyone had any questions about the coming to power of the worker-communist party, referring to the French Revolution

---

<sup>375</sup> *Party and Political Power - Mansoor Hekmat*

or dozens of other revolutions. Let's first see how he explained the process of gaining power:

*"We take power on the shoulders of the people and through the people. Whoever then asks about the process of the coming to power of the worker-communist party, we refer them to the French Revolution or dozens of other revolutions. Revolutionary governments usually came to power through revolution. For example, the Cuban Revolution. That shouldn't be a concern. What you and I have to ask is, what does this government want? What is it doing and who does it represent in that society?"*<sup>376</sup>

First, Mansoor Hekmat wanted to gain political power on the shoulders of the people and through the people, and not through the working class. The people are not equal to the working class. Secondly, the French Revolution of 1789 was a bourgeois revolution; although an important and progressive historical movement, it was not a proletarian revolution. The key question is, why didn't Mansoor Hekmat refer to the Paris Commune? The Paris Commune was also formed in France, incidentally after Mansoor Hekmat's favourite revolution. How did the Communards gain political power? Third, even Mansoor Hekmat could not drag the concept of revolution into the slime when he stated that "revolutionary states usually came to power through revolution". For example, the Cuban Revolution." Which revolution happened in Cuba? Was or is the Cuban government a revolutionary state?

For Mansoor Hekmat, his victory, namely, the possibility of his party gaining political power, was certain. He even set a time when he would gain political power: one to two years after his speech in October 2000. As he said to his apostles:

---

<sup>376</sup> <http://hekmat.public-archive.net/fa/3920fa.html>

*"Comrades! We are in one of the most decisive moments in the history of Iranian society ... For the first time, the worker-communist party is one step away from victory. I think we have to go forward and witness this victory and not think about the past. And I think we should go for this victory. Go for power. Let's go, and we can ... Please, everyone who wants to be a carpenter, to be a builder, to write a poem, to write a book, let this happen in another two years, if we fail. The worker-communist party must now go to the heart of Iranian society as a compact political force. It has to change it. I think it has to do it and we can do it ... we have to set a day when we can secure power. And that day for the worker- communist party is one of those days that could happen in a year, a year and a half, or the next two years."*<sup>377</sup>

Of course, one year before his speech before his disciples, Mansoor Hekmat, in his interview with a journalist, had even been willing to bet on a year and a half for the fall of the Islamic Republic, saying:

*"Let's bet on a year and a half. Who knows? The Islamic Republic may disappear even faster."*<sup>378</sup>

The bourgeoisie and the Western media preferred Khatami to the Khamenei faction, trying to bring him before Western societies; even the Pope met with him. The worker-communist party assessed this as the opposition of Western reactionary forces to the rise of a radical socialist regime and wrote in its own organ:

*"The fact is that the Islamic Republic has fallen down to a hole, and the spectre of the people's revolution and the rise of a radical socialist regime in Iran against Western reactionary forces have*

---

<sup>377</sup> Mansoor Hekmat - Opening speech at the Third Congress of the worker-communist party.

<sup>378</sup> Mansoor Hekmat in an interview with Safa Haeri, February 1999

*frightened everyone from the governments of Italy and France to the Pope and the BBC and CNN and so on.*”<sup>379</sup>

Mansoor Hekmat thought that the people would order the destruction of the Islamic Republic in the year 2000, then he hoped to see it fall in 2001. For the New Year, he sent a congratulatory message to the Iranian people which said:

*“In the past year, the people of Iran have publicly demanded the Islamic Republic's overthrow; the leaders of this reactionary and inhuman regime have realised that their days are numbered. The past year has been a year of awakening and hope for us, and a year of fear for them. A strong people's movement has begun, which aims to end this twenty three year old nightmare. Hoping that this is the regime's last year, that we will overthrow Islamic reaction and capitalism in Iran, and that we will celebrate the establishment of a free, equal and humane society in the next new year.”*<sup>380</sup>

Hekmat believed that the monarchists represented a bourgeois tendency that was pro-Western and that the West had also opened an account for this part of the bourgeoisie. To gain political power, these political forces must be managed, and this requires dialogue with such currents. It was in this context that the Constitutionalist Party of Iran and Reza Pahlavi (the former Crown Prince) were invited to attend to the Third Congress of the worker-communist party, about which Mansoor Hekmat said:

*“Look, even the monarchists have sent a tribune to the worker-communist party to talk; they are now trying to make the*

---

<sup>379</sup> Editorial, *International* No. 28, March 1999

<sup>380</sup> New Year Message to the People of Iran

*differences between us and their opinions less important. They think that the worker-communist party is modern. These will push the Islamists back; we are going to take power with the US.”*<sup>381</sup>

For the political power of Mansoor Hekmat, the monarchists were important because they had a social base within the country and a large cultural superstructure from the pre-revolutionary period. Mansoor Hekmat said:

*“A small but real minority in society is for them. That is, they have a social base within the country and a layer of the Iranian bourgeoisie stands with them. Is active with them and knows them as his own government. They have a vast cultural superstructure from the pre-revolution era with them.”*<sup>382</sup>

If the monarchists had a social base in the country, why were they dumped into the rubbish bin of history some 40 years ago? That the Islamic bourgeoisie has committed so much crime, of such barbarism, that some despair, alas of the Aryamari era, is a sign of the backwardness of human society. Nationalists and ethnic groups can also arouse strong nationalist sentiments and sometimes even bring large numbers of people with them. Hitler was also supported by a large number of people in the wake of the defeat of the German Revolution and the subsequent desperation of society the followed it. It was important for Mansoor Hekmat to gain political power, even for him to stand by the most reactionary reactionaries. We continue our search for how to gain political power from Mansoor Hekmat’s perspective.

Mansoor Hekmat at the Third Congress of the worker- communist party stated that, when he said that he would gain political power with the

---

<sup>381</sup> Mansoor Hekmat - “Positive and Negative Movements”, side seminar at the Third Party Congress

<sup>382</sup> Is it Possible to Win Communism in Iran?, Mansoor Hekmat.

support of three million people, neither the monarchists nor the US had any objections, only the leftists. In his speech to congress, he told his supporters that he was now determined to lower the percentage and gain political power with one million people, in other words, about 1.5% of Iran's population at that time. Mansoor Hekmat stated:

*“When I told a newspaper in Germany two years ago that, with 5% of the population, which is three million people, we are taking power, the monarchists did not say it is impossible, the US did not say it is impossible, it was the left who said no: ‘with three million people you want to seize power?!’ I now want to bring this number down [laughter and applause from the audience]. I think two million, one million is possible to gain power. Why not? It has to be done.”*<sup>383</sup>

Following the formation of the Iranian Communist Party, with its radical propaganda, it was able to gain at least a hearing in society. But, in the process of the continuing disillusionment of the Iranian Communist Party, as well as silence in some circles and the tendency of domestic activists, the willingness from inside of Iran to support the party was virtually meaningless, and communications with the party also reached a new low. This was a fundamental dilemma for the newly established Iranian worker-communist party. Mansoor Hekmat, years later, explained this problem concerning worker-communism:

*“This is the party that was involved in Sanandaj May 1<sup>st</sup> [activities]; had contacts with different worker circles who listened to our radio, who copied and distributed radio programmes, who travelled abroad [to meet up with us]. But, now, we ask ourselves,*

---

<sup>383</sup> Mansoor Hekmat - Lecture on “Political and Economic Struggle for the Working Class”, Third Congress of the worker-communist party



*and others ask us, what happened to the influence we had [among the working class]? It is interesting that we gained that influence during and after the bloody repression of June 1981. We enjoyed a worker's base and fabric; but we don't have it now. What happened to these workers? It's obvious; they lost interest."*<sup>384</sup>

The lack of labour influence in the country is also mentioned in a report to the Second Congress of the Iranian communist party, in which Koorosh Modaressi, Secretary of the Iranian worker- communist party's internal committee during its formation, endorsed Hekmat's statements as follows:

*"The internal committee is composed of a one-and-a-half year plan of action, codified and approved by the political office. This committee created, following a relatively complete recession in organized activities within the country, since the establishment of the party."*<sup>385</sup>

On the one hand, with the complete stagnation of domestic activity in the country and, on the other hand, with the defeat of state capitalism in the Eastern bloc, the model of state capitalism, even with a socialist description, was less attractive in terms of recruiting forces around the party in Iran. The dilemma of recruiting for the purpose of political power has become increasingly important. Given the ideological superstructure of the Islamic bourgeoisie and the oppression that the Islamic Republic imposes in relation to even the most insignificant issues of the people, modernism, secularism, civil rights and so on, recruitment has become easier. Hekmat insisted there is no disdain in recruiting power based on

---

<sup>384</sup> *Party and Political Power* - Mansoor Hekmat

<sup>385</sup> For further information, see pages 172 and 173 of the book *In This Deadlock* by Reza Moghaddam, one of the former leaders of the worker-communist party

secularism, modernism etc. Love of power is not enough, however. As Hekmat said:

*"Never mind if the official, legal press in Iran does not look upon us favourably. 60% of the people in that country are anti-religious and anti-god, who have reached the end of their tethers under the Islamic regime, and all of who are our potential supporters. Whoever has had enough of Islam, has us; whoever has had enough of women's inequality, has us; whoever has had enough of this regime's and its opposition's 'orientalism', has us. And it is our right that they should have us. By regarding us as their representatives, these classes have not distorted our working-class and communist identity. There are people who say 'we are with you because you say what the youth feel and what women feel; because you speak of a more modern culture; or because you are standing up to religion'. There is nothing wrong with that... To have these people around us is not demeaning."*<sup>386</sup>

Of course, Hekmat elsewhere explained what he meant by the process of overthrowing the Islamic Republic and gaining political power. This overthrow could be the result of a US military strike such as the overthrow of the Taliban in Afghanistan, Saddam in Iraq and other manifestations of chaos. Hekmat wrote:

*"The overthrow can be the result of a military process [US military strike], crisis and chaos, civil disobedience and electoral interactions, and so on. It can be the victory of forces other than or in addition to revolutionary forces."*<sup>387</sup>

---

<sup>386</sup> Power Party and Society: From a pressure group to a political party

<sup>387</sup> Mansoor Hekmat, "Overthrow, Revolution and Socialism", letter to Hamid Taghvaaee and Fateh Sheikh, 17 July 1999

Mansoor Hekmat in his speech told his followers that, in order to become a major player on the social scene, you have to deal with large numbers. Emphasizing that media propaganda, increased newspaper circulation levels or other necessary tools is important to engineer public opinion, he said:

*“You have to go to the context of society, where one deals with large numbers. Its publications sell in the several hundred thousands and its demonstrations attract several tens of thousands. In order to be the source of change, one has to go into the middle of society in real politics. This is where the main actors are on the social scene and the job is won by the player who can say that, if it is up to me, I will implement my programme. Staying on the sidelines was an essential feature of the radical left in my opinion. Just look at any country.”*<sup>388</sup>

Apparently, in that crowd, everyone was melting under the bright image of the leader, like the image of Christ; they even regarded his words as the words of Christ. Did it not come to the mind of any of the apostles of Mansoor Hekmat that the population of Iran in 1980 was about 37 million, less than half it is now. On 12 June 1980, about 150,000 people participated in the Mujahidin's meeting, and the circulation of the Mujahidin's magazine in the spring of 1980 was about 600,000 copies per day - yes, per day! None of the official or government publications enjoyed such a circulation, and the Mujahidin demanded their participation in political power from the outset. Why did the Mujahidin fail to become a major player on the social scene and ultimately became a religious sect in line with US foreign policy and Arab governments?

---

<sup>388</sup> Speech at the opening session of the Second Congress of the Iranian worker-communist party

Mansoor Hekmat was trying to attract international solidarity and public opinion to the political power he wanted to gain in the future. He did not believe in workers' and socialist movements and stated that they were not in a position to even earn their wages. But, for him, they could rely on Iranian people abroad and occupy the Iranian space outside Iran:

*“The second point, in my view, should be the fact that we have to define Iranian society from now on in two areas. We have to assume that the Iranian people live in two different geographical areas. Some inside Iran and some outside. And we have to win both domains ... As a result, the movement that wants to win in Iran must now be present in the Iranian atmosphere outside Iran. The next thing is international solidarity and public opinion. Working with labour movements, working with socialist movements and working with public opinion. They want force. And so, I relied on that first force. Workers' and socialist movements do not have much of a voice. They are good at releasing a prisoner and so on, but they are not in a position to even earn their living. The reality is, in the Western world, the labour movement is in a mess. And I think we're talking about the next one or two years. The notion that the Western labour movement will come in and defend such a state is not very logical.”<sup>389</sup>*

Mansoor Hekmat believed that, once the political power is in place, the new government should promote flexible diplomacy and should not pursue a policy of hostility to the West and the countries of the region.

*“Another point is that, in my opinion, people see themselves in the government ... Such a government should have an extremely flexible and wise diplomacy. In my opinion, the intention of war*

---

<sup>389</sup> Is it Possible to Win Communism in Iran?, Mansoor Hekmat.

