

## B. The Dialectics of National Struggle and Class Struggle Serve Proletarian Revolution



**The workers' and peasants' councils at this time don't go beyond the bounds of economic struggle. In the future, however, they can be turned into organs of power of the masses.**

There are many problems that the Iranian government faces. Iran is a poor third world country. There is widespread poverty and lack of jobs, caused by the plunder of the imperialists. There are national questions such as the Kurds, the Balushis, the Arabs and others. There is the question of social justice for workers, and for women. And, of course, most important of all is the task of defending Iran's independence from the U.S. and Soviet superpowers who will try every trick in the book to make a comeback.

Within the struggle for independence, the struggle for social justice and socialism must go on. Both are part of the overall class struggle. While it is possible for third world countries to gain independence from the superpowers, it does not mean that the struggle between the classes stops.

And unlike the "C" PML, which sees the struggle as "chaos," we see the ongoing class struggle and division inside Iran as inevitable and necessary in strengthening the revolution, especially in combatting superpower subversion. Like a communist party, which grows through internal struggle, bad elements jump out and advanced elements shine out in the midst of struggle.

Right now the Trots, revisionists, SAVAK agents,

and capitulators from the bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie are jumping out — that is determined by their class nature. This is a good thing and better now than later. For even if the reactionaries are able to take power, the masses will learn who their real friends and real enemies are and be tempered in the struggle, fighting, failing and fighting in preparation for the dictatorship of the proletariat and socialism. The advanced elements from the workers and peasants as well as other genuine patriots are coming forward in the struggle today.

There is dual power. On the one hand there is the government headed by Bani-Sadr representing the national bourgeoisie, which holds the official state power. On the other hand there is the system of revolutionary committees composed of Muslims, the majority under the direct leadership of Ayatollah Khomeini. That is the main point of division of state power, with the revolutionary committees able to do such things as handle the local police functions and other governmental powers, including in some cases the right to issue visa clearances.

But the revolutionary committees do not represent democracy for the workers. They operate under the system of one-man rule and are controlled tightly by

the Islamic leadership. At this time, the revolutionary committees and the government block the masses from real power. On the factory and village level, there are workers' and peasants' councils, which mainly handle questions in the factory or local area of the countryside, much like the trade unions or peasant associations in other countries. This is the other aspect of dual power. At this time they don't go beyond the bounds of the economic struggle. In the future however they can be turned into organs of power of the masses. The revolutionary committees would not be abolished since they do represent the views of some of the masses, but would be put on a democratic basis and function as advisory bodies, like local congresses — with mass representation of different strata — did in China under Mao's leadership. This is a question of the communists situating themselves, assuming leadership among the masses and building up their independent strength within the blow-by-blow fights in the united front against superpower subversion.

Clearly the key to victory of the Iranian revolution was the united struggle of the millions of workers and peasants against the Shah. Now to protect Iran from superpower subversion, the masses must be mobilized. Thus the revolution within Iran must continue to enlarge and protect the interests of the workers and peasants *to unleash them to the fullest extent for the struggle for national independence*. The people are the motive force pushing history forward.

So any action which goes against the interests of the struggle must be opposed. For instance, the recent

constitution of the Islamic Republic does not give workers the right to strike. While we oppose strikes which are aimed at subverting the revolution and are used by the agents of imperialism, the right to strike is a fundamental right and necessity for the working class to protect its day-to-day interests against the capitalists. Without it, the workers are at the mercy of the capitalists and will hinder their support of the revolution.

This is a question addressed by Chairman Mao in the period of the United Front Against Japanese Imperialism. He showed the identity between the national and class struggle, that is, the struggle against Japanese imperialism and the struggle between the classes in the united front: **"To sustain a long war by long-term cooperation or, in other words, to subordinate the class struggle to the present national struggle against Japan — such is the fundamental principle of the united front. Subject to this principle, the independent character of the parties and classes and their independence and initiative in the united front should be preserved, and their essential rights should not be sacrificed to cooperation and unity, but on the contrary must be firmly upheld within certain limits. Only thus can cooperation be promoted, indeed only thus can there be any cooperation at all. Otherwise, cooperation will turn into amalgamation and the united front will inevitably be sacrificed. In a struggle that is national in character, the class struggle takes the form of national struggle, which demonstrates the identity**



**Yasir Arafat, leader of the PLO, Hojatoleslam Khomeini, son of the Ayatollah, and President Bani-Sadr in Tehran. Although opposing the superpowers is in both the national bourgeoisie's and the proletariat's interest in the immediate sense, in the long run it serves the proletariat's interest.**

between the two. On the one hand, for a given historical period the political and economic demands of the various classes must not be such as to disrupt cooperation; on the other hand, the demands of the national struggle (the need to resist Japan) should be the point of departure for all class struggle. Thus there is identity in the united front between unity and independence and between the national struggle and the class struggle."

And he said that for the united front to be strengthened, there have to be *mutual* concessions, and not concessions which benefit only one party or class to the detriment of the other.

