

**A. Both Trots and Revisionists Deny the  
Marxist Truth that the Third World's  
Fight for Countries' Independence and  
National Liberation  
Weakens the Superpowers  
and Serves the People's and Proletarian  
Revolution in All Countries**

The counter-revolutionary sect, the "RC" P, has attacked the heroic fight of the Zimbabwean people. Blinded by their chauvinist faith in the strength of the two superpowers, the Trotskyite "RC" P does not believe that a third world country can fight off imperialism. In their March 7, 1980 ragsheet, "*Revolutionary*" *Worker*, they call ZANU's victory a "shameless capitulation and sellout of the struggle of the Zimbabwean people." This is nothing new. "RC" P is following the PLP's beaten path of Trotskyism. Right after the Sandinista National Liberation Front (SNLF) had waged armed struggle, kicked out U.S. imperialism and formed a national front govern-

ment in Nicaragua, PLP jumped out and screamed "turn the guns against the SNLF." This is exactly what "RC" P is saying. When ZANU needs the most support, "RC" P shouts "turn the guns against Mugabe and ZANU!" The only difference between PLP and "RC" P is that "RC" P is afraid to *openly* drop Mao Tsetung Thought and the need to support struggles for democratic and anti-imperialist governments in third world countries. Blinded by their Trotskyism, both the "RC" P and the PLP fail completely to see how the national liberation struggles of the third world directly aid the preparation for revolution here in

the U.S.

With the seizure of the U.S. embassy (read spy-base) in Teheran, the Trot "RC" P after viciously attacking the Iranian revolution had the rug pulled out from under them. They are forced to mutate their line to avoid being openly allied with the superpowers, the U.S. and the Soviet Union. Meanwhile, formerly centrist and now revisionist forces like the *Guardian*, which before attacked the Iranian revolution and Khomeini for denying women's rights and freedom of the press in the abstract, have also been forced to deodorize their coverage for fear of smelling too openly pro-imperialist.

Their basic argument is that Khomeini is losing his grip on Iran and thus he either instigated or supports the action of the students to keep himself in power. On November 14, 1979, the *Guardian* came right out and said: "Many observers have speculated that the protest was organized with Khomeini's blessings in order to divert attention from increasing internal problems. High unemployment continues to plague the economy, housing and other necessities are in short supply, and the contradictions with Khomeini's policies continue to mount." This was repeated on December 19: "At the same time, significant opposition to Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini's use of the crisis to consolidate the control of the country by the Shiite clergy, headed by himself, has simmered just below the surface." (This is from an article titled "Internal Contradictions Plague Iran.")

The Trotskyite "RC" P has never for a moment hidden its hatred for the Iranian government led by Ayatollah Khomeini. The pages of its newspaper are filled with feature-length articles on the subject. "... the Khomeini-Bazargan government has clamped down on the workers' struggles in all spheres. . . ." It calls a Deputy Prime Minister of the government a "... reactionary whose crimes against the Kurdish people rival those committed by the butchers of the Shah's regime. . . ." And again, "Meanwhile, the head of the government's 'revolutionary courts', Ayatollah Khalkali, bloodied his hands with another 20 executions. . ." and "... recently they have even set up a 'special task force,' little different from those organized by SAVAK under the Shah to attack the proletarian movement." And summing up their line on the government, they say "... the Khomeini-Bazargan government's desperate lashing out at the Kurds is a sign of its underlying weakness and its reactionary nature."

The confrontation between the U.S. and Iran over the "hostage" question and Khomeini's staunch stand, however, have forced these political speculators to quietly *mutate their position* on the "reactionary nature" of the Iranian government and Ayatollah Khomeini in their December 7, 1979 issue of "*Revolutionary Worker*". There they state "While Khomeini most certainly cannot be relied on to continue the

struggle, nevertheless his present stand is an opportunity for the Iranian people to step up their fight against imperialism. And the stand of the U.S. proletariat must be to support this and all manifestations of genuine national and patriotic resistance in Iran and countries like it, that weaken our common enemy. When faced with the choice between Khomeini and the revolutionary struggle of the Iranian proletariat and the oppressed masses, we will definitely choose the latter. But when faced with a choice between Khomeini and the U.S. imperialists we will definitely choose Khomeini!"

**"What the "RC" P wants to ignore here is simply the reality of imperialism . . . Thus, even after a half-century of struggle against Trotskyism in the ranks of the proletariat the "RC" P still mumbles Trotsky's famous words, 'If I had a choice . . .'"**

What the "RC" P wants to ignore here is simply the reality of imperialism. They accidentally forgot that the problem is the imperialists have "deprived" a clear cut and simple "choice" to all revolutions in oppressed nations, forcing the pretended choice between the national bourgeoisie and the proletariat or between the imperialists and the national bourgeoisie. Moreover, who is the revolutionary proletariat? In a number of third world countries it practically doesn't exist. The "RC" P is blinded to the question of how you *develop* the proletariat in the crucible of real class struggle.

Thus, even after a half-century of struggle against Trotskyism in the ranks of the proletariat, the "RC" P still mumbles Trotsky's famous words, "If I had a choice . . ."

But the reactionary Trotskyite, pro-imperialist thrust of the "RC" P's line can't be missed. They reiterate that Khomeini is using the embassy takeover by the students to push his own ends — getting through the newly-drafted constitution of the Islamic Republic of Iran. This in itself is ridiculous as the constitution was supported by the vast majority of the population in a voting turnout of way over 95%. It shows, however, that the "RC" P echoes the ladies and gentlemen of the *Guardian* and the real position of the Soviet bosses in their common complaint that Khomeini is using the crisis to shore up his power base in Iran.