*and the issuance of such things should never be left to any place. Must give assurance that we do not fight with anyone. Are you fascist? Bravo, good for you! We want to do another thing here. I do not think that we should invite any controversy. There should never be hostility towards the West and the countries of the region. The solution is that you have a flexible diplomacy... As a result, the key is that the victorious communism, it must be idolatry Wand will coexist with the world of his time. At least 10 years.*”<sup>390</sup>

In their dream world, activists of worker-communism had taken up desired posts and titles in the state that was supposed to be soon realized. One wanted to be president, another minister, and yet other the head of revolutionary radio and television. Maryam Namazi, a member of the politburo of the Communist Party, in a 2003 interview, responded to the questions of the interviewer Mustafa Saber, who was also a member of the politburo, as below:

*“Mustafa Saber asks: ‘Where do you see yourself in the next five years? What plans and schemes do you have for the future? What do you think your energy and effort should be focused on?’*

*Maryam Namazi replies: ‘For the next five years I see myself as the representative of the socialist republic in international assemblies or maybe the minister of a part of the government.’”*<sup>391</sup>

Years later, however, Ms Namazi not only failed to become a representative of the socialist republic in international assemblies and a minister, she also resigned from the worker-communist party. Koorosh

---

<sup>390</sup> As above.

<sup>391</sup> *Communist Youth* No. 19, February 2003

Modaressi also failed to become president as well as overall leadership, and chose the corner of the solitude instead.

## Worker-communism and the ideology of the personalities

One of the fundamental differences between proletarian class consciousness and ideology (any ideology) is that proletarian class consciousness is the product of a collective process, but ideology is the product of individual effort. Ideology emphasizes individualism, whereas, in the revolutionary organization, collective work is emphasized. Ideology is highly appropriate and, in the manifestation of the bourgeois right and left parties, personalities are important, not the result of collective work. In ideology, the character of the elite plays a pivotal role; in class consciousness, the working class raise their consciousness in the process of collective struggle. In ideology, charismatic personality has a special place, while personality is alien to Marxism; indeed, prominent Marxists such as Lenin, Luxemburg and Bordiga strongly opposed the personality cult. As Marx himself wrote in a letter to Wilhelm Blos:

*“I ‘bear no ill-will’ (as Heine says) and nor for that matter does Engels. Neither of us cares a straw for popularity. Let me cite one proof of this: such was my aversion to the personality cult that at the time of the International, when plagued by numerous moves - originating from various countries - to accord me public honour, I never allowed one of these to enter the domain of publicity, nor did I ever reply to them, save with an occasional snub. When Engels and I first joined the secret communist society, we did so only on condition that anything conducive to a superstitious belief in authority be eliminated from the Rules. (Lassalle subsequently operated in the reverse direction.)”<sup>392</sup>*

Unlike Marxism, on the left of capital, especially Stalinism and Maoism, the personality cult is particularly important. Again, unlike

---

<sup>392</sup> [https://marxists.catbull.com/archive/marx/works/1877/letters/77\\_11\\_10.htm](https://marxists.catbull.com/archive/marx/works/1877/letters/77_11_10.htm)

Marxism, characters have a special place in worker-communism and, according to Mansoor Hekmat, worker-communism is the party of personalities. The personal identity of the characters is supposed to be the beloved character of the movement, not the movement's goals and objectives. Hekmat wrote:

*"In this sense, Marx's communism, worker-communism, is always a "party of personalities". Dissolving the individual identity of communists in a faceless administrative and military organisation, to the point of converting their names to initials, stripping communists of identity and turning publicity, agitation, slogan and calls into products of secretariats and central administrative bodies of clandestine organisations are not products of our movement. They do not represent our movement."*<sup>393</sup>

It is an undeniable fact that the ruling ideas in society are those of the ruling class, and this rule becomes invalid only in revolutionary conditions. In class society, propaganda plays a central role in engineering public opinion. The better pre-election campaigns are run, the chances of success increase. It is in this context that propaganda becomes as important to worker-communism as it does for other bourgeois parties. Propaganda and action become the main condition of the opposition's mainstream. To be the main opposition is the goal, not the proletarian movement, through organized intervention in the class struggle and the defence of communist goals and programmes. A revolutionary organization cannot gain its influence through the respect for and popularity of individuals, big names or celebrities. This is contrary to proletarian aims. The revolutionary organization gains its influence only

---

<sup>393</sup> Power Party and Society: From a pressure group to a political party – Mansoor Hekmat



through its programme, positions and practical involvement in the class struggle. Hekmat encouraged his disciples to prepare for political power:

*"In regards to becoming the active and the most visible part of the opposition, there are many factors to mention: Demonstrations, journals, personalities, activities, meetings, gatherings, strikes, etc... These are the conditions for the party to become a main trend among the opposition. If the party becomes the main opposition force abroad, assigns 60-70 people to work in Iran and the rest [of the party] turn abroad upside down, people will hear about the party, and then we'll be the active part of the opposition... We need to have posters with the pictures of our candidates for revolutionary councils, town halls, for the leadership of trade unions, etc. This is the time that comrades should prepare their best photos which we can publish, pictures that will be published in papers inside the country. Is it unwise from security point of view? But [we have to take into consideration that] there are new conditions... Our leadership must be accessible to the public. They [the bourgeoisie] post their photos on walls with their "long live... and down with..." slogans; in return, we must post our photos and our "long live... down with..." slogans in many more numbers... These are real people, not political organisations who behind secret names issue communiqués. Their names are real; you know the person behind the name; you know their behaviour and character. After all, real people must appear in front of the scene."*<sup>394</sup>

In the sociology and social psychology of class societies, as much as a phenomenon, the bigger and larger its splendour, the greater its grandeur. A skyscraper is magnificent because of the number of floors it

---

<sup>394</sup> *Party and Political Power* – Mansoor Hekmat

has; a general is judged by the number of stars on his or her shoulders. For a force that wants political power, the greater its magnificence, the more chance it has of gaining power. It is not the case that a social class reaches a degree of class consciousness in the course of the class struggle, in order to present its alternative to class society and to exercise political power as a social class. The question is, in the class society, will this grandeur and greatness be created by resorting to lies, forgery, propaganda etc. in order to increase the chances of gaining political power? Worker-communism belongs to this tradition, and Mansoor Hekmat taught his apostles in congress how personalities resort to lying and falsification, in their pursuit of glory for worker-communism. Hekmat said:

*“If we are a party that wants to go to the centre, we must look at ourselves as a people, which is critical in the world of politics. Not only when my comrade becomes a leader will I say, wow, but what is this?! I’m better than this! But, if the standard is not high enough, I can tell others, see how high it is? This is my comrade. But what is this?! We are nurturing the future leader of the protest movement in this party among those who sit here and are in this party. The party that is rapidly changing the landscape of political activity is intensifying its cooperative nature and filling each other’s vacancies. The money you collect for this party, well, put two zeros in front of the amount, because it’s two zeros that will allow you to get there. Not one zero, but two zeros. One guy came to give me \$10; you have to say the guy gave me \$1,000. I have recruited three members; you should say, I have recruited 300 members. The dignity of everyone goes up in other people’s mind. Their expectations are extremely high, comrades. Seventy people came to the speech of a comrade, it must be claimed that 7,000 people came to the speech. I’m really saying, if you are going to the centre ... even though the other side is falling to you on this scale and you are in such a fight, either wear your armour or don’t join*

*this war.... This movement, in its own right, may have a liberated region or it may have fallen into power, it may be at war, it may be at peace. It may be a coalition in the cabinet. The expectation that comes from our comrades is that I'm a blatant politician in this country. Each of us must think that he or she is a high-profile political figure in society ... he or she must really be such a figure.*"<sup>395</sup>

The growth of the working class is not linear, and this growth is not only different in different parts of the globe, but even within a particular country. Most importantly, the workers and the revolution-naries do not have the same abilities and consequently appear in different forms or at different levels in the struggle. A revolutionary organization is not equal to the algebraic sum of its members but is the product of collective action. In the intellectual system of worker-communism and Mansoor Hekmat, it is not the maturity of the class consciousness of a social class, which is capable of governing society, that has reached the surface, but the "political elites" that are competent to govern society and social institutions. The other side of Mansoor Hekmat's demagoguery is that it is as if the officials of the state or institutions are elected on the basis of genuine competence. Only one case needs to be mentioned here: Trump, a real estate broker who became the president of the world's largest economy and war machine, even given the criteria of bourgeois society and the fact that he had no political background. With humiliation of the working class, Mansoor Hekmat offered posts in ministries, in municipalities and on big projects to the political elites in his own circle, who can now become the personalities in any future scenarios of political power. As Hekmat said:

---

<sup>395</sup> Is it Possible to Win Communism in Iran?, Mansoor Hekmat.

*“Any of you, if you were so minded, in any regime ... could be a minister in that country. How many people do you know here who could have been a mayor if he had gone to that country and said ‘I’m not political’? How many of you could be responsible for a hundred large projects? In my opinion, many. We have taken over from the political elites of society.”*<sup>396</sup>

As mentioned, one of the characteristics of worker-communism is to associate with personalities. There is a need for publicity, especially for colourful advertising of these characters. Mansoor Hekmat claimed that, in Iranian society, labour leaders are anonymous, while, in Latin America, they are well known at the municipal and the parliamentary level. But he stated his main purpose behind this anonymity saying that, in Latin America, the left make approaches to the labour unions, their leaders talk to each other and agree that voting for the left will help them to get into power. Atomized workers in the unions and the left are a tool for gaining power. All of this demagoguery and political charlatanism are about working with famous, yet anonymous personalities in order for worker-communism to gain power. Hekmat preached:

*“The other weakness is the relatively underdeveloped labour movement ... If you go to Latin America, you see that the labour leaders are well-known leaders at the city level and lawyers in the parliament. The leaders of such trade unions are prominent people in society ... Latin America has always been this way: the left gets closer to the trade unions, and their leaders talk to each other and encourage their members to vote for the left and help them to get into power. In Iran, workers are single and atomized and therefore unable to organize the structures of trade and the defensive struggle. As a result, a large hole is left behind by the communists.*

---

<sup>396</sup> Is it Possible to Win Communism in Iran?, Mansoor Hekmat.

*Going forward to make a basic move, you see a class moving in its name, or at least by its name; it does not know what strength it has on the stage.*”<sup>397</sup>

Ms Leila Danesh, former editor-in-chief of *International*, the organ of the worker-communist party, in relation to the party of Mansoor Hekmat, the party that was once its editor-in-chief, says the following about personalities and personality cults:

*“Encouraging the Mujahideen leadership and more recently the worship of party, guiding the organization as prophetic, with horns and shoulders directed at every dissenting voice ... A party of characters, who race to print their photos, crushing each other.”*

A former member of the central committee of the worker-communist party, with regard to the personality cult in worker-communism, and the spirit of leadership, explains how these have affected the practice of worker-communism:

*“Readers of these texts cannot yet fully comprehend the formation of such relationships. They have not seen how, in the three-day plenum (Vast Plenum of November 1998 with the participation of central committee members and 45 cadres), about 70 people were invited, who drank coffee and smoked from 8 a.m. to 11 a.m. and 12 p.m., awaiting the party leadership’s ‘formalization’ in the meeting place, after hours of delay, because of the traffic jams. The traffic jams also explained the problem. Not once, but all of the three days.*”<sup>398</sup>

---

<sup>397</sup>Is it Possible to Win Communism in Iran?, Mansoor Hekmat.

<sup>398</sup> Principles of the relationship with governments - approved by the Communist Party, June 1999

Another former member of the central committee of the worker-communist Party and a Hekmatist, who, for the moment, has chosen a corner to be alone in their retirement, while expressing his platonic love for his fuhrer, describes the new leader of the worker- communist party as follows. Of course, his description of this new leader can also be extended to the leader of worker-communism, as he says that he is also ashamed that such a leader was once his leader. He writes:

*“These word are obviously unfounded. These word says for this reason that the members of the worker-communist party of Iran did not find any suspicion and thought. Says for the humans that they are brainwashed and unable to think...I am ashamed that such a person was at one time the leader of the party I was a member of. So far, I do not have any Marxist contender to comment so careless on the issues.”*<sup>399</sup>

---

<sup>399</sup> The Populism of Hamid Taqvaei and the Overthrowing Charter of the worker-communist

## **Worker-communism and relations with foreign governments**

Unlike previous class systems, capitalism is a global system, and consequently the struggle of the working class demands a global response. The struggle of the working class and the spread of the struggle necessitate a fundamental intervention: class solidarity. Class solidarity, both nationally and internationally, is the cornerstone of proletarian internationalism. In its struggle, the working class can only rely on the support and solidarity of their class sisters and brothers. In other words, the working class and its political organizations can only communicate with other sections of the working class or seek help and solidarity - indeed, the history of the working-class struggle over the last 200 years has been full of such contact, support and solidarity.

Contrary to proletarian solidarity, in the history of the labour and communist movement, there are no theories, and no opinions about the relationship between a workers' organization and a communist political organization with states. In none of the programmes and statutes of the communist organizations can the term "relationship with the states" be found, but the emphasis has been placed on proletarian internationalism.

