

# Ideological Struggle

## Why We Revealed The Ideological Debates To The Public

### Part I: A Summary Of Our Present Situation And The Deviation Towards The Right Within Our Organization.

It has been more than a year that we have been facing an internal organizational crisis on a political, ideological and organizational basis. After passing through the first round of contradictions and disagreements, which were primarily reflected between the "Central Committee" and the former editors of KAR and because of the insufficiency of the organization's internal debates concerning specific political questions about the "Central Committee's" line and program, they announced that the Executive Council of the organization could not practically be held.

Seven months ago, during the organization's Plenary, the fundamental roots of and solutions to the crisis were evaluated. At that time, ideological and political contradictions became evident,

causing the "majority" and "minority", in accordance with their positions and stands toward questions concerning the internal crisis, which have now taken a more specific formation. The Plenary resolutions, which were set out by the "majority", because of their deviated positions and in the absence of any principled agreement by the "majority" comrades, not only could not provide suitable grounds for the correct solution to the crisis within the organization, but also were based on instability and ambiguity which resulted from lack of knowledge and confusion on the part of a majority of participating comrades, regarding that content of principled relations between the majority and minority wings within the organization and this brought about such a situation and cir-

cumstances which spread the crisis to a wider extent.

In the Plenary, discussions concerning the reasons for the crisis and solutions for it were summarized into two basically different analyses with respect to the fundamental roots of the crisis, and this resulted in two policies and two totally separate and contradictory lines, as follows.

A) In the ideological debates that are being organized, we must follow the path of answering the urgent needs of the movement and manifest our aims, program, strategy and tactics in order to solve the crisis. In this process, we would re-evaluate the previous deviation during the setting out of goals, program, strategy and tactics, (stages of revolution, revolutionary program, etc.) The different views and deviations of the right and left wings will become clear and from this, the ideological - political alliances will be dealt with at the Congress.

B) The ideological debates must be organized with regard to the ideological line of the past, along the basis of "strengthening of principles." This strengthening is in order to achieve an

## An Analysis of the Split in the OIPFG

ideological basis of Marxism-Leninism. During this process, a manifesto reflecting the newly developed position will be established and regulated according to approval by the central body or Congress and will be announced to all the public. After finishing this process, we would then establish our goals, programs, strategy and tactics and call a Congress to approve them.

C) In order to solve the ideological crisis, there would be organized the two following and connected procedures, with emphasis on their priority and secondary importance.

1) The previous ideological system must necessarily be confronted on the basis of "strengthening of principles" and achieving a minimum base of Marxism-Leninism. Reaching this base is necessary for agreement in principled moves and progress in political unity and the establishment of a program and goals. At the end of this process, the changed ideological positions within the organization will be established and regulated for approval by the Congress.

2) In the ongoing process of organized ideological debate, the stratification of goals and a program of

*Continued on page 6*



# An Analysis of the Split in the OIPFG

*Continued from page 6*

strategy and tactics will begin and be continued. During this process, there will be struggle against new forms of left and right opportunism and possible alliances will be formed. At the conclusion of this process, the Congress will be called and its resolutions will be recognized as the strategic ideological positions of the organization. The ideological - political sectors which are formed during the process will be dealt with in the Congress.

(The above sections were quoted from the Plenary Pamphlet)

In the above summarizations, paragraph C was approved. Paragraph A was the "Minority" position and paragraphs B and C (although there are some differences between them, they are essentially the same) express the "Majority" positions.

The contents of the Plenary discussions show that from the ideological and political points of view, they evaluated the fundamental roots of the crisis within the context of two contradictory views.

One was based upon revolutionary Marxism-Leninism and the other based upon opportunism and tailing after the events. During the process, the two currents would necessarily expose the contradictions at the time of confrontation between the different political issues. As you may have noticed, during the Plenary we declared that, following the insurrection, the current intensifying class struggle and the acute political situation will force us to organize and confront the ideological debate between the two currents concerning an analysis of the present situation, determining political strategy and necessary tactical tasks for Communists and, by answering the above necessary questions, will accomplish the evaluation of the nature and necessity for waging armed struggle (in the past) by Communists.

