

Site menu:

 [sholajawid.org/english/main_english/CPI\(MLM\)fallen_post_MLM.html](http://sholajawid.org/english/main_english/CPI(MLM)fallen_post_MLM.html)

The Communist Party of Iran (MLM) has fallen into the lost road of "post MLM"

By the Communist Party of Afghanistan (Maoist)

Introduction:

The document of the Communist Party of Iran (Marxist Leninist Maoist) Central Committee that has been published under the title "Call for All Iranian Communists: Two roads for Communism" is an Iranian version of the post Marxism Leninism Maoism of the new statement and the Constitution of the American Revolutionary Communist Party (RCP USA) and carries every single basic feature of that line within itself. However, on certain points, this document talks more bluntly and clearly than the new Constitution of the RCP USA and, occasionally talks more in a more mixed up fashion than that one.

The Iranian document is basically an international topic and therefore it must be presented for discussion on an international communist movement level rather than solely *Call for All Iranian Communists*.

For many years the CPI MLM has been one of the important members of the Revolutionary International Movement and their representatives have played key roles alongside representatives of a couple of other parties on this Movement's leading committee. Thus it would have been necessary for the CPI MLM to bring its discussion in its new document first with the RIM related parties, including ours (The Communist Party of Afghanistan – Maoist) as an internal document as opposed to a call to every Iranian communist--an unprecedented act.

The text of the document exposes who the CPI MLM means by "all Iranian Communists". They are leftover various Fedaei guerrilla groups, Worker-Communist groups, different types of pro- Russian, Chinese and Hoxhaite groups such as Komeleh, Ranjbaran, Toofan and others associated who all are self proclaimed Iranian communists.

Firstly: Given that the Central Committee of the CPI MLM calls upon all communists of Iran in regard to an international topic, therefore the group is calling all communists of the world to publicize the RCP USA's manifesto on an international level. Such an approach cannot have any meaning except unconditionally tailing the RCP USA's manifesto without any amendment or notes added to it.

Secondly: This Iranian ideological-political and organizational disbanding directed toward the Revolutionary International Movement and all of its member including our party is a regressive move to completely destroy the ideological, political and

organizational body of the RIM. This is why the document considers the CPI MLM belonging to the RIM and the general MLM movement as a historical factor, saying: "Historically ... this party belonged to the Marxist Leninist Maoist movement (actually Revolutionary Internationalist Movement-RIM)..."

Thirdly: Despite all the internationalist claims of the document, its working focus is not on advancing the international communist movement or regional communist movement. Rather, it is looking to become the banner holder of the Iranian communists in the so called "second wave of proletarian revolution." That is its reason to call upon those groups saying: "This is a historical opportunity for communists of Iran to become the banner holder of the proletarian revolution's second wave by relying upon the suitable objective conditions."

Limited Iranian nationalism is obvious within this document. This is one of the reasons that like other members of the RIM, the Communist Party of Afghanistan (Maoist) is ignored totally, and rather a rainbow of phony Iranian communists from pro China, Russia and Enver Hoxaite up to "Worker-Communists" are spoken to. This Iranian reductionism has another side as well. Unfortunately the major forces of the Iranian communist movement have been in the past and still are the Tudehist (pro Soviet,) Fadaee-ists (originally Che Guevara minded but later pro Soviet reformists) and other lines rather than the Maoists.

Unlike what can be seen in Afghanistan, Turkey or India, the Maoist line in Iran is not the major line within the colorful spectrum of the communism in Iran. Due to its own historical and social limits and weakness it is constantly ignored by various Fedaaee groups and recently the Worker-Communists. The Central Committee of CPI MLM's recent document is a form of condescension toward this short sided spectrum. This condescension began from the third plenum of the Central Committee of this party in 2006 that was presented in a document called "Reconstruction of the Communist Movement" and now it is more theorized. Right then we told them during an internal movement discussion that the framework presented in that document would lead ideological struggle against the phony communists of Iran to a dead-end, and the CPI MLM's insistence on it would lead them gradually more and more condescend to them on a lower level.

The condescension of the CPI MLM in this document toward the phony Iranian communists will mislead the whole so called communist movement of Iran more than before and clearly will cause the short time or medium time destruction, or further poverty and weakness of the Iranian Maoists.