Relations with governments are not just applicable to pro-Russian or Chinese currents; under the name of "communist diplomacy", the radical phrase part of the left of capital are associated with governments, and they try to justify their action by referring to the passage of Lenin's train from Germany. Worker-communism is also one of these trends. Before examining the relationship between worker-communism and the states, a brief examination of the issue of how Lenin's train crossed Germany is necessary. The British and French governments, allied with Russia in the war, prevented the revolutionaries from returning to Russia for fear of the Russian Revolution. Martov (not a Bolshevik but a Menshevik) proposed a plan, in exchange for migrants passing through

Germany, where the interim Russian government would release German and Austrian prisoners held in Russia. A number of telegrams was sent to Russia as a result. Since the interim government did not respond to the telegrams, Fritz Platten, a Swiss internationalist, concluded the agreement with the German ambassador to Switzerland, who was in full agreement with other internationalists, and the internationalists from different countries signed the travel protocol.<sup>400</sup>

Its main points are:

1. All emigrants, regardless of their opinions on the war, shall be allowed passage.
2. The railway coach in which the emigrants will travel shall have the privileges of extraterritoriality; no one shall have the right to enter the coach without Platten's permission; there shall be no control either of passports or luggage.
3. The travellers agree to agitate in Russia that the emigrants who have been granted passage be exchanged for a corresponding number of Austro-German internees.

Thus, 32 immigrants with different party affiliations, including Lenin, were able to return to Russia. The day after arriving in Russia, Lenin submitted a full report, entitled *How We Arrived*, to the Executive Committee of the Petrograd Council, which was later published in the *Pravda* and *Izvestia* newspapers. With these explanations, we refer to the resolution of the worker-communist party, known as the “Principles of Relationships with States”, adopted by Mansoor Hekmat in 1999. The declaration states that:

*“Contact and establishment of relations between the worker-communist party and governments, whether in the region or elsewhere: if the rules adopted by the central committee are strictly*

---

<sup>400</sup> <https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1917/apr/04b.htm>



*adhered to, it is in principle permissible ... At this point relationships with the following governments are not allowed:*

- *Islamic governments*
- *Iraqi government*<sup>401</sup>

According to this resolution, except for Islamic governments and Iraq, the worker-communist party can have relations with other states. Of course, the Iraqi government was listed because of the formation of the Iraqi worker-communist party. The key question is, why does worker-communism want to have a relationship with governments? One of the leaders of worker-communism says:

*“The relationship with Iraq, at a very limited level, was going on with Komala before the Iranian Communist Party was formed. The scope of this relationship after the formation of the Iranian Communist Party went far beyond what we even imagined in that party. Our central organs including the leadership of the Communist Party and its Kurdistan organization, leisure facilities, radio broadcasting facilities, publications [etc.] ... all in Iraq, were financed by the use of facilities we got from Iraq.”*<sup>402</sup>

The ideologues of worker-communism have always falsely claimed that getting money and possessions was unconditional. Through demagoguery, they claim that the Communist Party did not become an appendage of imperialist tensions. Following the First Gulf War ceasefire, protests erupted throughout Iraq, to which the criminal Saddam responded with a bloodbath and the displacement of millions of people. Not even the only communist party in the world (the Iranian Communist Party) could

---

<sup>401</sup> Principles of relationship with governments - From the communist party's approvals of June 1999

<sup>402</sup> Iran Tribune

make a simple statement about the events. Mansoor Hekmat responded thus:

*“The reason why the statement was not issued, indeed, the reason for the lack of official reaction from the political bureau to this day, is the fact that this event was a practical burden on the Kurdish organization of the Communist Party.”*<sup>403</sup>

What was the practical burden on the Kurdish organization of the Communist Party? The fact is that, the main force of the party, under the guise of Komala, has become part of the imperialist tensions. Many times, the Iraqi state punished Komala by bombing its headquarters and, each time, some of Komala’s partisans died. This meant that, as Komala remained within the sights of Iraqi foreign policy, it could not make the slightest mistake. The most prominent and elite partisans of Komala in the Shawan battalion died in the Iraqi chemical bombing raids. Mansoor Hekmat, in connection with the bombing of Komala’s camps by Iraq, and how 23 of the most militant and elite partisans of Komala were victimized by such a policy, says:

*“The camps were gradually transferred to the depths of Iraqi Kurdistan and the Iraqi military control areas. Military transfers were really only allowed with Iraqi permission and the freedom of the organization was restricted to sending troops to Iran ... Maintaining the balance and the policy of non-interference in the ‘internal affairs of Iraq’ became much more difficult. As an example, only to intimidate Komala and separate it from the Iraqi Kurdish opposition, the Iraqi regime bombed our camps on several occasions. In only one case of chemical bombardment of the*

---

<sup>403</sup> The Consequences of the Middle East War - The Events in Iraqi Kurdistan - Interview with Communist No. 61

*central camp of Komala, 23 of our most prominent and oldest activists lost their lives.*”<sup>404</sup>

We found out, after getting money and facilities from Saddam Hussein, how much came without conditions for the Iranian Communist Party. Wasn't the death of 23 most prominent activists, through chemical bombing, at one time unconditional? Iraq seems to have given way to other capitalist states. Another leader of worker-communism (Mansoor Hekmat's wife), on the topic of receiving money from different capitalist states which contribute to suppression and killing around the world, explains as below:

*“As far as receiving money from various capitalist states that are in one way or another involved in suppression and massacre in the world is concerned, all the major opposition parties and organizations and various social, cultural and art institutions created by the left opposition abroad have received financial support from a state. There are many institutions in different European countries which are in some way related to opposition organizations, and these have been formed with financial support from various states. States that are members of NATO. Moreover, until the fall of Saddam Hussein, main opposition organizations got money from Saddam Hussein's state, and apart from Komala, no one else has publicly announced these financial supports to the people.”*<sup>405</sup>

Mansoor Hekmat responded to rumours that the Iranian worker-communist party received money from Israel during a side-line seminar during its Third Congress, saying:

---

<sup>404</sup> Mansoor Hekmat - “diplomacy” or political choice?

<sup>405</sup> Azar Majedi (widow of Mansoor Hekmat) – International tribunal to handle the crimes of Islamic can be support or condemnation?

*“Even to my mind, the rumour that they are getting money from Israel is in our favour. Let it be said! Israel is not going to help a four-person circle. Certainly, we have seen the benefit in this. Perhaps it is estimated that the worker- communist party is a force that can be invested in it. Let them say that. It is clear that we are cursing them because of the intentions and goals they pursue. But this naive lot don’t realize that such an image has gone into people’s homes and, as a result, people are saying that they can capture and maintain [power], and may even reach a compromise with Israel and the US, so that they can keep themselves in power.”<sup>406</sup>*

---

<sup>406</sup> Mansoor Hekmat - “Positive and Negative Movements”, side seminar at the Third Party Congress

## The ideology of Marxism-Hekmatism

We have examined, in the Section Two, that the class consciousness of the proletariat is not an ideology, as opposed to the class consciousness of the proletariat which evolves into a collective process, where ideology is acquired individually and is individual. In the ideological view, it is not the historical course of events but the ideological character that plays a special role. We have again examined how Stalinism, following the defeat of the tide of world revolution, in its pursuit of emptying Lenin's revolutionary positions, produced a kind of ideology, a religion of Lenin's revolutionary theories, called "Marxism-Leninism". Stalinism with "Marx-ism-Leninism" went to war with the revolutionary ideas of Lenin. It is important to note that, in Lenin's lifetime, neither Marxism-Leninism, nor even Leninism was used, only the term Bolshevism was used, and it was Bolshevism that was prevalent. It was only after the death of Lenin and the rise of Stalinism that Marxism-Leninism was promoted and transformed it into the official ideology of the former Soviet Union, similar to an official religion in some countries.

Certain conditions, such as World War II, or liberation movements and the like, which created a chance for worker-communism, prior to worker-communism coming to power, would provide a better basis for presenting a new kind of ideology such as Hoxhaism, although not as important as in the case of Albania.<sup>407</sup> However, supporters of worker-communism made great efforts for their leader Mansoor Hekmat to be taken seriously, not at the level of Sadr Gonzalo<sup>408</sup> or Sadr Avakian<sup>409</sup>, but at the level of Marx; even better, they want him to be seen as the Marx of his era. This was not about the additions of Hekmat to Marxism-Leninism,

---

<sup>407</sup> <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hoxhaism>

<sup>408</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Abimael\\_Guzm%C3%A1n](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Abimael_Guzm%C3%A1n)

<sup>409</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bob\\_Avakian](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bob_Avakian)

but an emphasis on Marxism, in order to lay the groundwork for complementing the ideology of “Marxism-Hekmatism”. Like religious followers, Hekmat’s disciples did all they could to praise their leader. This show was completed by the installation of a statue of Mansoor Hekmat near the tomb of Marx in order to accommodate Marxism-Hekmatism. It is said that, if a lie is repeated more and more, eventually it will be considered to be a certainty. Let us take a look at Mansoor Hekmat’s disciples’ description of their leader and how they elevated the sublime positions of Hekmatism, as well as their eulogy for Marxism-Hekmatism. That the leadership of an intellectual tendency is capable of presenting such ideas and then disseminating them only indicates that the body of this intellectual tendency is ready to accept such ideas.

It is sometimes argued that Mansoor Hekmat did not believe in the personality creed; rather, it was his followers who, after his death, attributed such a status to him or promoted “Marxism-Hekmatism” as his teachings. All of this is groundless; in the discussion of characters, we saw that he played a central role in the personality cults of worker-communism. Mansoor Hekmat also played an important role in promoting “Hekmatism”. In his speech at the meeting of the politburo of the Iranian worker-communist party, he repeatedly reiterated the concept of “Hekmatism” for his disciples. He even blamed them for having failed to learn his teachings over the years, to rise to the level of Hekmatism and to be in line with Hekmatism. Apparently, absolute truth can only be visualized in the luminous existence of Mansoor Hekmat, and the prophet, despite his great efforts, never delivered salvation to his disciples in the end. Apparently, worker-communists are more loyal to religions than to bourgeois materialism. At the meeting of the politburo, he said:

*“As I will argue in the leadership debate, this has nothing to do with following the line of Mansoor Hekmat and Hekmatism ...*

*Worker-communism and Hekmatism are not the governing thread in this assembly.*<sup>410</sup>

As we have seen, Mansoor Hekmat far from disagreed with the proposition of “Hekmatism”; rather, he repeated it over and over to his disciples to make it clear to them that he was Marx of their time. Compare superstition and the personalization of Mansoor Hekmat with the conditions that Marx and Engels faced by having to join to a secret communist society. For them, anything that would lead to superstition, authority and personality cults should be removed from the statute. One of Mansoor Hekmat’s disciples, who believes that Hekmatism is the key to solving problems and advancing worker-communism, gave the following eulogy (it is important to note that this text was written before the death of Mansoor Hekmat, who himself was one of the target audience):

*“Mansoor Hekmat is not just the result of a given history or the product of certain struggles over a period of 20 years. It is not a collection of articles. Moreover, it is a line, a method and an attitude towards contemporary capitalist struggles. It is the strategy of the victory of socialism in the present world. It is Marxism in the post-Lenin era. It is today’s reading of Marxism. It is the ‘ism’ of the current era. It is Hekmatism! ... Hekmatism must be known. Hekmatism should be studied. Hekmatism should be taught ... Hekmatism must be represented in the struggles.”*<sup>411</sup>

One of the leaders of worker-communism and a follower of Hekmat claims that the man he followed even promoted Marx’s works. He also provided a list of writings by Mansoor Hekmat to show how he was promoted to the position of the Marx of his time.

---

<sup>410</sup> Mansoor Hekmat’s speech to a session of politburo of the Iranian worker-communist party, 7-8 July 2001

<sup>411</sup> Ali Javadi - Hekmatism: The Key to Solving our Problems and Moving on!