Blinded by their Trotskyite and revisionist world



outlook, the "RC" P, *Guardian* and other assorted political speculators can't possibly understand what is actually going on – the position that Khomeini is taking, his relation to the people's movement and the nature of the third world national bourgeoisie in the era of imperialism. They always see only the struggle aspect between Khomeini and other national bourgeoisie, on the one hand, and the masses on the other. This is metaphysical through and through. It liquidates the forefront question in a third world country – the fight against the two superpowers' aggression and subversion. It liquidates the unity aspect in the united front against the two superpowers.

Because the Trots deny the objective situation of the various classes under imperialism, they are reduced to attacking Khomeini as a religious fanatic, echoing imperialist media like *Time*, *Newsweek*, and the *New York Times*. Before the embassy takeover, the "RC" P never mentioned a word about the *dual* aspect of the national bourgeoisie or its representative, Khomeini, in relation to the movement for people's revolution. On the one hand, the national bourgeoisie of a third world country fight imperialism because they want to run the country for their own material interest free from superpower plunder and interference. On the other

hand, they vacillate and can go over to one or another imperialist power if they are threatened by the people's movement. That's why for the proletariat there is *both* unity and struggle in the united front with them in protecting the country's independence and national liberation.

But in the era of imperialism, for third world countries the bottom line is whether or not they resist imperialism, no matter what class the leaders come from, their views or even their motives. Whatever they do to fight imperialism weakens it directly and aids the world's peoples in fighting their main enemies, the U.S. and Soviet Union. That's the main and fundamental criterion in the era of imperialism.

The "RC" P are bourgeois psychologists. As reactionary idealists, they believe the *motives* of an individual determine the objective effects of the third world countries' and peoples' fight against imperialism. This is an anti-materialist and anti-communist outlook. Though a Moslem clergyman, a religious believer in god, Khomeini is part of the Iranian national united front opposing both superpowers. His objective political practice (i.e., his fight for Iran's national independence) proves him to be a relatively consistent anti-imperialist – regardless of his ideology. As Chairman Mao summed up: **"No matter what classes, parties or individuals in an oppressed nation join the revolution, and no matter whether they themselves are conscious of the point or understand it, so long as they oppose imperialism, their revolution becomes part of the proletarian-socialist world revolution and they became its allies."** (On *New Democracy*, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, pp. 343-344) For communists, who are dialectical materialists, there is unity and struggle between motive and effect: the question is: in the era of imperialism, do we look at an individual's ideology by itself or do we look at the *political actions and effects* on the superpowers? Even honest working class leaders are affected by some form of bourgeois ideology. But the course of events – fighting shoulder to shoulder and under our leadership against the bourgeoisie, with communist agitation and propaganda done day-to-day on all events of all classes – brings them over to become or support communists regardless of certain ideological problems inherited from capitalist society.

Thus, to hit Khomeini on the basis that he is using the movement for Iran's independence to try to consolidate his role completely begs the question of his *objective* role at this time, as well as the present character and motive force of revolution. The question is: regardless of who leads the Iranian revolution, is it anti-imperialist or not? Only by grasping this question correctly and proceeding from there can the proletarian revolution be pushed forward in Iran. Stalin was very clear on this point – no matter what they call themselves or what they believe, the fight waged by a feudalist like the Emir of Afghanistan is objectively revolutionary while those socialists who supported

their own imperialist bourgeoisie in World War I are worthless reactionaries. As he said, "The revolutionary character of a national movement under the conditions of imperialist oppression does not necessarily presuppose the existence of proletarian elements in the movement, the existence of a revolutionary or a republican programme of the movement, the existence of a democratic basis of the movement. The struggle that the Emir of Afghanistan is waging for the independence of Afghanistan is objectively a revolutionary struggle, despite the monarchist views of the Emir and his associates, for it weakens, disintegrates and undermines imperialism; whereas the struggle waged by such "desperate" democrats and "socialists," "revolutionaries" and republicans as, for example . . . during the imperialist war was a reactionary struggle, for its result was the embellishment, the strengthening, the victory of imperialism." (*Foundations of Leninism*, p.75-76)

This is precisely why even if Iran's government is run by "conservative Muslim clergy" it makes not a whit of difference with regard to the anti-imperialist nature of the struggle. In fact the Soviet revisionists are masters at making false distinctions to cover up their speculating on one national liberation group against another, thus splitting up genuine national liberation movements, as in Angola. There, they called the MPLA "socialist" and the other national liberation groups — who also fought the Portuguese colonialists — "reactionary." By engaging in this name-calling in pursuit of their superpower aims, they liquidate the main criterion — whether or not these groups fight imperialism. In politics, words are cheap. It's what you do that counts.

In action, *what is the motive force in history?* Is it the people of the world, like the third world people's striving for self-reliance, cutting off the hand of imperialist plunder and domination, the line Khomeini is taking? Is it possible to be self-reliant or not? By the way, even the *Wall Street Journal* admits that Iran is becoming more self-sufficient in food, with wheat crops increasing since the Shah's fall because of the revolution's unleashing the Iranian people. Or is it Castro, Ethiopia's Mengistu and the Soviet-dominated ruling clique in Afghanistan who go to Moscow and beg for aid on their knees? Castro has gone so far as to say that it is impossible for the third world to be self-reliant and therefore it must rely on the Soviets, basically condemning those countries to continued oppression by imperialism, like Cuba itself.

Whether or not you fight imperialism is the fundamental line of demarcation in the era of imperialism. And any other distinctions are irrelevant at best, and sinister at worst, outside the context of that fundamental distinction.