The matters written in "Call for All Iranian Communists: Two Roads for Communism" can be discussed from different angles. But in this current piece we limit our discussion to the two matters that in our view contains the post Marxist-Leninist-Maoist line that is all over this document. One of them is the general negation of the theory and framework of Marxism, Leninism, Maoism, and the other one is the absolutist perception of the role theory plays. Additionally in a section called What is to be Done, we present the general

framework of the Communist Party of Afghanistan (Maoist)'s draft response for theoretical and practical matters of the international communist movement and the RIM in particular.

General negation of theory and framework of Marxism, Leninism, Maoism:

The Communist Party of Afghanistan (Maoists)'s Fourth Plenum produced a document published as "Our position in regard to the new statement and constitution of the Revolutionary Communist Party USA." We indicated that due to its strategic framework it is a post Marxist Leninist Maoist line. In the course of leaving the **framework** of Marxism, Leninism, Maoism, it is presenting a new ideological-political thinking **frame**, through the "new synthesis" of Bob Avakian.

The Central Committee of the CPI MLM expresses this strategic exit from the **framework of Marxism Leninism Maoism more bluntly than the RCP USA. Let us go over this document's text:**

"The first wave of proletarian revolution has reached its objective ending. The wave that began with the publication of the Communist Manifesto by Marx and Engels evolved through important breaking points like the Paris Commune, October Revolution, Chinese Revolution and especially the Cultural Revolution in China, and finally it ended with the loss of socialist China.

"Hence the current crisis is the result of the grand defeat the communist movement has gone through with losing proletarian state power first in the Soviet Union and later in China after Mao's death in 1976. The communist movement's crisis escalated after the downfall of the Eastern bloc and the further development of the anti-communist struggle of the bourgeoisie on an international level. This crisis per se is the definite sign of an era's ending and, beginning of another era."

"...the first round of the movement is due to the theoretical framework Marx had presented and which was developed by Lenin and Mao. A new era needs a new framework that is based upon a critical summation of the past period. The new era we are facing is not a repeat of the previous round and hence cannot be based upon the foundations of the past."

Why do we consider the strategic framework of the new statement and constitution of the RCP USA as post Marxism-Leninism-Maoism? That is since we believe that this line presumes Bob Avakian's synthesis as a theoretical new departure from the framework, origin and foundation of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and is trying to design a new framework, origin and foundation of a non MLM theoretical foundation. In other words this new strategy is not looking to rely upon the theoretical framework that Marx presented and was developed through Lenin and Mao. It is not looking for its further development but rather Avakian is negating this whole framework and wants to build up a new framework.

This strategy is blunt and clear in the CPI MLM's central committee statement. Let us

look over it once again to see it clearly:

"The development of the first round of the movement is due to the theatrical framework Marx presented and was then developed by Lenin and Mao. The new era needs a new framework that is based upon acritical summation of the past period. The new era we are facing is not a repeat of the previous round and hence cannot be based upon past foundations."

The agenda here is to completely eliminate the theoretical framework of Marxism Leninism Maoism and replace it with newly built framework. In other words not only it is aiming to eliminate Maoism, the Chinese revolution and the Chinese Cultural Revolution in addition to the elimination of Leninism and the Soviet revolution, but also Marxism is under attack, a thing not even Mansoor Hekmat and the Worker-Communists have dared to execute.

Let's go over this one more time:

First of all, the whole idea of counting Marx, Lenin and Mao's periods of time as a single revolutionary wave (first proletarian wave) is an incorrect and unprincipled perception.

Capitalism and the class struggle in this system were the objective cause of Marxism being formed. At the time of Marx, capitalism was free trade competition. Capitalism's turning into the level of imperialism and its consequential content and class struggle were due to the development of capitalism, building the foundation for Marxism turning into Marxism-Leninism. The proletarian revolution's expansion toward countries oppressed by imperialism, and more than that, the defeats of the Soviet revolution and the battle against return of the capitalism in revolutionary China prepared the ground for further development of Marxism Leninism into Marxism, Leninism, Maoism.

Up until now there have been three stages of development in Scientific Communism, 1 – Marxism, 2 – Marxism-Leninism and, 3 – Marxism, Leninism, Maoism.

The four key points of the proletarian revolution at the times of Marx, Lenin and Mao are: the Paris Commune ((1871), October Revolution (1917), Chinese Revolution (1949) and Chinese Cultural Revolution (mid sixties). Between the Paris Commune and October Revolution 46 years had passed, between the October Revolution and Chinese Revolution 32 years, and between the Chinese Revolution and Cultural Revolution of China almost one and a half decades. Therefore there is not an objective foundation to think that Marx, Lenin and Mao's times were a single revolutionary wave (First Proletarian Wave of Revolution).