*“Nader [Mansoor Hekmat], in this time, has fought in defence of Marx’s legitimacy ... and promoted Marx’s works ... Compare his criticism of democracy with the criticism of Hegel’s philosophy of law and the Jewish question, compare a Better World with Critique of the Gotha Programme and The Communist Manifesto. I do not need to name any of Mansoor Hekmat’s other works in the past five years and his earlier works ... I reiterate that, yes, I, along with hundreds of other communists, recognizes Mansoor Hekmat as the Marx of this era and the leader of Bolshevism in the post-Lenin world.”*<sup>412</sup>

We also believe that, for any serious and searching person who does not seek discipleship nor is caught up in a sectarian framework, reading Mansoor Hekmat’s writings and comparing them with Marx’s works, if there is room for comparison, will reveal the depth of differences. Apparently, from the perspective of the apostles of Mansoor Hekmat, for some in the political arena, there was a suspicion that he was as likely to evaluate himself as Lenin. However, this misconception diminishes the position of that noble leader, diminishes the nobility and superstition that surround it, and reduces the grandeur and superman qualities of this honourable man. So, another disciple of Mansoor Hekmat, Mr Assadpour, emphasizes that he was not Lenin of his time, only the Marx of his time, and writes:

*“It has been in the political arena of Iran for many years that it is known (not only by lovers of him) that Mansoor Hekmat considered himself to be, instead of Lenin, the Marx of his era!”*<sup>413</sup>

---

<sup>412</sup> Iraj Farzad - Mystical and Sufi Opportunism in the Guise of Worker and Socialism, 2 July 1999

<sup>413</sup> <http://www.hekmatist.com/2014/040314-mostafa-bahman-shafig.html>



In order to gain a better understanding of the abolition of the ideology of Marxism-Hekmatism from the point of view of Hekmat's disciples, we have to look at some of the apocryphal statements of these apostles. In the following sentence, the "Marxist-Hekmatist principles" as in the Stalinist "Marxist-Leninist" principles are intended for us to consider. Both try to present dogmatic principles of their ideology:

*"Let me first emphasize that entering the gun factory and taking the 'armed struggle' to the field of politics and the struggle of communists and workers are not in themselves elective principles. Our struggle is not about inevitable Marxist-Hekmatist principles. We are Marxists and Hekmatists."*<sup>414</sup>

In the following, we are not seeking to determine the concept expressed in the sentence, but rather the doctrine of Marxism-Hekmatism and the presentation of the ideology of Marxism-Hekmatism:

*"This approach, contrary to the teachings of Marxism and Hekmatism, has nothing to do with consciousness or ignorance of the left."*<sup>415</sup>

The dogmatic and ideological approach is repeated in the literature of worker-communism. Here, too, we aim not at the concept expressed in a sentence, but at the repetition of Marxist-Hekmatist theory:

*"Arming the forces with Marxist, communist and Hekmatist theory."*<sup>416</sup>

---

<sup>414</sup> <http://www.azadi-b.com/arshiw/?p=4312>

<sup>415</sup> Reza Danesh - Communist Party or Alliance with the Non-worker Left

The Fifth Marx International Congress was held at the University of Paris in October 2007. Apparently, this congress was not up to date, unaware that Marx belonged to the 19th century and that the Marx of our time was to be discovered and introduced on the podium of universities. Ms Majedi accepts responsibility for presenting Hekmatism to this congress, providing a Hekmatist interpretation and calling for Hekmatism to be expanded. She writes in a report about her attendance:

*“In early October, the Fifth Marx International Congress was held in Paris ... The worker-communism of Mansoor Hekmat, Hekmatism, must be represented and presented at this congress. My seminar was about the validity of Marxism today and for this world. Providing a Hekmatist interpretation of Marxism and worker-communism ... We call for the spread of Hekmatism and worker-communism.”*<sup>417</sup>

In 2007, in conjunction with the Fifth Marx International Congress, we witnessed a series of protests and labour strikes in France, which unfortunately achieved no success. Ms Majedi blames the lack of a workers’ victory for the lack of an international of worker-communism and argues that Hekmatism should be introduced to the younger generation of the working class around the world:

*“The recent French workers’ strike and its defeat underscore the importance of a worker-communist international. The advance of worker-communism and Hekmatism is important to the young*

---

<sup>416</sup> Mohammad Fotouhi Sara - Privative Party and Marxist Educational Organizations

<sup>417</sup> Azar Majedi - Strike of French Workers and the International Congress of Marx: A Congress of Hope or the Subject of Marxist Work?

*generation of the working class and the left of the world, inspired to mobilize around its living, dynamic, attractive, radical and militant Marxism, whose its feet is on the ground.”<sup>418</sup>*

Recently, another disciple of Mansoor Hekmat outdid the eulogies of his predecessors, namely, the personalities of worker-communism. He claimed (yes, he only claims) that all communist thinkers, such as Marx, Lenin and Luxemburg, can be found somewhere in worker-communism. He was not able to provide the slightest argument or evidence to support the validity of his statements. Christ’s disciples argued better than this disciple of Mansoor Hekmat. The flattery of these disciples is really more embarrassing than religious panegyrists:

*“I claim that Mansoor Hekmat is the Marx of our epoch. So much of Mansoor Hekmat’s name is in our language; Marx’s name is not, there is so much criticism and praise about Mansoor Hekmat which is not about Marx. There is so much love and hatred for Mansoor Hekmat which is not about Marx ... the transparency of Marx’s thought! It may be more correct to say that Marx himself was the same, but we need a clear and modern language to express the critique of capitalist society!*

*Why can’t Hamid Taghvaaee be the Lenin of our time? In my opinion, Lenin belongs to a century ago, and Hamid belongs to today! There is so much criticism and appreciation about Hamid, but not about Lenin. So many of Hamid’s articles are considered to be like articles from Lenin on the sidelines. Hamid Taghvaaee is the Lenin of today and a strong leader of 99% of the community ... Why*

---

<sup>418</sup> Azar Majedi - Strike of French Workers and the International Congress of Marx: A Congress of Hope or the Subject of Marxist Work?

*can't Mina Ahadi or Nasrin Ramadanali or Mehrnoosh Mousavi be Rosa Luxemburg?*"<sup>419</sup>

This believer, this wayfarer of pure Hekmatism, has confused his religion, namely, worker-communism, with Marxism. Marxists view social events with a dialectical attitude. Marx's greatness was not due to his genius in the social sciences but to the alignment of Marx with the rise of a social class called the working class. It was not Marx who brought communism to the working class; rather, it was the working class that made Marx a thinker. Lenin became Lenin only in the shadow of the rise of the working class in pursuit of a social revolution. Rosa Luxemburg would never have been a genius in the social sciences without a workers' movement entering onto the field of struggle.

Proponents of worker-communism claim that communism in Iran without Mansoor Hekmat would have been at the level of communism in Turkey or Pakistan. The issue here is not the working class or the struggles that the working class has recorded in its historical struggle; rather, it is the communist one. The question that arises is, how is communism in Iran better than Turkey despite the existence of a "great man like Mansoor Hekmat"? Again, one of his disciple claims:

*"Communism in Iran without Mansoor Hekmat would have been like communism in Turkey and Pakistan."*<sup>420</sup>

Which horizon has communism opened up in Iran, both regionally and globally, which has not been opened up in Turkey? What tradition of struggle has communism brought to Iran? Contrary to the demagoguery of the followers of worker-communism, Mansoor Hekmat, with his radical turn of phrase, was able to silence the last shimmering criticisms of the

---

<sup>419</sup> [http://www.azadi-b.com/G/2019/01/post\\_385.html](http://www.azadi-b.com/G/2019/01/post_385.html)

<sup>420</sup> Nasser Asghari - On the sidelines of a critique of the Socialist Workers' Alliance of Komala

left of capital, thereby preventing it from furthering its critique and advancing toward communist and internationalist positions. It should not be forgotten that, after the Third International, it was the only revolutionary programme to look at social events from the internationalist horizon.

Mansoor Hekmat's disciples speak of thousands of his brilliant works, pointing out that a communist party in the US has even adopted and announced the "Programme for a Better World", one of these thousands of brilliant works, as its programme and platform. If we sum up the writings, speeches, interviews, memos or anything that this saviour of humanity gifted us over the course of our 24 years of political life, they would only total 625. These exaggerations, these lies "thous-ands of glittering effects", makes the disciples themselves look ridiculous. Whether or not the party paid his dues on time, whether or not the party paid him justly, is not our concern. One particular journalist, an ideologist who works for a media outlet, who should arrange interviews, articles, memos, and so on, wrote in his eulogy to his leader the following:

*"Mansoor Hekmat, the greatest leader of the labour communist movement, without the help of a discount barrister, promoted bold and uncompromising human rights in the last hundred years. The thoughts and politics of Hekmat have touched upon various aspects of political and social movements in Iran, the Middle East and even the world. You know, these days, the "Programme for a Better World", one of the thousands of brilliant works by Mansoor Hekmat, has been adopted by the communist current in America, which has announced it as its own programme and platform. It is no coincidence that from the women's liberation movement to the labour movement, the movement against execution, the council movement and the children's rights movement, we see the stamp of the worker-communism of Mansoor Hekmat and we see how Hekmat returned communism from the margins to the context of*

*society. This philosophy, which came after Lenin and the October Revolution, whose wave has not slept for 97 years, well, it is unprecedented.*<sup>421</sup>

Mansoor Hekmat's disciples are apparently not ashamed of exaggeration and sectarian thinking and claim that he returned communism from the margins to the context of society. Our specific question to this disciple is, what was the fate of the party in the US which adopted the "Programme for a Better World" as its programme and platform? We know the answer: the party was removed from the scene.

---

<sup>421</sup> <http://www.azadi-b.com/arshiw/?p=47809>

## Worker-communism and westernism

Ideologies of worker-communism have tried to pretend that worker-communism is a Western phenomenon. It is a trend rooted in Western culture and civilization and, with the victory of worker-communism, Western culture and civilization will rule over Iran. It is incorrect to portray Western culture as progressive and Eastern culture as backward. Let's first see what Mansoor Hekmat preached about in this regard:

*"The most important asset of the worker-communist party is that it is a Western party ... a party whose roots are in Western European thought, culture and civilization ... That is to say, with the victory of the worker-communist party in Iran, Western civilization wins ... Open up the country to the West and then present it alongside Western civilization and Western criticism of the world, with a Western worldview ... as a result of the daily political disagreement with Western governments that may arise or, if not, reaching a deeper peace with the people of Western Europe and the US ... a country is created that seems to speak of a set of values that are Western which the freedom seeker feels comfortable with it."*<sup>422</sup>

Mansoor Hekmat not only considered himself a supporter of Western civilization but also viewed the pro-Western bourgeois and reactionary currents of Iran as progressive. Pointing to their power, he argued that they are not marginal but social and that they have transferred the capitalist system to Iran. On the topic of being progressive and of the most reactionary and the most rabid tendencies of the bourgeoisie, Mansoor Hekmat said:

---

<sup>422</sup> Is it Possible to Win Communism in Iran?, Mansoor Hekmat.

*“But what is the point of pro-Western power? Firstly, on a larger historical scale, this is a major current of politics. It is not a marginal current. It represents a kind of nationalism in Iran. It represents a kind of bureaucratism and secularism in Iran. These [bourgeois tendencies] are the ones who brought us schools, built the universities, built the roads and paved the roads. These are the ones who moved society from the feudal system to the capitalist system. People remember that too.”<sup>423</sup>*

Given the ideological superstructure of the Islamic bourgeoisie and the restrictions it has imposed on society, the propagation of Western culture and civilization can be heard not only among the youth but also among the middle class. One can absorb the force with which they want to grab Western culture and civilization, albeit in the form of socialism. Now that we have at least become acquainted with Mansoor Hekmat’s views on Western culture and civilization and pro-Western Iranian currents, let us examine this issue from the Marxist horizon, to see how well they fit into bourgeois theory.

The first bourgeois revolution occurred in England in the mid-17th century which led to generalized democracy in society.<sup>424</sup> Following this bourgeois revolution, the newly emerging democracy in England bloodily suppressed the first communist movement in modern history, the Levellers.<sup>425</sup> The most famous bourgeois revolution occurred in France in 1789, which is even more famous than the British bourgeois revolution. The French Revolution, with the slogan “Freedom, Equality, Fraternity” and its declaration in support of human rights, opened a new chapter in

---

<sup>423</sup> Is it Possible to Win Communism in Iran?, Mansoor Hekmat.

<sup>424</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/English\\_Revolution](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/English_Revolution)

<sup>425</sup> The Levellers were an egalitarian, even crude communist, movement in the 17th century in Britain which sought to distribute communal wealth equally among members of the community. This movement was cruelly suppressed by the Democratic Republic of Cromwell.



human history; but this exceptionally new democracy in France, which crowned itself with sovereign power, in 1841 and especially in June 1848, commemorated the uprising of French workers. Years later, during the first proletarian revolution in human history in 1871 (Paris Commune), the same civilized barbarians, inspired by the same modern Western culture, massacred at least 20,000 Parisian proletarians in one bloody week, with another 40,000 arrested.

The civilized barbarians, referring to the same Western model of civilization, imposed World War I on the proletariat in Europe, which in turn led to the Russian proletariat ending the first imperialist war with the October Revolution. These same democrats, these civilized barbarians, the same major Western powers, after the October Revolution, suppressed the October Revolution by resorting to Western culture and civilization and by forming a white army.

During the German Revolution of 1918-1920, about 20,000 German workers were slaughtered by Western civilization. We refer here not to communist narrators and witnesses, or to bourgeois Republicans, but to the truth teller Emil Julius Gumbel<sup>426</sup>, who published in 1924 a book entitled *Four Years of Political Murder*, which depicted the political slaughter at the heart of Europe during German Revolution, with an appeal to democracy. These civilized barbarians, by killing a leading section of the German proletariat, paved the way for another world war in 1939. By resorting to Western culture and civilization in the name of democracy, proletarian leaders of the West, including Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht, were brutally murdered.

It was the Westerners who bombed Hiroshima and Nagasaki in the name of democracy and freedom. Colonization and then colonial wars were pursued by these same Westerners, by these same democrats. To this list we can add dozens more of the crimes of the Western bourgeoisie.

---

<sup>426</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Emil\\_Julius\\_Gumbel](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Emil_Julius_Gumbel)

The emergence of the bourgeois revolution in the West also provided the basis for the emergence of the social class, the working class, in the West. Wage slavery is an integral part of bourgeois civilization. If bourgeois civilization, bourgeois culture and bourgeois democracy first emerged in the West in the first place, consequently, the proletariat, internationalism, proletarian culture and so on were formed in the West. Unlike bourgeois culture and civilization, proletarian culture and civilization do not recognize the West and the East, and internationalism is the cornerstone of this.

## **Worker-communism and the Freedom Guard**

The diehard tradition of armed struggle is strong in all four parts of Kurdistan, including Iranian Kurdistan. Kurdish nationalism, especially its radical phrase wing dressed in socialist clothing, by sanctifying the armed struggle, has been able to attract protesters from society and, especially, young people into its ranks. Much of the worker-communist force is made up of people who were once involved in armed struggle in Iranian Kurdistan via Komala. During those years, many people were dug out from their social identity and became a Peshmerga force (partisan) and camped for years. Some of them had extensive experience in guerrilla warfare with the Islamic Republic's military and were among the elite commanders of the Peshmerga wars.