There are relatively more progressive and consistently anti-imperialist elements as well as relatively backward. But our fundamental stand is to encourage



**Anti-U.S. demonstration in Iran. Whether or not you fight imperialism is the fundamental line of demarcation in the era of imperialism.**

and support any and all opposition to the superpowers, including the Soviet Union.

### **THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE NATIONAL AND COMPRADOR BOURGEOISIE IN THE THIRD WORLD**

As we stated in *Workers Viewpoint Journal* 5 in 1978: Revisionists, Trotskyites and some U.S. Pan-Africanists raise the point that Mobutu is a "comprador" who oppresses the Zairean people and therefore must be overthrown by any means. The PanAfricanists denounce the oppression of the people and want Mobutu overthrown, but are blinded to the larger picture, the struggle against the main enemies of the people of the world, the Soviet and U.S. superpowers, and end up with an incorrect line on the question. The revisionists, on the other hand, not giving a damn about the interests of the third world, but out to serve the chauvinist national — that is, imperialist — interests of the Soviet New Tsars, use the position to justify Soviet aggression against the third and second worlds.

In November 1965, Joseph D. Mobutu, then a major general and commander of the army, dissolved the civilian government and proclaimed himself president. Whatever his origin, Mobutu did play the historic role of unifying Zaire and keeping it unified under his regime. An example of this was his embarking upon a policy of "authenticity" which involved the adoption of African names for people, places and things to



**Mao greets President Mobutu of Zaire in March, 1975 in Peking. To consistently fight imperialism, especially the two superpowers, we must first of all support the national sovereignty of third world countries and every move by leaders like Mobutu against the imperialists.**

solidify national unity. And in 1967 he nationalized the country's largest mining company, the Belgian-owned Union Minière du Haut Katanga, which became the General Congolese Ore Company. He did this because he has his own interest to protect as a bourgeoisie of a third world country. He wants to protect the interests of his class — to keep Zaire's market and labor for themselves to exploit. But also because of this Mobutu opposes the imperialists and their attempts to dismember his country, and he takes certain progressive stands with the third world like opposing Portuguese colonialism in Africa. Thus, although helpless before the onslaught of the imperialists and having to call on one to help drive off the other, he has interests to protect from the imperialist powers.

The development of this national interest and alongside it the opposition to imperialism from rulers such as Mobutu is due to a great extent to a new factor in history — the rise of the third world. After World War II, many colonies were granted formal independence by their colonial masters but rulers were set up backed by the U.S. or the former colonial powers. This was the case with Marcos of the Philippines, Sukarno of Indonesia, as well as Mobutu. Although backed by imperialists, they developed national interests which ran counter to the imperialists' wishes. Examples are Diem of Vietnam and Haile Selassie of Ethiopia, both of whom were overthrown and murdered by the same superpower that originally backed them, the U.S.,

exactly because they were developing independent interests.

This process was propelled forward with the growing strength of the third world as a new contemporary anti-imperialist force. With the development of this factor, rulers like Mobutu latched onto it to defend his own interests, such as protecting resources like oil, copper, coffee, etc. Therefore, when we look at rulers like Mobutu, we must see the overall and real trend and motion and not get stuck with rigid metaphysical conceptions ("either he's all for Zaire or all for imperialism") outside the development of the international situation.

Many of the rulers of the third world were comprador bourgeoisie (which is by no means a rigid definition when applied to real life), but they can now *develop* into national bourgeoisie with dual aspects — on the one hand against imperialism to protect their class interest, and on the other hand exploiting and oppressing their own peoples. Often but not as a rule (like Sadat of Egypt), they side with imperialists when the people are ready and rising up to overthrow them. by the very class nature of the national bourgeoisie in the era of imperialism, they are unstable. No national bourgeoisie is totally consistent against imperialism. They differ only in degree, and the degree certainly varies with the times.

So definitely the proletarian parties and socialist countries can facilitate and benefit from the develop-

ment of the anti-imperialist aspect, that is, understanding the laws that govern them and adopting correct policies to encourage the progressive aspects while maintaining independence. For example, the proletarian parties in imperialist countries by opposing their own bourgeoisie's imperialist measures can expose and pressure them to stop outright invasion and covert interference. This not only helps to educate the masses in the imperialist countries about the nature of the government, but can facilitate the development of the world-wide struggle against imperialism. Socialist countries, for example, can develop genuine mutually beneficial trade relations and aid the third world countries so as to lessen their dependence on imperialist powers and strengthen their national independence, which in turn naturally weakens the imperialists.

Regardless of how some of these rulers came into power after World War II, most of them did ride into power with ties to one imperialist power or another, since many of the third world countries got political independence through political negotiations and not through straight military victory. The imperialists certainly prefer these rulers over communists and more consistent anti-imperialist nationalists. But again times have changed. And the larger motion of the third world has made some of these rulers more conscious of their own class interest, which is tied to national interests.

But there are instances when we have to criticize the national bourgeoisie. When Mobutu called in the French and Belgian troops during the invasion by the Soviet-backed and instigated Katanganese Gendarmes, this was not in the national interest of Zaire. Once the French and Belgians got in they proceeded to take control of the economy. The International Monetary Fund (IMF) took over the financial ministry of Zaire. Imperialist banks moved in to force an austerity program on Zaire. It's one thing for Mobutu to take arms from the one imperialist to fight another but it is not in the national interest of Zaire to invite the imperialist troops in.