"All political parties and groups in the united front must help each other and make mutual concessions for the sake of long-term cooperation, but such help and concessions should be positive and not negative . . . the factory workers demand better conditions from the owners, and at the same time work hard in the interests of resistance; for the sake of unity against foreign aggression, the landlords should reduce rent and interest, and at the same time the peasants should pay rent and interest; all these principles and policies of mutual assistance are positive, not negative or one-sided." ("The Question of Independence and Initiative Within the United Front," *Selected Works*, Vol.2, pp.213-215)

Mao said: "We do not deny the class struggle, we adjust it. . . . Unity against Japan requires an appropriate policy of adjustment in class relations, a policy which does not leave the laboring people without political and material safeguards, but also gives consideration to the interests of the rich, thereby meeting the demands of solidarity against the enemy. It is bad for the War of Resistance to pay attention only to the one side and neglect the other." ("The Role of the Chinese Communist Party in the National War," *Selected Works*, Vol. 2, p.200)

In terms of the relations between the workers and the capitalists in Iran, the united front is both unity and struggle. On the one hand, each has to subordinate their immediate class interests to the larger question of protecting Iran from superpower subversion.

For instance, right after the revolution it would have been incorrect for the workers to strike for better conditions, given the fact that a crucial part of putting Iran in a position to fight superpower subversion was restoring production. (There was an incident right after the revolution in which an agent of the Shah was going around paying workers at the plant gates not to return to work. When he was arrested, they found a box of money in his car trunk.)

On the other hand, the standard of living must be improved for the people to be unleashed to support the revolution. That's why concessions by the workers must be *reciprocated* by the capitalists. If the capitalists are getting fat while the workers are starving, they will ask "why should we support this?" Any

capitalist who opportunistically uses the united front to take advantage of the proletariat's restraint and fatten himself is carrying out a reactionary policy that weakens the united front. Thus, in that situation not only is a strike justified, but it is necessary to protect the proletariat's independence and initiative in the united front and the united front itself. United front unity means struggle to build the united front against those incorrect policies and actions that threaten to break it.

The same goes for the clause on women's rights. While the constitution does say that women are "equal before the law," it does not address the basic rights of women. Women are an important part of the revolution, as the events leading up to the overthrow of the Shah proved. They do suffer special oppression and they must be given rights such as the right to work at the same jobs at the same pay as men, the right to divorce, etc.

A very important point is the government's call for the people to turn in their arms. Only an armed people can protect the country from the aggression of the superpowers and the undermining by the counter-revolutionaries. This is an important point of principle and could mean the difference between the revolution's life and death. While we support disarming and ruthlessly suppressing the Trots, revisionists and other superpower agents, we oppose a *general* disarmament of the people. It would be extremely short-sighted and narrow for the masses to give up their arms and for the government to try to make them.

Although opposing the superpowers is in both the national bourgeoisie's and the proletariat's interest in the immediate sense, in the long run it serves the proletariat's interest. That's why it is correct "to fall back the better to leap forward" as Lenin said. This is because of the dialectical relation between "countries want independence" and "people want revolution," which we talked about earlier, what Mao calls the identity and mutual dependency as well as struggle between national struggle and class struggle.

In any country, the political power of the proletariat can be established only under the leadership of the proletariat itself and of its own political party.

In the third world, the formation of the proletariat and the establishment and growth of its political party must be based on the tempestuous nationalistic and democratic mass revolutionary movements including the workers, peasantry, petty bourgeoisie and national bourgeoisie, which strive for the independence of the state and the liberation of the nation.

The struggle in the third world takes two main forms. One is the armed struggle against colonialism, Zionism, racism and imperialism. The U.S. communists must give unconditional and resolute support to the armed struggle. The other form is the struggle against neo-colonialism. The fight for economic independence is the continuation of the struggle to achieve complete political independence.



Doing bold communist propaganda among the masses, and going against the shallow chauvinism whipped up by the bourgeoisie around Iran—fed by revisionists and especially Trots like the “RC”P and PLP—the Communist Workers Party concretely support the Iranian revolution, a direct reserve of the U.S. proletarian revolution and profoundly serving preparation for the dictatorship of the proletariat in the 80s.

U.S. communists must support the poor and backward countries in shaking off the political control, economic plundering and cultural aggression of the imperialists and colonialists because this is a necessary measure for the development of a national economy, the establishment of the ranks of the proletariat, and moreover, the establishment of the political party which must lead this great class in carrying on the revolution. Also, to the extent that the superpowers are weakened, to that extent reactionaries in the third world are also weakened. Thus, it serves the main force in its fight for New Democracy, and in the preparation for the dictatorship of the proletariat in third world countries.

It cannot be imagined that the ultimate victory of the proletarian revolution is possible in third world countries without the development of state independence and a national economy. Communists are distinguished from opportunists precisely in this matter.

#### SUMMARY

What we have laid out is the real relation between the representatives of the national bourgeoisie like Khomeini and the people, the relation between the fight for

Iran's independence as a country and the front of people's revolution in the era of imperialism.

This is exactly what the “RC”P and *Guardian* don't understand. That's why they are forced to mutate their position on the revolutionary essence of the Iranian revolution, from calling it reactionary to saying it's “better than U.S. imperialism.” Fundamentally they take class analysis and *rip it out of the context of the era of imperialism* and put it above the real world, the concrete struggle of the world's people against the main enemies — the U.S. and Soviet superpowers. That's why they have to do circus acrobatics with their line, flipping and flopping like clowns. And that's why unlike them, the Communist Workers Party, U.S.A. from the beginning has said that the Iranian revolution and national liberation struggles like it, by striking hard blows at the superpowers, are direct reserves of the proletarian revolution in all countries and greatly heighten the prospects for proletarian revolution in the U.S. □