During the formation of the worker-communist party, many of them left the camp and entered Western countries as refugees. Worker-communism no longer had a military force. With the formation of the Iraqi worker-communist party, the Iranian worker-communist party was able to deploy its military force in Iraqi Kurdistan under the auspices of their Iraqi counterparts, which in turn led to the creation of a political-military patrol for the Iranian worker-communist Party.

Worker-communism was aware of this and still is; due to the current situation in Kurdistan, because of the strong roots of nationalism, but with no military potential, the chances of any force claiming power are drastically reduced. Given the conditions in the region, the possibility of a sustained military force for worker-communism has been ruled out. Worker-communism attempted to resolve this problem through the use of an unstable armed force, which secretly travelled to Iranian Kurdistan for organizational purposes. After the necessary preparations, the armed forces of the Iranian worker-communist party launched its first public-political propaganda campaign from 14-16 September 1999, in connection with its political-military patrol. Issue No. 31 of the *International*, the organ of the worker-communist party at the time, conducted an interview

with Mansoor Hekmat on the importance of the political-military patrol of the party. Hekmat said in that interview: "Having the potential to assert itself as an armed party in large measure is a vital condition for any serious activity in Kurdistan." Rahman Hosseinzadeh, then Secretary of the Kurdistan Committee of the worker-communist party, writes in this regard:

*"The formation of the armed forces and the organization of military activity were among the policies of the party in Kurdistan. The first conference of party cadres, held in 1992, clearly set out our policy framework in a resolution ... Following the call of the Kurdistan Committee a year ago, young and other interested people in the field were organized. Soon, the armed units of the party formed to meet the needs of this period. During this period, military and political training, exercises and manoeuvres were put in place to enhance political and military capabilities. Our recognition was that our force was ready to be inside Iran. With Abdullah Darabi joining these units, thus providing high-level command, it was high time for the political-military patrol inside Iran, which we had been preparing for a long time, to begin."*<sup>427</sup>

The Iraqi Kurdistan region could not tolerate the military force of worker-communism in Sulaymaniyah, Iraqi Kurdistan. In July 2000, Iraqi Kurdistan Patriotic Union forces stormed the head-quarters of the Iraqi worker-communist party in order to destroy it. In the attack and subsequent incidents, six worker-communism activists were massacred by the Patriotic Union.

After the US invasion of Iraq and the disintegration of civil society in Iraq, there was a possibility that what had happened in Afghanistan

---

<sup>427</sup> *International No. 31*

before could be repeated in Iran. Worker-communism was approved to set up the Freedom Guard by the Hekmatist Party in 2005, to prevent civil society from breaking up in the process of the overthrow of the Islamic Republic. Peshmerga is associated with Kurdish nationalism, so the term *guard* replaces *Peshmerga*, so as to present a more modern image of the armed forces. The Freedom Guard was supposed to be organized and armed in the neighbourhoods and, by taking control of the cities, in the process of overthrowing the Islamic Republic, prevent the Iraqiization and Yugoslavization of Iranian society. Concerning the main duty of the Freedom Guard, Hekmatists write:

*“Organizing the Freedom Guard is an important part of the work to undermine the Islamic Republic and to facilitate its overthrow, and it is an important link in the gaining of power by the party. But, in addition, organizing the Freedom Guard in the current situation, given the danger of an American attack and the likelihood of turmoil and war, has become one of the most important actions of the Hekmatist Party.*

*The Freedom Guard is a tool used by the working class and the party to ensure the political, social and economic security of society during the process of the overthrow of the Islamic Republic. The Freedom Guard, in addition to guaranteeing the people sovereignty over their lives and a means at their disposal, will shorten the lives of ethnic, nationalist, Islamic and political gangs. The Freedom Guard must provide the basis for this form of empowerment for the people and the party.”<sup>428</sup>*

If we exclude the Iraqiization and the Yugoslavization scenario of Iranian society, the fact is that worker-communism sought to exert social influence by displaying military power in Kurdish society. A series of

---

<sup>428</sup> On the Tasks and Framework for Organizing Freedom Guard Units

conversations was held on Partow TV about the Freedom Guard and the urgent need to fight against the Islamic Republic and other dark forces, which was later published in written form. In these conversations, there was an attempt to cover up the struggle against the regime in radical clothing. Salam Ziji, one of the officials of the Freedom Guard, explains:

*“What are the basic duties of Freedom Guard units?*

*[Response] Each Freedom Guard unit should essentially consider its political role at the centre of its activities today. In the place where it is formed, it should strive to impassion that space against the Islamic Republic and to encourage and mobilize the people against the policies of the Islamic Republic in various dimensions. Enlightenment and awareness against the ethnocentric and religious policies that are responsible for the atrocities and calamities inflicted by the government are among the most important and essential tasks of any unit.”<sup>429</sup>*

According to the definition put forward by Freedom Guard officials, in the duty of the Freedom Guard, we see only an anti-regime struggle that other currents of anti-regime movements are doing on a daily basis. Of course, Freedom Guard officials have emphasized that the Freedom Guard has not carried out any military operations against the Islamic Republic and is currently only organizing, preparing and arranging for future developments, as stated by the following official:

*“The Freedom Guard has not imposed any war on any person or entity so far; at this point, it is only preparing and organizing,*

---

<sup>429</sup> <http://www.azadi-b.com/arshiw/?p=49406>

*making the necessary preparations and organizing its forces for future developments.*”<sup>430</sup>

Now, let’s put aside the agitations and propaganda that stem from newspapers and television to see what the Freedom Guard has done in reality. Although it is still in a preparatory phase prior to entering the war with the Islamic Republic, it has carried out operations, some of which we will briefly look at. In one of these operations, a unit of the Freedom Guard, while campaigning, warns intruders against ill-treatment of women and youth. The report reads:

*“On 4 November 2011, a unit of the Freedom Guard, known as the Nasim Guard Freedom Unit, participated in a large-scale propaganda campaign in large areas of the city of Sanandaj. In this widespread move, which ended successfully, the Nasim Guard Freedom Unit received a wide welcome from the people of Sanandaj. In the course of this operation, it has also taken action against certain individuals affiliated with the Salafi Islamic Reactionary Movement and the Islamic Republic, who have made threats and created a hostile atmosphere in society, especially for women and young people.”*<sup>431</sup>

The Nasim Guard Freedom Unit, in the above operation, at best, performed the duty of the police, in order to stop women and young people being harassed. Another unit involved in other operations distributed statements condemning the US and the UN economic blockade of Iran to pedestrians and motorists. Is the Islamic bourgeoisie opposed to condemning Iran’s economic blockade? The report reads as follows:

---

<sup>430</sup> The Freedom Guard is a Pressing Necessity for the Fight Against the Islamic Republic and its Black Forces.

<sup>431</sup> Freedom Guard command in Kurdistan - announcement on the Freedom Guard’s presence in Sanandaj

*“On the night of 5 January 2007, the Freedom Guard in the city of Kamyaran made its presence felt. In a precise and organized operation, at 10 p.m. local time, Unit 5 of the Freedom Guard, turned up armed on Beheshti Avenue and moved among the people along the road to Kamyaran Tobrehriz. Members of the Freedom Guard Unit distributed a statement from the Hekmatist Party, which condemned the US and the UN economic blockade and its consequences for the Iranian people to pedestrians and passengers in cars and vehicles in transit.”<sup>432</sup>*

All operations were supposed to be carried out in coordination with the Freedom Guard General Command. But, it appeared that one of the units went rogue and failed to coordinate its actions with General Command. This unit sought to finance party activities by taking hostage an adult child of one of the capitalists in Sanandaj. This raised serious problems both for the unit and for the Hekmatist Party; one of the Hekmatist Party leaders explains the problem as follows:

*“We in the leadership of the party were informed at the time of the incident. All the members of the leadership ... were rushing to find a solution to stop the incident. After the incident, we tried to contact the family as soon as possible and make up for the problem. Security issues and then arrests did not allow us to make up for it.”<sup>433</sup>*

But this unit of the Freedom Guard was merely involved in an adventurous attempt to compete with other nationalist currents in Iranian Kurdistan; we will return to this issue. After the extensive propaganda

---

<sup>432</sup> Freedom guard activities in 2009

<sup>433</sup> [http://m-ghazvini.com/?page\\_id=319](http://m-ghazvini.com/?page_id=319)



about the formation of the Freedom Guard, the noise gradually died down. Rahman Hosseinzadeh, a leader of worker-communism, says:

*“We set up the Freedom Guard, a very important project, which, in the first year, carried out 22 operations. But how many operations has carried out in the last five years? Obviously, it’s inappropriate to ask, as sharp leadership recognizes the appropriateness of power, which means you do not put all your potential into one basket.”*<sup>434</sup>

Following the Hekmatist adventure of the Freedom Guard, in December 2009, a court in Sanandaj issued an international arrest warrant for 12 Hekmatist activists, some of whom were considered Freedom Guard officials, on the basis of being a “terrorist and organized criminal gang” on the Interpol listings. Interpol also issued a wanted poster. The aim of the criminals sitting in the Sanandaj court was to impose restrictions on the movements of the Hekmatists, as they were claimed to be somehow responsible for the Freedom Guard. Here’s a look at the announcement made by the Hekmatist Party:

*“The Hekmatist Party strongly condemns this Interpol action. We ask Interpol to refrain from acting in this way, and to abrogate the list immediately. We consider Interpol, the police and the member governments of this entity to be directly responsible for whatever happens to these people. We hold Interpol responsible for strengthening the police atmosphere in Iran. We are able to defend ourselves against the thugs of the Islamic Republic and its associates; if they cross the border, we will stop them. At the same time, we will not only bring this issue before the relevant courts in*

---

<sup>434</sup> Rahman Hosseinzadeh - Differences Between the Working Class and the Communist Party or the Working Class and the Left Coalition Organization

*Europe and the US, but we will also sue Interpol for endangering the security of the Islamic Republic's opposition ... At the right time, we will offer the international police a choice. With the whole population willing and able to take part in this action, we will introduce ourselves to Interpol in protest. And we will force the international police to declare that the Islamic regime's request is not based on any action. We will practically and officially rub the muzzle of the regime in soil and make it more invalid than ever.*"<sup>435</sup>

The Hekmatists after a lot of exaggeration and hyperbole were clear: they would defend themselves against the thugs of the Islamic Republic and its associates ("if they cross the border, we will stop them") or they bring the matter before the European and US courts and sue Interpol (indeed, they followed up on this with a lawyer and launched the "Stop Campaign"). Finally, after three years of trying, Interpol removed the names of 13 people from its public most-wanted list, but they are still on the non-public list. Of course, being put under the pressure of the Islamic bourgeoisie by the Western gangs, in line with the standardization of the Islamic bourgeoisie, was one of the reasons for ceasing the pursuit of these political opponents through Interpol. The Hekmatist Party's announcement in this regard is as follows:

*"Interpol made a significant retreat as did the Islamic Republic by removing the name of the opposition's 13 political figures from its public list. The withdrawal is solely the result of the joint work of the movement against the terrorist plot of the Islamic Republic ... The Hekmatist Party, while appreciating the 'Stop Campaign', will do its utmost to bring this campaign to a close and completely erase the names of these 13 political activists from view".*<sup>436</sup>

---

<sup>435</sup> <http://www.hekmatist.com/161209hezb.html>

<sup>436</sup> <http://hekmatist.com/2012/Hekmatist-interpol.htm>

Although the Freedom Guard project was an adventure which was doomed to fail from the beginning, the blows to it affected society to a lesser extent. Unlike this project, the adventure that the Hekmatists pursued during the student protests in relation to “Students for Freedom and Equality” dealt the greatest blow to the student movement, which is still unable to straighten its back. Political frustration was one of the consequences of the failure of the student movement, with the Hekmatists playing the biggest role in the defeat.

One of the former Hekmatist leaders left the Hekmatist Party, despite being loyal to Mansoor Hekmat, in protest against its failure to support “Students for Freedom and Equality” as well as the Freedom Guard project. Concerning the failure of the latter, before it becomes a real entity, Mr Qazvini wrote:

*“The Freedom Guard or the armed forces of the Hekmatist Party, as the Hekmatist Party declared it four years ago, did not find any foreign entity. Only in Kurdistan on a very limited level did efforts to form it fail so quickly ... The Hekmatist Party’s theory is that the armed organization of the people in the environment, regardless of the factors of the day, the traditions of the people’s struggle, etc., is a theory similar to that of the Communist League [here, Qazvini refers to a Maoist organization in Iran which should not be confused with the Communist League of Marx]. However, if the Communist League could carry out a serious action on the basis of its theory, the Hekmatist Party would not be able to turn its theory into even the least amount of practice. The foundations of this theory were shaken from the start.”<sup>437</sup>*

---

<sup>437</sup> Mahmoud Qazvini - Freedom Guard, so inaudible that it will not be understood

The Freedom Guard was supposed to guarantee the political and social security of society and to cut off ethnic, nationalist and Islamic currents from people's lives. During the protests of November 2019, the province of Kurdistan was one of the areas where the repression of the Islamic bourgeoisie was especially violent and the death toll was very high. Under such circumstances, the Freedom Guard was supposed to guarantee the protection and security of the protesters. But the Freedom Guard, according to a former Hekmatist leader, did not fundamentally become a foreign entity; it was merely an adventurous propaganda exercise in competition with other Kurdish nationalist currents, and the noise of propaganda was quickly silenced.