Secondly, the wave of the proletarian revolutions neither began at the very moment of Marx's time when the Communist Manifesto was published, nor has it ended either objectively or on a theoretical and subjective level.

Despite the grand changes that have occurred, still the socio-economic order--that was challenged by the theoretical framework founded by Marx and advanced by Lenin and Mao, i.e. the capitalist order--its foundation and basis are still intact. Regardless of the changes it has gone through, basically, as a class the working class needs to become a class for itself, imperialist capitalism still exists, and we are still confronted with a post-capitalist system, or it can be called a post imperialist status within the capitalist order.

Although the waves of proletarian revolution from Marx's time to the defeat of the revolution in China have dwindled, still they have not ended completely. In the seventies the people's armed movement of Naxalbari in India, armed struggles of the communists of Philippine and Turkey, and in the early eighties people's war in Peru and nineties in Nepal have been going on. Despite their shortcomings each one managed to create proletarian revolutionary political power in broad areas of their countries at different levels of development. Each of these struggles under the leadership of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism has remarkably affected the living and thoughts of the masses of people and also the world's revolutionaries and their foes, albeit Westernized perceptions see them as insignificant in contrast with the Paris Commune.

The People's War in India is expanding despite ups and downs in its theory and practice. Also in the Philippines the armed struggle of the communists is still going on. So be it! At a time when swift and widespread expansion and development of revolutionary struggle worldwide are not probable, still the existence and survival of these struggles is absolutely necessary.

Instead of giving these struggles support and propaganda, this document undermines them. Such undermining is inherently an indirect attempt to tear down these struggles of resistance and instead wants everybody to sit down and watch the spectacular fabrication of this *New Theoretical Framework*. This in itself is an extremely destructive and paralyzing axis of pacifism for communists of all countries, especially communists of Iran and its surrounding countries, including the Afghan communists. It must be fought against adamantly until the end.

If we focus on the times between vital revolutionary points in the history this is the picture we can obtain:

Between the Paris Commune and the October Revolution 46 years had passed, but between the Chinese revolution's defeat in 1976 and the beginning of the people's war in Peru only four years passed, although there was not a gap between the beginning of the people's war in the Philippines and the gigantic leap in India's Naxalbari that is still progressing. In 1996 when people's war began in Nepal, the people's war in Peru was still going on a protracted level despite its perilous decline. Only four years have passed from the final defeat – or approximate final phase of victory in Nepal; and during the same period of time the People's War in India has expanded geometrically. Now where the hell do you see that the complete ending of a wave of the proletarian revolution?

The Revolutionary Communist Party of America, and now after them the Communist Party of Iran (Marxist-Leninist-Maoist), are performing an insincere requiem for the real communist movement (Marxist-Leninist-Maoist) in order to – in their mind – enforce their so called new drafts under labels such as New Synthesis or New Theoretical Framework. But those who want to block the well for drinking water with stones and mud will be the ones who will firstly die from thirst. This shall be seen soon. Avakian cannot put muddy stepmarks on the graves of Marx, Lenin and Mao in order to get a reputation for himself under the title of the Marx of the *New Wave of Revolutionary Communism*.

Of course, the theoretical framework of Marxism, Leninism Maoism needs to explore and develop further and further. But we have to determine what we want out of this theoretical framework. This theoretical framework is not a collection of a number of theoretical works and theoretical sum ups of the practices of Marx, Lenin and Mao Tse-tung, and could not be such a thing. Additionally we have to be aware that Marxism, Leninism, Maoism is an organic whole and each level of its develop can only present its general meaning and true content. In other words, the Marxism of Marx's times is not the same thing as the Marxism of Lenin's times, and there is a qualitative difference between the two. In its first step and in general, Leninism contains a continuation of Marxism. But not mainly, as in the second step it has correct scientific discourse and it contains further scientific discoveries and proletarian ideological revolution as well.

For example, the appearance of the theory of imperialism by Lenin was the means for further scientific gain and ideological proletarian revolution in regard to the further development of capitalism into the stage of imperialism. Also due to the occurrence of uneven growth of imperialist capitalism and the appearance of weak links in the imperialist world, the theory of having simultaneous revolutions in several advanced capitalist states does not fit into the Marxism-Leninist theoretical framework.