We announced this suggested line and program as the only way of "principled agreement" for the progress of ideological debate, which would guarantee our conscious participation in the unfolding class struggle in society and that will lead the way toward "principled agreement" between the current differences.

The second line, that was put forward by the "Central Committee" resorted to using abstract categories to "strengthen principles", achieving a minimum Marxist-Leninist ideological base (!!!) and for hiding their right-oriented stand. By using different excuses they eluded taking a specific position toward questions of program and tactics.

The "Majority" sector was accepting two different ideological views in their evaluation of the fundamental roots of the crisis in words, but not in essence, for their action, at exactly the time when the Plenary began to get to the solution of the crisis, it was obvious that they were seeking fundamental roots of the crisis through members of the organization within the movement and ignored the objective conditions of the working class, the class struggle of the toiling masses and the necessity for Communist leadership. In fact, the "Central Committee", in taking and propagandizing the positions that they did and still insist upon served to spread ideas which led to condemning the Iranian Communist movement to be separated from the spontaneous worker's movement. At the time of the presentation of a solution to the crisis, the spontaneous and protesting workers' movement and the peo-

sant's and people's democratic struggle to gain land and their rights of self-determination were forcing us to follow them.

Exactly for this reason, mobilizing and providing the forces in the organization to draft a strategic base, program and proletarian tactic is our most important task.

What could it have meant and still mean to talk ideological debates to re-evaluate past tactics as being the fundamental task of the organization, except to say that the representatives of these ideas were placing their sectarian interests over the fundamental interests of the movement and the interests of the working class, and that the confusion in their thoughts, which was a cover for pragmatists views within the organization was theorized and propagandized all throughout our organization. In a metaphysical way, the "Central Committee's" attitude concerning ideological debate has no proximity to a material understanding of the concepts of Marxist ideological debate. Misunderstanding to dialectics of mutual relations in the organization, ideological debate and the struggle of the working class in these acute circumstances is itself representative of the narrow-sighted and limited views of the "Central Committee" with respect to the long term interests of the working class and the masses' democratic movement.

Those who have achieved their original aims through anti-organizational factionalism after the Plenary (afterwards, two of the "Minority" comrades, one a member of the "Central Committee" and the other an advisory member, in accordance with Plenary resolutions, had to resign from the KAR editorial board in order to await the final decisions) found, more than ever, the scene suitable for their righteous aims. This time, by denying the Plenary resolutions which, through their own suggestion, were approved, they were purposely ignoring every kind of Communist principle and leading the crisis, in all its dimensions, to a point of explosion. Plenary resolutions stated that until the final formation of views during the process of ideological debates and until the political - ideological positions could be dealt with in a Congress that would be called for these issues, there must neither be position taking or analysis concerning either the past line of the organization or the present ruling circle. Instead, the political positions that were propagandized by the "Central Committee" through the use of different excuses and various covers and these comrades gradually and without consulting anyone, began to dismiss "Minority" comrades from their organizational positions and continued this practice without stopping. (All the printed analyses in KAR # 35 and in following issues concerning the ruling circle and the articles printed in the local organs are evidence of the "Central Committee" ignoring the Plenary resolutions. All those were written without consulting the opinions of any members within the organization.)

The internal struggle within our organization against the influence and spread of bourgeois and petty bourgeois ideology, which has been deliberately reflected as an ideological debate against the views of the "Central Committee" is in no way related to minute and trivial issues or limited to some organizational problems, but, because of its deep political and ideological origins, it manifests itself in all the fundamental and important issues in class struggle and theoretical and practical presentations.