## The collapse of worker-communism

Mansoor Hekmat, given his ability, was able to deal with the internal contradictions and heterogeneous positions of revolutionary Marxism and present a new ideology with a radical look, under the title of the ideology of worker-communism. Worker-communism was able, by its radical phrase, to absorb the protesting layer in the political milieu and grow numerically. In the short term, with its radical turn of phrase, along with communist and internationalist terms, can address the inner contradictions; but, in the long term, the new ideology will show that these self-contradictions emerged as a crisis. Before examining the collapse of worker-communism, let's see how worker-communism was going to revive Marxism and communism in the world. Mansoor Hekmat said the following about the revival of communism in the world by worker-communism:

*"If anything is to revive communism in the world, it is the ability and competence of two or three worker-communist parties in the world who have become a force in several countries of a fair size. This is what will regenerate communism, Marxist theory, the Communist Manifesto and Capital. It is our duty and what we owe to the world communist movement to become powerful. We just need to be in power for a couple of years in some part of the world...We, the parties who are able to become a power in society, will revive communism...We are capable of this. I don't honestly know which other parties around the world are doing this. But I can see that on the scale of a country like Iran we are capable of doing it."*<sup>438</sup>

---

<sup>438</sup> Party and Society: From a pressure group to a political party

Ideologists of worker-communism described the Iranian worker-communist party to be the party that was the most revolutionary, the most leftist and the most socialist political party in contemporary history since the Russian Revolution of October 1917. It was supposed that the worker-communist party, like the Bolshevik Party, would play a historic role in the revival of communism, not only in Iran but in the world. According to one of the leaders of worker-communism:

*“Without exaggeration, building a political party with the above characteristics is the greatest project of communism in modern world history since the Russian Revolution of October 1917.”*<sup>439</sup>

When the glorious mansion of worker-communism, with its massive stone pillars, and with the divine glory of Mansoor Hekmat, seemed immortal to the followers of worker-communism, it began to crumble as a result of a political earthquake. Like the dissolution of religious sects, the dream world of the disciples collapsed at once. Following the publication of a press release by one of the party's founders, Reza Moghaddam, who was about to leave the party, a political explosion took place in the worker-communist party in April 1999, which left about 75 party members and cadres involved in the process. The main reason for resignation was the inability of the leadership to fulfil the goals of worker-communism, that is to say, the non-class transition. Consequently, the leadership rotation was announced along with the programme positions of the Second Congress of the worker-communist party. The resignations tried, with the radically phrased literature, to contrast the non-communist positions of the worker-communist party with those of the old communist positions and subsequently launched an artificial dispute. The resignations did not appear in the form of a certain

---

<sup>439</sup> Koorosh Modaressi - The Necessity of Fundamental Changes in the Hekmatist Party Structure and Practice

intellectual tendency, but were fragmented. This proves the legitimacy of these positions of the internationalists, that it is not possible to form a revolutionary tendency within bourgeois parties. Within bourgeois parties, one can only speak of the loss of force and convergence towards revolutionary positions, which was not true for the fall of worker-communism, in other words, the forces that broke away from worker-communism never attempted to orientate towards communist positions.

On 4 March 1999, Bahman Shafiq, a member of the then central committee of the worker-communist party, submitted a paper entitled “Theses on the Creation of the worker-communist International” to the Central Committee in line with the formation of a worker-communist international. Bahman had put forward a draft proposal for a worker-communist international, with a number of German left activists. But his plan, rather than extending the scope of its influence, sparked a collapse in worker-communism. It is a fact that the assassination of the Crown Prince of Austria-Hungary on 28 June 1918 sparked World War I, but the cause of World War I was not the assassination of the Crown Prince, but the capitalist system that had passed through its boom period and entered its decadent era. Capitalism had resorted to the last solution, a world war, to respond to its crisis and survive. The same can be said of the demise of worker-communism. Bahman’s thesis of international formation ignited this spark. However, the reason for the collapse of worker-communism was not Bahman but the fact that the internal contradictions of worker-communism had elevated this intellectual tendency to an explosive level, with only a spark needed for a fully fledged political explosion. The crisis that Mansoor Hekmat was able to delay many times finally revealed itself. Let’s first look at his reaction to the Bahman thesis. He wrote:

*“The communist international must be a unity of communist forces, not an aggregation of communist intentions with subtitles in different languages, or a dialogue between communist isolationists. The key to establishing an international centre for the spread of*

*worker-communism, with whatever structure and agenda it wishes to exert beyond paper and the public domain, is that its primary creator must be real political forces. My first question to the German comrade who has come to create a worker-communist international with us is, what is preventing him from first creating a worker-communist party involved in German political life? If there is an active communist organization with 1,000 members in Germany, show us, and we will announce a worker-communist international the same day.*

*In my opinion, our point of departure is to set up an international, find or help to create organizations in the most important countries of the world, whose attitude and action plan are more or less similar to ours, and make an impact on their society ... Simply put, we are talking about the political expansion of the Iranian Worker-communist Party - bringing it closer to power, reaching out to the communist circles in more important countries, in order to push them to form active political parties with a programme to similar ours, and certainly creating a forum for the international dissemination of our views and finding like-minded people, in my opinion, represent the real way forward on the path to a worker-communist international.”<sup>440</sup>*

The crisis was not the result of a process of internal struggle, such as in the case of the Mensheviks and Bolsheviks, or even that of conventional bourgeois parties, but rather more like the dissolution of religious sects. The discussions took place not only at the level of the party members but also at the level of the Central Committee and its advisers. The members of the party only realized their ideological crisis as

---

<sup>440</sup> Mansoor Hekmat - To Comrade Bahman Shafiq, Copy to Comrades of the Central Committee Regarding the Text of Comrade Bahman Shafiq, from the “Crisis Documents” 1999



resignations began to come in. Those who resigned stated that Mansoor Hekmat had fallen out of line with worker-communism with discussions, for example, on “party and society”, “party and political power” and “party and personalities”. Meanwhile, the class transition has not taken place, meaning that the worker-communist party has not been able to find its labour base. Mansoor Hekmat skilfully recognized this and stated in the discussions of Second Congress on “party and society”, “party and political power” and “party and personalities” that the worker-communist Party had not fallen out of line with worker-communism and stressed that the current insurgents in the party had not raised any political or programme differences with the party before. Hekmat wrote:

*“The last (and first) time we saw a systematic disagreement of comrade Bahman with the official line in the party leadership was in the last plenum on the issue of the party’s attitude towards the political situation in Iran, Khatami, civil society and the party’s practical approach towards Iran.”*<sup>441</sup>

For Hekmat, the new positions of the worker-communist party were a continuation of the debates on worker-communism, and, while there had been no rotation in worker-communism, he provided a list of topics that eventually led to the formation of the ideology of worker-communism. As Hekmat argued, why you don’t come to discuss those positions? In other words, from the horizon of Mansoor Hekmat, it was necessary to show inner continuity, the coherence of worker-communism, that the new issues were in harmony with the old ones. Bahman Shafiq declares that he evaluates the list provided by Mansoor Hekmat as Marxist and that he is critical only of the last texts in the list, writing:

---

<sup>441</sup> Mansoor Hekmat - Stop! Check Your Brakes, from the “Crisis Documents” 1999

*“Comrade Nader [Mansoor Hekmat] says, why don’t you come to discuss about past positions? I consider the list given by Comrade Nader [Mansoor Hekmat] to be Marxist and I have been a supporter of it. It is the subject of these three recent debates that I call non-Marxist.”*<sup>442</sup>

Both Bahman’s argument and that of those who resigned were that the positions of this current in the past was Marxist, which prevented those who resigned from moving towards communist positions; instead, they had continued their counter-revolutionary and anti-communist positions with a radical turn of phrase. Reza Moghaddam and Majid Mohammadi were two figures in worker-communism who were active in the labour movement, representing the same argument from the left of capital, that Stalinism after the fall of the Berlin Wall was the weak effect of “workerism”. Both assess the lack of class transition, namely, the non-relation between worker-communism and the labour movement, as the reason for the leadership’s deviation from worker-communism, a position which was influenced by inverted “workerism”. Majid Mohammadi was not a critic of worker-communist ideology as a bourgeois ideology, but rather of the fact that the party had abandoned worker-communism, writing:

*“I don’t think anyone still believes in the issues of worker-communism, even though they remain in this party. Sooner or later, they will go. I don’t think anyone thinks of influencing the labour movement but staying in the party will sooner or later not be an option. ... I wish the party, although it had abolished the banner of worker-communism, had acted as a party in the protests and*

---

<sup>442</sup> Bahman Shafiq - The King Is Naked, from the “Crisis Documents” 1999

*movements of the aforementioned arenas [against religion, against sex discrimination etc.].”<sup>443</sup>*

Although Majid Mohammadi was anonymous, Reza Moghaddam was one of the founders of the worker-communist party with an active background in the workerism tendency. Moghaddam was apparently supposed to be the author of the manifesto of those who resigned, especially as he considered the class transition to be a departure from the party’s basic positions on worker-communism. Bahman stated that, with the release of Moghaddam’s manifesto, the worker-communist movement experienced a fundamental rift, leading to a profound split in worker-communism. Bahman supports this manifesto:

*“With the public release of the manifesto from Reza Moghaddam, all these scattered fronts were involved in a great struggle, facing each other ... What was beyond these arguments, and perhaps long before, was a fundamental rift in worker-communism. It was a deep split in this movement. The manifesto of Reza Moghaddam announced the dimensions of this split in its shortest and most concise lines. I support this manifesto and belong to this movement, which this manifesto represents.”<sup>444</sup>*

But Bahman did not join the Reza Moghaddam manifesto wing; the majority of those who resigned went their separate ways, with only a very small minority, together with Reza Moghaddam, forming a unity of socialist workers. As noted earlier, the main body of the party was not aware of the issues on the Central Committee; it only became aware of the

---

<sup>443</sup> Majid Mohammadi - To Party Members and Supporters, from the “Crisis Documents” 1999

<sup>444</sup> Bahman Shafiq - Beginning of Another Era, from the “Crisis Documents” 1999

crisis as resignations began, with the crisis infection the main body of the party soon after. Finally, after the collapse of the worker-communist force, despite the will of the leadership of the party when the crisis became public, the continuation of the debate was not about political positions, but rather the form of a renewed allegiance with the leadership for the faithful and breaking the allegiance for those who had resigned. Even after the crisis unfolded, leaders of worker-communism did not want party members to engage actively in the discussions but stated that they could read the documents if they wished; neither active involvement in the discussions, nor the study of discussions was compulsory. Party officials wrote:

*“The texts by comrades on the Central Committee and its advisors are sent to you following recent discussions on the Central Committee. Party members can read these documents or any part thereof as they wish. The following should be strictly observed when distributing these documents via party committees:*

- 1. The files related to these posts should not be sent to anyone via the Internet.*
- 2. A number of these writings is reproduced, with a copy for every 10 members. It is clear that studying these documents as well as discussing them is not mandatory. If comrades are interested in reading them, they will be are provided by the Central Committee. After copying the required number, please be responsible comrades and delete these files from your computers.*
- 3. These versions should be numbered and no comrade should copy them.*

4. *After two months, collect these documents and destroy all copied examples.*"<sup>445</sup>

Later, Mansoor Hekmat pointed to an undeniable fact that the members and body of the party were unable to defend worker-communism. This is also quite natural; one cannot expect anything less when members do not go through the discussion channels and when leaders decide for them, given that the members have become disciples. If Hekmat's authority had not been in place, the crisis of worker-communism in 1999 would have been much wider and more destructive than it appeared. Hekmat said:

*"In the case of the resignations (April 1999) that came in, if it wasn't for me, the party would have literally disappeared at that time. It would have become a sect. There was such confusion in the organization that no one could have put it back together ... There was no one else except the great Mansoor Hekmat who could say to these five people that you were not worker-communist ."*<sup>446</sup>

---

<sup>445</sup> From Headquarters to the Committees and Party Officials, from the "Crisis Documents" 1999

<sup>446</sup> From the speech of Mansoor Hekmat at the meeting of the politburo of the Iranian worker-communist party, 7-8 July 2001

## Worker-communism and not being on the line

One of the strengths of worker-communism has been its spread to Iraq; but, according to one of the leaders of worker-communism, the Iraqi worker-communist party only accepted the ideology while failing to emerge as defenders of worker-communism. For this reason, the Iraqi worker-communist party has not been able to have a serious impact on Iraqi society, despite being in that society. But, activists in the Iranian worker-communist party are defenders of worker-communism, despite being far from the society in which they operate. They have also managed to become the most distinctive left faction in Iran. The leader of worker-communism who came after Mansoor Hekmat writes:

*“The experience of the Iraqi Worker-communist Party has shown how overwhelming the difference between accepting ‘all the topics of worker-communism’ and appearing in this role can be. Contrary to the experience of the Iranian worker-communist party, it revealed itself to be a party outside the community in which it was active. But, it has had great effects, and we have become the most distinctive force on the Iranian left. Therefore, the formation of an international by the Iranian and the Iraqi worker-communist parties will not be more than a caricature in the present situation.”*<sup>447</sup>