The other instance was the invasion of Uganda by Julius Nyerere in March 1979 under the pretext that Amin was a fascist butcher and "human rights" violator. Definitely Amin has to be overthrown, but this should be done by the Ugandan people not 15,000 Tanzanian troops. Nyerere's act not only constitutes a violation of Uganda's sovereignty, but more importantly it gives the imperialists a pretext to invade *either* Uganda or Tanzania in the future. Nyerere's argument is no different from the argument of the Israeli Zionists who claim that Africa is backward because you have feudal rulers like Amin who murder the people, so that the Israeli Zionists must go in and "civilize" the Africans.

Many people supported Nyerere claiming that Tanzania is progressive while Uganda is reactionary. But this put the question outside the era of imperialism.

This is the same as Angola when the Soviet Union claimed that the MPLA was the only progressive national liberation group while the other groups were reactionary, as a means to bring MPLA to power and try to make Angola a neo-colony. On the question of Uganda, Nyerere's justification is no different from the imperialists' and Zionists'. It has set a serious precedent for the imperialists to launch a future invasion of both Tanzania and Uganda. And today the Ugandan people are no closer to liberation.

Why is it crucial to support the sovereignty of Uganda and Zaire, even with the oppressive regime of someone like Amin or Mobutu? How does it fit into the struggle against imperialism, especially the two superpowers, and in the final analysis against all reaction?

The consolidation of third world countries into nations and having genuine independence is against the interests of imperialism. Imperialists' interests force them to intervene everywhere and violate all nations' sovereignty in order to be able to export capital, seize and exploit sources of raw materials, dominate markets and superexploit labor. Therefore, political sovereignty of nations hinders or prevents them from carrying out their goals. Communists must take a consistent stand for the safeguarding of the third world's national sovereignty. To allow any imperialist or other sovereign country to violate Zaire's sovereignty through the use of mercenaries, with a proxy army, under the cover of "national liberation" or worse, justifying it, is to throw open the gates for the superpowers to invade and undercut sovereignty with impunity anywhere in the world. It would allow the superpowers to run rampant into any third world country with the flimsiest of reasons, including Carter's bogus "human rights" smokescreen.

Thus to *consistently* fight imperialism, especially the two superpowers, we must *first of all support* the national sovereignty of third world and second world countries, and every move made by leaders like Mobutu or the Philippines' Marcos insofar as they take stands (as in OPEC) against the imperialists. An example is Mobutu's struggle against Portuguese colonialism and the recognition of the People's Republic of China. This aids the struggle for national liberation, because imperialism is the main prop of reaction in third world countries and thus whatever weakens imperialism on a world scale also surely weakens internal reaction. Those who blindly oppose Mobutu without looking at the concrete political content of his acts in fact aid the two superpowers to whip up contradictions among third world countries, and among different nationalities and nations within.

The situation in Ethiopia and Somalia is an example, where the Soviet Union armed both third world countries. To the extent that they can, the Soviets will always use differences and make them antagonistic, weaken the country and carry out their interference and domination, in contention with other imperialists to be



Trots like the "RC" P and PLP, forgetting about imperialism, make the criminal call to "turn the guns around" against Mugabe and ZANU in Zimbabwe (shown here) and the Sandinistas in Nicaragua.

top dog imperialist. This is an objective law governing imperialism. Therefore, communists must support the Organization of African Unity (OAU) which says differences such as on borders should be settled through peaceful negotiations and through mutual consultation.

### RELATION BETWEEN THE FIGHT FOR COUNTRIES' INDEPENDENCE AND CLASS STRUGGLE WITHIN THIRD WORLD COUNTRIES

The peoples of third world countries will determine their own future. It is a law of history that the proletariat and the peasantry will grasp Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought themselves and from their own experiences, with the help of communists, and apply it to the actual conditions in their own country. This is the way that the fight against imperialism and for national liberation will be able to be consistently carried out. This is the only way that the oppressed people in those countries will be finally emancipated. In other words, revolution cannot be exported. For it is, in the final analysis, the masses themselves of the country who have to carry these revolutions through to the end. In today's world, given the correct foreign policies of socialist countries, like the consistent proletarian internationalism of socialist countries in defending the sovereignty of third world countries, including unconditional material aid and the establishment of mutually beneficial trade, as well as forming anti-imperialist blocs along political and economic fronts is the implementation of the Leninist

policy of peaceful coexistence. This will influence the proletariat and other revolutionary elements to see the future and the correct social system for themselves. And in turn, they have to and will carry these revolutions out by themselves, through to the end.

Foreign policy is a concentrated expression of the internal economic system. It is imperialist countries that have to violate the sovereignty of other countries to export their capital and industrial goods in order to maintain their system. Unlike the Soviet Union, where capitalism has been fully restored, genuine socialist countries are not compelled by their internal economic system to export capital and industrial goods. They're not compelled to export "revolution."

The foremost condition to aid the consistent fight for social progress and revolution within all third world countries, is to safeguard their national sovereignty.

As Lenin described it: "**World revolution has been so powerfully stimulated and accelerated by the horrors, vilness and abominations of the world imperialist war and by the hopelessness of the situation created by it, this revolution is developing in scope and depth with such splendid rapidity, with such a wonderful variety of changing forms . . .**" ("Left-Wing Communism, An Infantile Disorder," Vol. 31, *Lenin Collected Works*).

Today the class struggle is not only between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. In fact, in the era of imperialism the essence of this class struggle takes many forms. These forms are "Countries want independence, nations want liberation and people want revolution." All these fronts and forms, under a cor-

rect communist, historical materialist strategy, can be and are complementary, if the correct stand, viewpoint and method are used to support these struggles.