The organization's political line and its positions on internal and external ideological debate, which should be determined and based on the need for a proletarian class struggle to guide the organization's activities and that of its supporters, was instead misguided and side-tracked by the "Central Committee". The comrades of the "Central Committee", either because of their lack of a stable position in relation to parties and main currents and the class nature within the ruling circle, or, at least so far, they have eluded outward acknowledgement that these exist, have shifted to the "right" and, at the same time, have adopted tactics based on sudden evaluations and temporary incidents. Such a situation has led the organization to adopt tactics and positions not in relation to the strategic goals and objectives of the organization but are based upon immediate interests and momentary rewards and benefits. Above all, the "Central Committee" is more concerned with gaining influence and establishing a "mass base" in the same way as opportunist European parties, than to think of the long term concerns and interests of the proletarian movement and mass movements. Thus, by going along with Bernstein's premise that, "The movement is everything but the goal is nothing," they have, in effect abandoned the fundamental principle of Communism, that is, that the liberation and victory of the proletariat and toiling masses is only possible through an independent proletarian course of action. Instead of relying on the proletarian class interests in their historical context, the "Central Committee" is searching for alliances with those on the top and is eyeing the different factions within the ruling circle. On the one hand, the domination of pragmatic views and the nature of the tendency to move to the "right" and, on the other hand, lack of reliance on the organized masses and ignorance of democratic centralism has come to be seen as the two distinguishing characteristics of the "Central Committee" in its ideological debate and the method of organizational and political guidance. The development of growing class struggle and the necessity to take up a specific and overt position on questions and acute political issues has been reflected in the evolution of two lines within the organization.

On one hand, the undemocratic and unprincipled actions of the "Central Committee", in establishing illogical relations between the "minority" and the "majority" currents within the organization, their reluctance to acknowledge the democratic rights of the "minority" in political, ideological and organizational matters, ignorance and lack of consideration for the opinions of the people within the organization in adopting and implementing the political line and program, repeatedly defying the rules and principles of the organization through using the Center's leverage and, on the other hand, and the most determining factor in our decision, the adoption of a method of compromise and submission in the class struggle and coalition with that powerful faction that happens to be gaining in the internal power struggle within the government, provoking confusion in the people, taking accelerated positions on theory and practice and heading toward opportunism and thinking more like the "Tudeh" Party; all this has made us bring into the open the internal struggle despite the opposition of the "Central Body" to this.

What we consider as an essential concern in the context of democratic

rights of the "minority" within the organization and that we consider as our fundamental concern, is an open ideological debate. We take it for granted that without bringing the ideological debate into the open, to fight with all our powers against the opportunism of the "Central Body", we will not be fulfilling our revolutionary tasks. In our opinion, open ideological debate can not only serve to present the ideological and political identification of the revolutionary wing of the organization within the proletarian - Communist movement, but also that it is primarily the only effective means of revolutionary struggle against containing the spread of the opportunist and revisionist tendencies and to protect the revolutionary current of our organization. Our goal is not mere criticism but that of isolating opportunism. This type of struggle is not based on prevailing bureaucracy in the organization but its base is a revolutionary one.

Such an undertaking by us is an effort to awaken and raise the awareness of the supporters of the organization and all those within the Iranian Communist movement who have a high regard for our organization. We believe that in a situation where factionalism is predominating our ideological principles, the foremost concern should be to disclose to the public the nature of the disputes and the approach of each of the two currents toward controversial questions. Thus, the public will be able to judge for itself.

Lastly, we have to mention that even though we regret the influence of opportunism in the "Central Committee", we never forget Lenin's teaching that, "Even the best of the representatives of democracy cannot limit themselves to mourning for confusion of thought, doubts and loss of belief in principles, whereas Marxists search for class roots of such a social phenomenon." (Lenin: *Ideological Debate in the Working Class Movement*)

\* KAR No. 61, June 3, 1980.

TO BE CONTINUED IN THE NEXT ISSUE.