Shortly before his death, Mansoor Hekmat complained to the Fourth Plenum of the Worker-communist Party that no cadres could be nurtured within the organization. The fuhrer of worker-communism had apparently forgotten this little nugget when he had encountered such precious gold as this:

---

<sup>447</sup> Koorosh Modaressi - The text addressed to the comrades of the Central Committee and comrade Bahman during the crisis 1999

*“Thousands honorable man rounding up to the party that they don’t know Lenin is eatable or drinking [phenomena] and Marxists and senior workers in the party should not indicate this as their less esteem but see that their own success.”<sup>448</sup>*

By this stage, only a few hundred rather than thousands were gathered around him and believed in the worker-communism of the prophet. Worse still, they were unable to melt before the leader and defend the ideology of worker-communism. This does not represent a problem on the part of the disciples, but rather a reflection of the sectarian relations in the religion of worker-communism which the leader himself played a major role in shaping. Believers who have believed in this religion “don’t know Lenin is an eating and drinking phenomenon” once this was the sign of success concerning this manner. As Mansoor Hekmat complained:

*“The cadres are not created inside this organization. The cadres are the same cadres we got from the earlier blast. We’re coming with them. The seeds are getting tired; our cadres are getting less and less. The new cadre that is being added is through an election to a country committee, based on its own opinions. It does not belong to this history, it does not necessarily belong to these views, nor can it explain the party to the people sat alongside it. Our new cadre not necessarily belong to this movement. Is an activist someone who has been active in a place simply for himself? Did he come to take part in action, but has now joined the committee. This person does not belong to any particular form of worker-communism.”<sup>449</sup>*

---

<sup>448</sup> Mansoor Hekmat in the article Goodbye Comrade, 20 April 1999

<sup>449</sup> Mansoor Hekmat - Report and Evaluation of the 14th Plenum of the Party

Mansoor Hekmat was aware that the ideology of worker-communism had failed to foster a layer of cadres, let alone cadres that would dominate worker-communism. After Hekmat's initial treatment and short return to party work, before his cancer returned, he practically admitted that he had failed in fostering a layer of cadres which could promote worker-communism and the worker-communist party in line with worker-communism. At a meeting of the politburo, he said:

*“Even though I am, the party is not in line [with worker-communism]. All of my political life has been about a group that does not need to be convinced to go in this direction, a group that is unafraid and wants to work hard. But it doesn't work hard; it's not like that the worker-communist party in my presence is aligned with worker-communism. It is not! As I will argue in the leadership debate, this has nothing to do with the line of Mansoor Hekmat and Hekmatism. The line of Mansoor Hekmat in the worker-communist party is a pressure group.”*<sup>450</sup>

Hekmat appears here as a prophet with an idea of the absolute, always trying to guide his disciples towards the right path and, despite years of trying to be a saviour by guiding his disciples, they still failed to follow the path of the prophet. Hekmat contemptuously stated that the worker-communist party was not aligned with him or and Hekmatism, with Hekmatists either in the lower layers of the party or outside the party. He did not explain why the leaders and cadres of worker-communism failed to appear in the form of theorists of worker-communism. These rumours were stated by someone who earned the title of the Marx of his

---

<sup>450</sup> From the speech of Mansoor Hekmat at the meeting of the politburo of the Iranian worker-communist party, 7-8 July 2001



era because of such eloquent words. Mansoor Hekmat depicted such a sad picture:

*“If these people were on the line, I wouldn’t have to run this much. Someone managed its congress, another its plenum and someone else brought out its publications. I also did some of the work. There were 50-60 in the anti-populist struggle; we were all working, and I was also doing something. The UCM was led by people like Hamid Taghvae, Khosro Davar, Habib Farzad, Mehdi Mirshahzadeh and others. I was also an activist in the anti-populist movement and a proponent of revolutionary Marxism. I was also one of only a few of them. But that organization was full of activists with their own lines. I was a revolutionary and I was also trying. But, as much as it is now, everything wasn’t tied to me. No one was feeling lonely. If you were tired, you could be sitting in your car, but the UCM would continue to work. The reason for this is that the worker-communist party is not aligned with worker-communism and the leadership does not care about it ... Those who espouse the view that ‘Hekmatists represent our movement’ are either in the bottom ranks or outside the party and not represented at the top. Many who have had their life changed through my writings are in the bottom ranks or outside.”<sup>451</sup>*

At the 14<sup>th</sup> Plenum of the worker-communist Party, Mansoor Hekmat appeared as Christ among his apostles, as if he had had no choice but to demonstrate this virtue and this sophistication, and as if he been elected to the prophetic mission as the sole thinker of worker-communism. He reiterated that worker-communism no longer ruled the worker-communist Party at that time, so it could not rule after it; but he

---

<sup>451</sup> From the speech of Mansoor Hekmat at the meeting of the politburo of the Iranian worker-communist party, 7-8 July 2001

was worried about whether the party would continuing to function, stating:

*“I said at a meeting of the politburo: I don’t have problem with the worker-communist Party being aligned [to worker-communism] after me. It is not in line now, then so be it. Worker-communism is not ruling now, then so be it. Unity and continuing its work are important.”*<sup>452</sup>

Mansoor Hekmat was aware of the power struggle for control of the party in the absence of his authority as well as the kind of generation he had raised. At the last meeting of the politburo of the Iranian Communist Party before his death, he stated that the leadership broke up the party from above:

*“[Mansoor Hekmat] addressed the politburo saying: ‘You, leadership, will break up the party but the bottom ranks will likely stay. The party will be torn apart at the top.’”*<sup>453</sup>

---

<sup>452</sup> Mansoor Hekmat at the 14th Plenum, September 2001

<sup>453</sup> Evaluation of battles and branches of the worker-communism in Iran, part 3, Majid Hosseini, 18<sup>th</sup> January 2008

## **The split in the Iranian worker-communist Party**

The split is the product of the inner contradictions of the worker-communist system of thought. The dissolution and demise of worker-communism are not due to the absence of the ideologue of worker-communism, as some of the disciples declare it; rather, it is the product of the inner contradictions of worker-communism. If the ideologue of worker-communism was alive, the split in worker-communism would have taken place; but, because of the authority of Hekmat, the split would have taken on a different form, as in the 1999 split, which more closely took the form of decomposition and the loss of force.

Internal disagreements had manifested themselves since Hekmat's hospitalization and, in the preceding discussion, we saw how he had stated that the party was falling apart at the top. In the first plenum after his death, disagreements arose over the party's leadership, political situation and tactical policy. The Modaressi wing insisted that the party should have a leader, claiming that the leader's plan had been raised in a battle for political power and that the leader's role is not merely an organizational post but essential to the debate on "the party and society" and "the party and political power". The Taghvaaee wing advocated for collective leadership. It seems that the Modaressi wing won the first round because, after the death of Hekmat, Modaressi became the leader of the party. But, in the plenum held after the Fourth Congress in December 2003, Hamid Taghvaaee took over as the leader of the party. Another triumphant victory for the Taghvaaee wing was the election of Azar Majedi (wife of Mansoor Hekmat who at that time belonged to the Taghvaaee wing) as head of the politburo.

Following the electoral success for the party officials on the Taghvaaee wing, the power struggle took on an acute form. The climax of the power struggle came when 21 members of the pro-Modrasi Central Committee issued a statement about the power struggle (internal disagreements). Following this statement from the 21 Central Committee

members on behalf of the Modaressi wing, the rival wing, the Taghvaei wing, called it a Cold War statement. Hamid Taghvaei, leader of the worker-communist party, on 22 August 2004, just two days before the announcement of the split, in an attempt to form the Hekmatist Party, informed party members about party leadership differences. Since there were only two more supporters from the Modaressi wing on the Central Committee than from the Taghvaei wing, Taghvaei himself proclaimed that the task of determining the fate of the party (power struggle) would not take place via the plenum, but by means of an extraordinary congress, set for 18-19 September 2004. Two days later, on 24 August 2004, the formation of the worker-communist party was announced, and Hekmatism was unleashed. In this power struggle, the Taghvaei wing proclaimed itself the true continuation of worker-communism, while the Modaressi wing declared that its wing was the true defender of Hekmatism. One of the previous leaders of worker-communism in relation to the power struggle between the wings' leaders and how they split offers the following description:

*“On this date, we can clearly see that the two ‘characters’ were ‘on the sidelines’ long before the start of the dispute and since the period of Mansoor Hekmat’s death. This is a fact in the history of worker-communism. Furthermore, a rational evaluation was immediately sought by the existing layer of cadres of the Communist Party, before reaching a state of limbo during that period. This layer accepted and agreed to hand over the fate and powers of worker-communism to those two marginalized characters. It is thus clear about the extent to which the layer of cadres in the worker-communist party was ‘in line’ with the policies and foundations of worker-communism. Obviously, that layer was long been associated with the ‘line’ of marginal elements, and Mansoor Hekmat and the foundations of his worker-communism, a critical tendency and pressure group in the*

*'minority'. The death of Mansoor Hekmat eliminated that critical tendency from the minority and allowed for the emergence of 'mainstream' communist marginal elements on the basis of the active 'cadres' of those lines.*"<sup>454</sup>

Apparently, Hekmat had been part of a critical pressure group, of course, in the minority, in the worker-communist party. The question that must be asked of the worker-communist leader who has currently chosen to sit in a lonely corner is, why did he become a sympathizer of one of these marginalized figures (Modaressi) during the aforementioned disagreements and not continue to defend the positions of Mansoor Hekmat? During the split, the worker-communist Party did not split into two, but it led to the loss of force, in the form of individuals and circles, which were mostly loyal to Hekmat. After the crisis, the worker-communist party and the Hekmatist Party declared themselves true defenders of worker-communism and Hekmatism and considered the other to be heretical to these ideologies.

---

<sup>454</sup> Iraj Farzad - Caught in a Fire and the Light

## Worker-communism and the acknowledgment of failure

Worker-communism was supposed to revive communism and Marxism, not only in Iran but in the world. It was referred to as the “greatest project of communism in modern world history since the Russian Revolution of October 1917”. But the disintegration of worker-communism into sects, as well as the inaccuracy of its policies during social events and the dismantling the framework of worker-communism, eventually forced some of the leaders of worker-communism to admit defeat and propose the formation of communist parties. Mr Modaressi, who once described the worker-communist Party as the greatest project of communism in modern world history, later wrote:

*“In my opinion, the space is open for the formation of other new parties in Iran and in particular in the context of the communist committees that have been formed. Those who have decreed that only those who are the product of the Iranian revolution can organize communism are often practically or mentally exiled. The Hekmatist Party, in my opinion, has so far provided the best platform for the formation of a working-class communist party, and as long as its line and activities remain at least official at this level, there should be more chance for this to happen.”*<sup>455</sup>

The post-Hekmat leader of worker-communism provides further explanation of the conditions and characteristics needed to form the party in question. He writes:

---

<sup>455</sup> Koorosh Modaressi - The Working Class and Organizing the Communist Party

*“Since the 1980s, for the first time, we are returning to internal party organization, and we want to rebuild the party with the new vision we have created in the last 20 years. We should note that we are creating the party in the context of traditional existence, in which people come together outside of their social environment, and our activities are essentially meeting and discussing, with the ultimate goal being to broadcast or encourage participation in those activities.”*<sup>456</sup>

The leader simply states that we must rebuild the party, while admitting that all the propaganda we produced to revive communism and Marxism was nothing more than demagoguery. He accepts that worker-communism had nothing to do with the worker. Rather, it indulged in political charlatanism to justify defeat. But another worker-communist leader grabs his collar and asks, after 22 years of not saying how the leadership of worker-communism would deliver communism: “Why is it now you claim that worker-communism has nothing to do with the worker? You were the leaders of this movement.” He writes:

*“What do they except from us? In order to explain this current situation, they echo the same observations and explanations made 22 years ago at the worker-communism seminars run by Hekmat. They don’t tell us what they have been doing for the past 22 years, relying on the topics of worker-communism? It looks like history has been frozen during this time and nothing happened and nothing changed. We created the Hekmatist party seven years ago, but don’t ask Koorosh Modaressi, myself and the leadership of the Hekmatist party why your party and yourself as leader, why you have not taken any serious steps to resolve these problems? ... They say your communism was supposed to be a big no-no to the whole*

---

<sup>456</sup> Koorosh Modaressi - Communist Committees - Part I

*history, they who spoke in the name of communism after the defeat of the October Revolution about the ideas that were raised in the name of communism and the camps, which were set up in the name of communism. What is it that you have raised from the remnants of this process? A voice that is unrelated to the worker and to the life of the worker, and to the interests of the worker?”<sup>457</sup>*

Not only are the practices and policies of the worker- communist party and later the Hekmatist Party called into question, but also the programme of worker-communism, namely, the “Programme for a Better World”, for which Mansoor Hekmat received the title of the Marx of his era. The internal contradictions of worker-communism once again manifested themselves in the Hekmatist Party. The Hekmatist Party demonstrated its crisis in the form of losing force before its split, which we will refer to later. One of the activists of the Hekmatist Party after separating from it wrote:

*“At the seminar of Azeri Madrasi, Mozaffar’s friends, in declaring the inadequacy and the ‘lack of relevance of the “Programme for a Better World” for the worker’, openly and incidentally spoke with anger and hatred, and everyone heard that one preached of communism’s inefficiencies during the past thirty years, while another said that ‘our nerves were crushed and this form of communism couldn’t do anything’... The question that was posed also goes far beyond this issue, including all talk of the ‘uselessness’ of the ‘Programme for a Better World’ for the worker and worker movements.”<sup>458</sup>*

---

<sup>457</sup> Hossein Moradbigi in Critique of the Seminar on the “Working Class and Organizing the Communist Party”

<sup>458</sup> Abdullah Sharifi - Avoid Giving an Answer



A former member of the Central Committee of the worker-communist unity party, Kamran Pader, assesses the currents that call themselves worker-communism, claiming they are nothing more than sects which have never been part of the communist and worker movements during their lifetimes. The statements of a former member of the Central Committee illustrate the fate of those disillusioned by worker-communism, despite being loyal to Mansoor Hekmat. He writes:

*“This is a continuity story of illusion which repeats the sequence as well as the vain and existential nature of existing sects, which claim that worker-communism is reminiscent of Mansoor Hekmat after his death. But the reality is that the worker-communist party and both Hekmatist currents, all three are deviant and ... The three currents that have claimed to belong to worker-communism throughout their lives have been linked to everything, except workers and communists. The nature and function of these currents, whether in the days of division and separation and throwing slime online, or in the golden age of coincidence and convergence, have been or continue to be irrelevant to the communist movement and the worker movement at all times.”*<sup>459</sup>

---

<sup>459</sup> Kamran Sustainable - On the Worries of Kazem Nikkhah!