Thus, the proletariat and all revolutionaries must unite with these rulers and their objectively anti-imperialist steps, measures and policies, no matter how small. They must be defended against the hegemonic habit of imperialists to step in and defend their old holdings and gain more interests either directly or through weakening of their imperialist adversaries. In the final analysis, whatever weakens the imperialists also strengthens the masses of workers' and peasants' struggle against their local bourgeoisie.

Not grasping this is what makes the "RC" P and *Guardian* blind to the dialectics of Khomeini's relation to the masses, whatever his own subjective intentions. To the extent that the national bourgeoisie or their representatives like Khomeini take a strong stand against imperialism, the people will respond in a massive way. The powerful sentiment and movement of the people — the motive force of the revolution — is such that for any national bourgeoisie to keep leadership of the movement, they have to bow to the people's demands to fight the imperialists and protect the country's independence. As Kampuchea's Prince Sihanouk's taking up the fight against the U.S. in the late 1960s showed, the people force them to. That's why the vacillating elements in the national bourgeoisie get sorted out, as some of the changes in the post of Iran's foreign minister in 1979 show. In turn, this strengthens the fighting spirit of the masses and aids their mobilization for revolution.

And it is clear that only Khomeini can unite the Iranian people in fighting for Iran's independence at this point. But Khomeini can change. If he is not supported in his stand against the two superpowers, he may have to turn to one or the other superpower, for instance, for military aid. As long as there are no strings attached, Khomeini has the perfect right to take all the U.S., Soviet or any other country's offers to fill Iran's need for a strong military. Khomeini can go two ways on this. He can take the arms and refuse any other concessions. Or he could get sucked in by the imperialists and capitulate to them. If he does this, it is the duty of the genuine communists to expose him to consistently fight to protect Iran's independence.

### TROT "RC" P TAKES IMPERIALIST LINE ON KURD QUESTION IN IRAN—A NATIONAL QUESTION IN A THIRD WORLD COUNTRY—BY LOOKING AT IT OUTSIDE OF THE CONTEXT OF THE FIGHT AGAINST IMPERIALISM

Another way the "RC" P attacks the Iranian revolution is through its support of the Soviet and U.S. subversion in Iran, whipping up the contradictions between the Kurdish people and the Iranian government. Presenting the question totally outside of the fight against imperialism, they state that "Throughout Kurdistan, the masses of people . . . are armed and ready to fight against the systematic national oppression practiced against them by the so-called "revolutionary" Khomeini-Bazargan regime . . . More

Trots — SWP, PLP, "RC" P — and the revisionist *Guardian* and PWOC are agents of the superpowers, by clamoring about abstract democracy and women's rights in Iran outside the context of the fight against imperialism.





and more Kurds joined the battle, determined to drive the reactionary army and the government's hatchetman out of Kurdistan . . . the Khomeini-Bazargan government's desperate lashing out at the Kurds is a sign of its underlying weakness and its reactionary nature . . ." (*"Revolutionary" Worker*, September 6, 1979, p. 14)

For all their demagoguery about "political autonomy," from these statements it's clear that the "RC" P has exactly the same line as the Soviet agents of the Kurdish Democratic Party who call for the independence of Kurdistan from Iran. The question is: why does the Soviet Union support the independence of Kurdistan at this point when the Iranian people have thrown out the U.S.? Precisely because it would serve their interests in taking over the country. In other words, *this line serves the Soviet social-imperialists.*

The fact is that the struggle includes both a struggle for democratic rights by the Kurds and the attempt by both superpowers, the Soviet Union and the U.S., to subvert the Iranian government. The Kurds, an oppressed nationality in the country's northern province of Kurdistan, also are heavily concentrated in the neighboring border areas of Iraq and Turkey. They have fought for centuries against national oppression against the rulers of all three countries. The CIA attempted to use them to stir up trouble, especially in Iraq, but Kissinger made a deal and the Kurds were slaughtered in the early 1970s. The Shah also mercilessly oppressed them and the Kurds in Iran were one of the forces who fought to overthrow the Shah and kick the superpowers out of Iran.

After the overthrow of the Shah, the Kurdish question still exists and they are demanding their national rights. Under their spiritual leader, Ezzedin Hosseini, the Kurdish masses have put forward the correct demand of regional autonomy under a unified Iran, as opposed to the *demand* for secession. As a separate state they would be at the mercy of the U.S. and Soviet imperialists, while under a revolutionary Iran fighting both superpowers, they can, within the context of fighting both superpowers, gain their national rights. This does not mean, however, that they have given up their right of secession. If the superpowers do somehow regain their position of hegemony in Iran, the Kurds will certainly fight for determining their own course, including the right to secede. And in the context of the fight against the superpowers, this would certainly be supported by the genuine communists.

But right now the agents of the superpowers are riding on the current struggle to subvert and weaken the Iranian revolution. For instance, there are ex-generals of the Shah who have re-entered the country and are riding on the Kurdish movement to overthrow the government.

On the other hand, there is the Kurdish Democratic Party. The leadership, before the Shah was kicked out, was in exile in the Soviet Union for over 20 years. Today they are clearly agents of the Soviets and are

close to the Soviets' fifth column in Iran — the revisionist Tudeh Party. After they attacked government troops in early August 1979, conspiring against the revolution, the Ayatollah Khomeini ordered the leadership of the party arrested and troops to move in to crush the counter-revolutionary uprising of the Kurdish Democratic Party.

There is no doubt that the Iranian government has to find ways to secure the national rights of the Kurds. And it has been trying. After protests by Kurds for more power to control their own affairs, the government had agreed to recognize a Kurdish revolutionary committee, just a few weeks before the fighting broke out. And Khomeini has ordered one full day of oil revenues, some \$75 million, to go to the Kurds, as he has done for the oil workers and the homeless poor.