## **The practice of worker-communism is bourgeois communist by type**

It had been propagated for years that, outside of worker-communism, no one seeks socialism and communism. It had also been propagated for years that the practice of worker-communism had sought to influence the social life of workers. It had been claimed for years that worker-communism had gifted communism with a class transition, in other words, worker-communism had moved communism away from being a bourgeois movement to a working-class movement. Finally, a member of the Central Committee of the Hekmatist Party declares that their party was not the source of any effect on the social life of workers and the dominant tradition of day-to-day work, operations, behaviours, roles or influence; rather, its practice has been consistent with the type of left and bourgeois communism found in Iran. He writes:

*“I do not forget that I am a member of the Central Committee of the Hekmatist Party. I consider this party to be closer to the worker than any other communist or leftist political organization in Iran. With all this in mind, our party, in social practice up to this moment, except for the historical moments in universities in previous years, has not had any effect on social life. Our party, despite the fact that most of its major policies are correct, has had no impact on the dominant tradition of day-to-day work, operations, behaviours, roles or influence, while its practice has been of the type associated with the left and bourgeois communism in Iran. For this reason, as far as it relates to the working class, as in the rest of the left, no protest tradition in the labour movement*

*sees itself being on the same horizon as the Hekmatist Party and engaged in a joint war.”*<sup>460</sup>

---

<sup>460</sup> Mohammad Fattahi - The Problem with Iranian Communism is not sectarianism but the Bourgeois Nature of its Political Traditions!

## Subsequent crises

Following the split in the Iranian worker-communist party and the formation of the Hekmatist Party, the worker-communist parties in Iraq chose to support the Hekmatists. In reality, then, the Iranian worker-communist party lost its base in Iraq. Thus, the Iranian worker-communist party sought to gain a new foothold in Iraq. It was in line with this policy that it encouraged dissidents from the Iraqi worker-communist faction to form a new party, which became the left worker-communist party of Iraq.

Following discontent within the Iranian worker-communist party, dissidents first formed a faction in December 2006 and then, on 9 June 2007, set up the worker-communist unity party.

The “permanent board political-practical platform” was adopted by the majority of the politburo of the Hekmatist Party in December 2011, the party had departed from the fundamentals of the Mansoor Hekmat line and must change its course with major changes and return to these fundamentals. A minority of the politburo saw it as a seismic shift in the official policies of the party and considered it to be a criticism of the official line of the Hekmatist Party. Meanwhile, most of the politburo accused the minority of lacking principles and behaving like brigands. The Hekmatist Party was divided into two branches. Following the split of the Hekmatist Party into two wings, namely, the majority (Rahman Hosseinzadeh wing) and the minority (Modaresi wing), the Iraqi worker-communist parties favoured the minority wing, which was the biggest blow to the wing led by Rahman Hosseinzadeh. Following the separation of the Modaresi wing from the Hekmatist party, the worker-communism unity party merged with the Hosseinzadeh’s Hekmatist wing.

Eventually, following the rise of discontent in the Hekmatist party (Hosseinzadeh’s faction), some dissatisfied members of the party left and later formed the Revolutionary Socialist Party of Iran. Although this party aligns the “Programme for a Better World” with its own programme and

refers to Mansoor Hekmat, it does not align itself with any other worker-communist party.

Splits have also been associated with the loss of force in the form of individuals or small circles. Most of these individuals or circles, while rejecting non-worker-communist parties, still adhere to the ideology of worker-communism, Mansoor Hekmat and Hekmatism.

## **Last word and conclusion**

A political current's appearance and formation reflect the historical conditions which surround it. Students who supported the *Azarakhsh* magazine would later form the Sahand circle. Sahand emerged as a Stalinist circle. It was strongly influenced and fed by Maoism during its formation and evolution, although the founding of "worker-communism" stems from the crisis of the "third current" and the need to reintegrate it.

The Unity of Communist Militants (UCM) denigrated the leader of Iranian bourgeoisie, Khomeini, and also the clergy of the petty bourgeoisie, but at the same time they believed that the petty bourgeoisie was a revolutionary class. The logical consequence of this reasoning would be that the leader of the bourgeoisie and a criminal such as Khomeini was a revolutionary. Only two months remained until the bloodiest massacres in the modern history of Iran. The bourgeoisie villains declared that there were to be no 'wounded', and that the soldiers should just 'kill in the street'. In such circumstances, in April 1981, the UCM had the only communist programme in the world still obstinately calling for a "petty-bourgeois leadership".

The UCM, with fiery anti-imperialist and anti-American sentiments, appeared in the political milieu as an anti-imperialist movement. According to the beliefs of the UCM, other revolutionary classes are interested in the overthrow of imperialism and the elimination of its intense exploitation and fierce dictatorship. As the working class was not the only class demanding democratic changes, the UCM put forward the slogan "For a people's democratic republic!", ensuring that the interests of other classes are taken into account. In other words, the working class, simply in terms of numbers, must be at the service of the objectives of other classes. The UCM turns workers into cannon fodder under the guise of defending the gains of the revolution in the war between Iran and Iraq.

The UCM used all its efforts to assert that the disgraceful Islamic Republic had failed to overthrow the revolution. In its coup, the bourgeoisie had also failed to suppress the revolution and, despite all the problems, the train of the revolution had continued at pace, thus forcing the bourgeoisie to resort to its operant, Iraq, to suppress the revolution. Workers participating in the war must defend their revolution.

The UCM, with the facilities of Komala, had succeeded in rebuilding the Line 3 under the concept of revolutionary Marxism.

The formation of an aggregation under the name of the communist party of Iran, with the ideology of revolutionary Marxism, effectively prevented the radicalization of these critiques, in practice, preventing them from raising questions about the left of capital. If the blood-bath of the Islamic bourgeoisie had not gone away, if the left of capital had not poisoned the political milieu with its seemingly radical and counter-revolutionary ideology, if the critics had continued to criticize, then it might have been possible to go beyond the critique of these circles and to move towards internationalist positions (communist positions).

The UCM pointed to the revisionist rule of the Soviet and Chinese Communist Parties, which led to the defeat of the world working class by its two major strongholds in these countries. It spoke of Khrushchev's revisionism and defended socialism in one country. It claimed that, even in Ghana, socialism alone could be established, albeit reduced to the level of state capitalism.

Worker-communism, under the name of national movements, sent workers to face imperialist slaughter in Iranian Kurdistan and turned workers into cannon fodder in imperialist conflicts. Worker-communism has made every effort to cover up its reactionary and capital-friendly positions in relation to the unions, while dressed in radical clothing. Worker-communism accuses internationalists of losing their vision and not seeing the reality of the trade union struggle. In short, worker-communism did what it could do, to present unions as worker organizations.

All the nonsense from worker-communism about revolution and overthrowing the state machine is no more than demagoguery. Worker-communism wants to get into the game of political power. Mansoor Hekmat claimed that, through elections, the chances of worker-communism to win political power were greater.

In parliamentarism, parliament is not at the service of communism, but communism is used to legitimize parliament. In parliamentarism, parliamentary representatives play a major role, and the working class plays the role of the infantry for parliamentarism. Parliamentarism is reinforcing the illusion among the working class that others are able to advance struggle on their behalf. This is what worker-communism preaches.

The necessity to overcome the crisis of “revolutionary Marxism”, the alienation of the working class from the Communist Party, the inefficiency of the so-called communist Party, the dilemmas arising from the Iran-Iraq War ceasefire, the dilemma of people living in camps and their social status etc. created the background to the emergence of the ideology of worker-communism: in other words, the crisis of revolutionary Marxism, and how it came about, raised the need for an alternative to worker-communism.

The rise of the working class as a **social class** raised the necessity for scientific communism (Marxism). But, unlike Marxism, the starting point for worker-communism was the response that Mansoor Hekmat himself had received. Apparently, he had discovered a new “elixir” with which to skilfully resolve, albeit temporarily, the crisis of revolutionary Marxism or, more likely, to postpone it again. He succeeded in transmitting the crisis of revolutionary Marxism to worker-communism, which then manifested itself in the crisis of worker-communism.

Hekmat wanted to gain political power on the backs of the people and through the people, not through the working class. He claimed that a labour party, despite being a minority, could gain political power and become a majority: that equated to about 1.5% of the Iranian population at



that time he made this claim, i.e., not the working class. Of course, Hekmat elsewhere explained what he meant by the process of overthrowing the Islamic Republic and gaining political power. This overthrow could be the result of a US military strike similar to the overthrow of the Taliban in Afghanistan, of Saddam in Iraq, and so on.

Certain conditions, such as World War II or liberation movements and the like, which created a chance for worker-communism, prior to coming to power, would provide more solid grounds for presenting a new kind of ideology such as Hoxhaism, although not as important as in the case of Albania. However, ideologists of worker-communism made great efforts to put forward the ideology of “Marxism-Hekmatism”, and Mansoor Hekmat himself played a significant role in its introduction.

Worker-communism was supposed to revive communism and Marxism, not only in Iran but in the world. But worker-communism itself collapsed because of its internal contradictions; it was no longer possible to delay the crisis of worker-communism. In the last plenum of the worker-communist Party before his death, Hekmat appeared as Christ among his apostles, as if he had had no choice but to demonstrate this virtue and this sophistication and been elected to the prophetic mission as the sole thinker of worker-communism. He reiterated that worker-communism was not ruling the worker-communist party at that time, so it could not rule after it; but he was worried about the party continuing to work.

It had been propagated for years that, outside of worker-communism, no one seeks socialism and communism. It had also been propagated for years that the practice of worker-communism had sought to influence the social life of workers. It had been claimed for years that worker-communism had gifted communism with a class transition, in other words, worker-communism had moved communism away from being a bourgeois movement to a working-class movement. Finally, a member of the Central Committee of the Hekmatist Party declares that their party was not the source of any effect on the social life of workers

and the dominant tradition of day-to-day work, operations, behaviours, roles or influence; rather, its practice has been consistent with the type of left and bourgeois communism found in Iran.

Not only are the practices and policies of worker-communist parties called into question, but worker-communism's "Programme for a Better World" itself is as well. Remember, this was the programme for which Mansoor Hekmat had acquired the nickname of the Marx of his era.

In defence of Marxism and against the slinging of proletarian goals and aspirations by the left wing of capital, we studied and examined worker-communism, from the formation of its circle to the collapse of worker-communism and to the parties and circles, and we have shown that this intellectual tendency, as the left wing of the bourgeoisie, in all social incidents has been against the working class and the class struggle. The fact is that, when capitalism entered the age of its decline, this ushered in the era of communist revolutions and imperialist wars. The bourgeoisie has lost its progressive role, while its most radical conscience is in the service of wage slavery and is embarrassing in favour of the existence of wage slaves. Imagine if, during World War I, the majority of working-class parties working under the name of social democrats had joined the bourgeoisie camp forever, whereas the currents that were loyal to proletarian aims worked as communist parties. Following the defeat of the tide of world revolution and in the process of the decline of the Communist International, this time, the parties operating as "communists" joined the bourgeoisie camp forever.

The advent of the wave of world revolution - and, with it, those problems that challenged the advance of world revolution - prepared the material context for the communist left. The signs of the defeat of this wave of world revolution led to the isolation of the October Revolution, which soon showed signs of degeneration. The decadent process of the October Revolution had an impact on all communist parties and revolutionary currents. In such a context, the necessity for the existence of the communist left was more and more prominent. Internationalists from

Bulgaria to Germany, from Russia to America, from Britain to the Netherlands, from Italy to ... rose to defend communist positions. But, in three countries where the Marxist tradition was strong, namely, in Russia, Germany and Italy, the communist left turned out to be strong and coherent. In short, the reaction of the communist left was a global response.

Now, the task and honour of defending communist and proletarian positions have been given to the communist left.

## **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 classes are **the fundamental 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.