But most of all the Iranian government has to fight the life and death struggle for its independence, fighting every attempt by the superpowers to subvert the Iranian revolution. The superpowers are clearly using their agents in Iran and the internal problems of the Iranian people to whip up counter-revolutionary attitudes.

For so-called "communists" like the "RC" P to call for secession is to support the imperialists against the people of the world. The Trotskyites of the "RC" P directly attack Stalin on this question. He made it clear that, in the era of imperialism: **"This does not mean, of course, that the proletariat must support every national movement, everywhere and always, in every individual concrete case. It means that support must be given to such national movements as tend to weaken, to overthrow imperialism, and not to strengthen and preserve it. Cases occur when the national movements in certain oppressed countries come into conflict with the interests of the development of the proletarian movement. In such cases support is, of course, entirely out of the question. The question of the rights of nations is not an isolated, self-sufficient question; it is a part of the general problem of the proletarian revolution, subordinate to the whole, and must be considered from the point of view of the whole . . ."**

**"Lenin was right in saying that the national movement in the oppressed countries should be appraised not from the point of view of formal democracy, but from the point of view of the actual results, as shown by the general balance sheet of the struggle against imperialism, that is to say, "not in isolation, but on a world scale." [emphasis ours] (*Foundations of Leninism*, p. 74 and p. 76)**

Almost without exception, third world countries are multi-national states. This is because, unlike the rise of the capitalist "modern nations" of Europe which developed during the rise of capitalism from feudalism, through the demarcation of markets between the rising capitalists, the nations of the third world were forged through the fire of struggle against colonialism during

the era of imperialism. Unlike the nation-states of Western Europe, for which Stalin said the criteria were **"an historically constituted, stable community of people, formed on the basis of a common language, territory, economic life, and psychological make-up manifested in a common culture,"** (*Marxism and the National Question*), the nations like Zaire came into being in the struggle against imperialist powers. It was in the course of struggle against external colonialism and imperialism that the national identity of the peoples like in Zaire was formed. It was the struggle against the *common enemy* and their *common oppression*, in the case of Zaire against the Belgian colonialists, U.S. imperialists and now also against the Soviet Union that the nation developed.

Many former colonial countries' borders were drawn by the imperialists, not necessarily according to the differentiation of people or of tribes or traditional kingdoms, but according to the strength of former colonial powers. Often, boundaries are drawn arbitrarily to instigate conflict among newly politically independent states. Thus almost without exception, nations of the third world are multi-national states, with many unsettled boundary questions.

In the case of Zaire, there are over 200 different tribal groupings within the borders of the country. So there is definitely a basis for different tribal and regional contradictions. But without taking into account the concrete content of the contradiction — whether it serves imperialism or the struggle for national liberation from imperialism — you are forced to side with one imperialist or the other against the interest of the overall struggle for national liberation against the two superpowers. The events in Zaire in 1977-1978 have shown this clearly.

### ATTACKING IRANIAN REVOLUTION AS "TROUBLESOME" CPC REVISIONISTS THROW OUT MAO'S THREE WORLDS FOR BANKRUPT TWO WORLDS OF THE SUPERPOWERS

On February 7, 1979, abandoning Chairman Mao's line on Three Worlds and totally betraying the interests of the people of the world, Teng Hsiao Ping urged the U.S. imperialists to intervene in Iran. In his meeting with Japan's Prime Minister Fukuda in Tokyo, he said, "The measures the U.S. has taken in Iran . . . are good. The U.S. should move responsibly. The Soviet Union will never be impressed by half-way positions. . . . If chaos continues in Iran it will produce a chain reaction in Saudi Arabia." And earlier, during his visit to the U.S. in an interview with *Time* magazine, the imperialists' "Man of the Year" said, "We see that last year South Yemen was taken over by the Soviet Union, and the Soviet Union gained influence in Ethiopia. If we go farther east there is Afghanistan, and now there is Iran, where there seems to be no end to the troubles."

Iran "troubles"? Pushing the view of relying only on the U.S. imperialists to fight the Soviet bloodsuckers instead of Chairman Mao's correct line of mainly relying on the third world as the main force against both superpowers, Teng Hsiao Ping turns reality upside down. The twisted logic of this revisionist view is that it's not the Iranian people who have risen up to overthrow the repressive rule of the Shah and the domination of both superpowers and thus weakened both the U.S. and the Soviet Union, but that it helped the Soviet Union!

With total disdain for the Iranian masses and mesmerized by trying to out-manuever the imperialists, Teng's statements only end in disaster.

Tactically using contradictions among the imperialists is a correct and necessary Marxist principle, provided these tactics are subordinate to a larger strategy, provided one has no illusions about who one's enemies and friends are. Lenin used the contradictions among the imperialists to sign the Brest-Litovsk treaty with Germany to buy time for the newly-born socialist Russia to strengthen herself. Stalin signed a peace treaty with Hitler's Germany, upsetting the schemes of the Western imperialists to push Germany into attacking the Soviet Union first, so that the Soviet people would have more time to prepare for the upcoming world war. Chairman Mao also made good use of the differences between the imperialists in the anti-Japanese war by uniting with the Western imperialists against the Japanese invaders, and again when he invited Nixon, top imperialist representative, to China. But Chairman Mao never had any illusion about the vicious nature of these imperialist or about who China's true friends were — the oppressed people of the world, especially the people and nations of the third world.

Teng has thrown Chairman Mao's correct Three Worlds line out the window and substituted his own pessimistic two worlds of the superpowers view. By relying only on the ability to play one superpower against the other and disarmed by his own illusions in U.S. imperialism, Teng has been out-manuevered. With his statement egging the U.S. imperialists on to intervene in Iran and opposing the Iranian revolution, Teng *disarms* the people of the world on the vicious nature of U.S. imperialism. His disgusting statements on Iran have given the U.S. ammunition to further their strategic policy of trying to incite the Soviet imperialists to attack China, thus safeguarding Europe, the focus of superpower contention, and giving the U.S. the only hope it has of regaining its top-dog position in the world.

The Soviet Union has also made good use of Teng's revisionist statements to discredit China in the eyes of the world's people and build up their own image as the "natural allies of national liberation struggles."

There is real danger of Soviet intervention in Iran, but Iran today, with the masses highly conscious politically, united and armed, is a tougher piece of meat

which both superpowers will have trouble biting into. It's a lot harder for the U.S. and Soviets to penetrate Iran today because of the awakened revolutionary people. In contrast, Iran under the rule of the Shah was easy for the imperialists to penetrate, which the U.S. made use of and the Soviets tried to use also.

The Iranian revolution is "troublesome" only to the two superpowers, especially the Soviet bear. Like a bourgeois politician, he's got confidence only in maneuvering against the imperialists and holds the masses of the third world in contempt. And as with all bourgeois politicking, Teng's maneuver ends up exploding in his face.

As Chairman Mao summed up, criticizing Krushchev's revisionist line: **"Certain persons in the international communist movement are now taking a passive or scornful or negative attitude towards the struggles of the oppressed nations for liberation. They are in fact protecting the interests of monopoly capital, betraying those of the proletariat and degenerating into social democrats."** (*A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement*, p. 15)

Even more fundamental than the line of the revisionist leadership of the CPC is the betrayal of people's and particularly proletarian revolution. To see the Iranian people's revolution as "trouble" and calling for the U.S. to take stronger measures is to say that the Iranian people should not have overthrown the Shah and kicked out the U.S. bourgeoisie, it would allow the Soviet Union to walk in.

But in reality the Iranian revolution has provided the best condition for the development of the proletariat. And a mobilized and armed Iranian people is the best guarantee against an attack by the Soviet Union.

Another example of this betrayal of revolution was the support for the French Legionnaire invasion of Zaire. This action was in a way opposed to both superpowers. And the supporters of the invasion under the guise of using contradictions among imperialists actually demanded that the people of Zaire side with the imperialist "liberators." The French and Belgian invasion had the backing and support of the U.S. and reflects the sharpening of superpower contention in Africa. These troops were protecting imperialists' interests in Zaire and not concerned about the people. After the Katanganese Gendarmes were driven out, the U.S., France and Belgium forced an austerity program on Mobutu and the IMF was called in to take over the economy. This meant more suffering for people of Zaire. It is one thing to say that the people of Zaire should take arms from the western imperialists to fight the Soviet-backed invasion but another to maintain the illusion that the imperialists will protect the masses. The only way to guarantee the sovereignty of Zaire is to mobilize the broad masses and arm them to defend the

country. This also provides conditions for the development of the communist forces, the most consistent fighters in the defense of national sovereignty. China's line today does not take into consideration how the subjective factors of revolution can be developed in present conditions. They see any move toward revolution as a bad thing since in the main these struggles are aimed against the U.S. and they think this means it strengthens Soviet social-imperialism.

Following their revisionist teachers, certain insignificant sects in the U.S. also call the revolution in Iran "terrible!" That's the disgusting social-imperialist view of the leadership of the clique League of Revolutionary Struggle and Klonsky and company of the "Communist" Party, ML ("C" PML). These active counter-revolutionaries are bending over backwards to lick the boots of the imperialists and denying the right of the oppressed people and nations of the world to overthrow their oppressors through revolutionary struggle.

The Iranian revolution has been a big blow to both the U.S. and Soviet imperialists and is the biggest defeat for U.S. imperialism since the Vietnam war, but you usually need a magnifying glass to find any coverage of it in *Unity*, the rag of the sect. Check out the February 9-22, 1979 issue. They're so ashamed of the Iranian people that they buried the Iran article way back on p. 11, hidden on the bottom of the page. The layout position of the article alone reveals the League of Revolutionary Struggle (LRS) leadership's political slant toward the Iranian revolution — revisionist!

"The Iranian economy is still in trouble," say these scabs, "with strikes continuing and many small shops still closed." The political strikes in the country were a lot of "trouble" for the hated Shah and his appointee, Bakhtiar, for the imperialists, especially the two superpowers, and for South Africa and Israel who depended on Iran for oil, not for the Iranian masses. Sure strikes have caused some domestic shortages, but this is a small sacrifice the Iranian people are gladly and consciously making in order to liberate themselves from the repression of the Shah and the domination of the imperialists. Under the Shah, the sale of oil served the imperialists and never benefited the masses. But the LRS clique don't care about these facts, all they're worried about is that oil production levels aren't up to normal! According to this revisionist logic, U.S. coal miners shouldn't have struck for 118 days in 1978 since coal production went down.

But that's not the end to their social-imperialist poison: "As the conflict continues within Iran, the threat of interference from the two superpowers, especially the Soviet Union, mounts. The Soviet imperialists are using both the tactics of subversion and military intimidation in their efforts to take advantage of disorder in Iran so as to take over the country." The



**Massive demonstration in Teheran before the fall of the Shah. The firm stand taken by the representatives of the national bourgeoisie like Ayatollah Khomeini against both superpowers serves to mobilize the broad masses.**

Iranian revolution is terrible, these revisionist prophets of doom say, because the USSR will use it to take control. But the fact is the revolution in Iran is aimed straight at both superpowers and has hurt them bad. The careerist LRS leadership is blind to the power of the Iranian people because to them the two superpowers make history not the masses. Instead of relying on *the people of the third world as the main force against the superpowers*, they see the main way to defeat the U.S. and the Soviet imperialists is to rely on one to out-manuever the other. Dropping Chairman Mao's correct Three Worlds line on the international situation like a hot potato, these slimy scum show they never believed it.

This is the same LRS who in 1976 said, "It is the oppressed nations and peoples of the world in struggle against U.S. imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism which is moving forward the entire struggle against worldwide reaction," (*Revolutionary Cause*, January 1979) in order to justify their disbelief in the rising danger of world war. But that was the "old" LRS back in 1976 and this is the "new" LRS today, the only similarity between the two being the careerist leadership's *complete lack of any stable political principles*.

LRS is so afraid of revolution they won't even use the word, preferring to refer to the Iranian revolution as a "conflict" or "disorder."

### **LRS CLIQUE TURNS REALITY UPSIDE DOWN**

"This is a critical time for the Iranian people, with the conflict and the threat of superpower interference growing. The immediate future is uncertain, but the long and protracted struggle of the Iranian people for

democracy and independence will surely continue," sniffle the LRS revisionists, turning reality upside down. The revolutionary masses of Iran have democracy and independence within their grasp *today* and the immediate future is "uncertain" only to the imperialists and reactionaries like the LRS leadership who don't know what to do about stopping the revolutionary storms shaking the world. These imperialist defenders long for the "order" of the Shah when liberation appeared "long and protracted."

The careerist LRS leadership aren't the only ones dropping Chairman Mao's Three Worlds line for their two worlds of the superpowers line. Look at the February 12, 1979 issue of the *Call*, the twisted mouthpiece of the "C" PML: "But the possibility of continued unrest and of civil war remains. This presents the danger of heightened U.S.-Soviet contention and involvement in Iran, which would result in increased threats to the country's stability and national independence." To the careerist Klonskyites, the revolutionary Iranian masses don't even exist. They're saying the Iranian people shouldn't be making revolution because the big, bad Soviet bear will get angry. Never mind the fact that under the Shah's repressive rule millions of Iranians were murdered, tortured, imprisoned and exiled, the fact that the superpowers bled Iran of its resources, at least there wasn't all this "unrest" that's going on today — that's the logic of these political con-artists.

But by opposing the revolution aimed at both the U.S. and Soviet imperialists, a revolution that's taken Iran out of the superpowers' sphere of contention and aided oppressed people's struggles all over the world, the ladies and gentlemen of the "C" PML *serve both superpowers and increase the danger of world war*.



The revisionists like the Hua/Teng cliques in China and their sects the "CP(ML)" and "LRS" here, by attacking the Iranian revolution as "trouble" help create conditions for U.S. imperialism to take desperate moves in attacking Iran.

#### "C" PML: APOLOGISTS FOR U.S. IMPERIALISM

By throwing out the window Chairman Mao's line that the third world is the main force against the two superpowers and that the masses are the makers of history and pushing the view that superpowers make history, the "C" PML is forced to *apologize for U.S. imperialism*. They whimper: "The U.S. imperialists, for their part, want to avoid being dragged into an armed conflict in the region. They recognize that if such a civil war were to erupt, they would be in the thick of it and their forces would be in a far weaker position than those of their rival, the Soviet Union." Klonsky must want to be the next U.S. Secretary of Foreign Affairs bad.

The only reason the Carter administration doesn't send the marines into Iran is because after Vietnam and Watergate the U.S. people won't let him. The main reason the U.S. imperialists are "in a far weaker position" today than in the 1950s when U.S. marines invaded Lebanon or the 1960s when Johnson crushed revolution in the Dominican Republic is because of the consciousness of the U.S. people and the fact that the third world has stood up and is whipping these bloodsuckers all over the world.

The imperialists by their very nature have to grab out for markets, raw materials and spheres of influence, and they are driven to launch imperialist wars of aggression to redivide the world. The renegade Klonsky's line is the same smelly line of "ultra-imperialism" pushed by renegade Kautsky long ago. And like their forefather Kautsky, the renegade Klonsky faction is trying to *disarm* the U.S. people as the nature of U.S. imperialism and is increasing the danger of world war!

#### RESORTING TO TROTSKYISM TO ATTACK REVOLUTION

There's no bottom to how low the careerist Klonsky faction will sink in serving their imperialist masters. "But while holding these forward-looking views, Khomeini has at the same time spoken out against technology and the modernization of Iranian society and has argued for severe restrictions on the role of women. His view of an 'Islamic Republic' is based on many of the old feudal customs of Iranian society." The "C" PML is parroting the cheapest U.S. imperialist slander against Khomeini in order to actively oppose the Iranian revolution and undermine U.S. people's support for it. To attack Khomeini for his "view of an Islamic Republic" when he is fighting both superpowers is an out-and-out Trotskyite line. In the present era anyone or anything which weakens imperialism is revolutionary and must be supported 100% by genuine communists.

To criticize Khomeini today for his religious views when in 1975 the "C" PML, then called the October League, defended the Shah for his purchase of U.S. arms with the excuse that he would use them to fight the imperialists shows the "C" PML's *instability of principles* typical of all political swindlers!

Neither the LRS leadership clique nor the Klonskyite leading faction in the "C" PML ever believed in Chairman Mao's correct Three Worlds line. All they ever believed in is their ability to switch their political beliefs whenever it suits their own careers. With their organizations getting more isolated every day and their membership dwindling, they know they've got no stake in the U.S. revolution. So they've decided to sell their political "capital" to the highest bidder.