In the same manner we can see a qualitative difference between the Marxism Leninism of the time without Maoism with Marxism, Leninism, Maoism. In Marxism Leninism the law of the negation of negation and also the law of quantitative to qualitative development are dialectical laws of Dialectical Materialism. The negation of the negation was found unacceptable by Mao Tse-tung, and he also exposed that the law of quantitative to qualitative change is one feature of the laws of dialectics as opposed to a separate law. Thus he concluded that contradiction is the fundamental law of Dialectical Materialism. That is why the dialectical materialism of Marxism, Leninism, Maoism does not have three fundamental laws and there is not a three pole trend in it. As a matter of fact, it only has a single fundamental law.

As far as this framework's development is related to Mao Tse-tung, based on the Communist Party of China's summation during the Cultural Revolution, in the Ninth Congress of the party in 1969 it took on the name of Marxism, Leninism, Mao Tse-tung Thought. In regard to Mao's contributions to the science and ideology of the proletarian

revolution, the Ninth Congress also contained a Lin Biao-istic segment (the age of the deterioration of imperialism) that later during the Tenth Congress of the party was eliminated.

Gathering up Mao Tse-tung's contributions to the science and ideology of the proletarian revolution under title of Maoism originated in the work of Communist Party of Peru in 1980, which was adopted in the following years by other parties and organizations as well. This process took approximately fourteen years until its ratification by the Revolutionary Internationalist Movement at the end of 1993. A general comparison between Mao Tse-tung Thought and Maoism based on collected resolutions of the Ninth Congress of the Communist Party of China and the large gathering of Revolutionary Internationalist Movement in 1993 that was titled "Long Live Marxism-Leninism-Maoism," reveals qualitative differences between these two and the more advanced condition of the latter in contrast with the former.

Our objective (we, the RIM associates), in general is expressed in the resolution that was called *Long Live Marxism-Leninism-Maoism*. The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Iran (MLM)'s critique in regard to the theoretical framework of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism is a departure from the theoretical framework of this resolution.

When we concretely have "Maoism" in mind, it does not contain the imperialism demise era, Lin Piaoism taking over before the leader's death, or the Hans' almost chauvinistic confrontation with the matter of self determination in China's multi-nationalities taken by the Chinese Communist Party and the state in Mao Tse-tung's time.

Since the intended parties of the document of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Iran (MLM) are the communists and the multi colored Iranian so-called communists and not the members and parties related with the Revolutionary Internationalist Movements and its associates within the theoretical framework of the *Long Live Marxism-Leninism-Maoism* resolution, it is within the framework of the so called "real Maoism". This sort of approach be it intentionally or with a hidden agenda is attempting to discredit Maoism and also gives a shield to the anti-Maoists.

In another part of the CPI MLM document it says:

"Real shortcomings and mistakes in the theories and methodologies of the communist leaders from Marx to Mao were not the cause of failure in the first attempts for communist revolutions as opposed to the bourgeoisie's widespread might in international level, but these mistakes did act as helping agents."

It seems as if in this piece CPI MLM has fallen into fumbling. Wouldn't the above text be formulated like the following?

"Real shortcomings and mistakes in the theories and methodologies of the communist leaders from Marx to Mao were not the [fundamental] cause of failure in the first attempts for communist revolutions as opposed to the bourgeoisie's widespread might at an international level, but they did act as a helping agent [and hence they are counted

as one of the non-fundamental elements of these defeats]."

Constant waves of revolutionary communism have began from Marx's time and continued during Lenin and Mao's, and after that it's been going on in theoretical level which means that the theoretical framework of the Marxism-Leninism-Maoism is mainly productive and should be firmly kept in hand. But at the same time it needs further development, and the international communist movement needs to supply that in a correct manner.

Thirdly: Crisis, like every other phenomenon, is relative and conditional. Of course undoubtedly right now the international communist movement has fallen into a deep widespread crisis in contrast with the times when there was socialism in the Soviet Union and People's Republic of China. Forming the Revolutionary Internationalist Movement and its up and down struggle within the last twenty five years was an attempt by the Marxist Leninist Maoist forces of the world as a response to the crisis the world communist movement went through after the Chinese revolution's defeat. This movement went into a bad condition after the recession in the struggle in Peru, but the peak of the struggle in Nepal gave it another high tide. Unfortunately though, after the Nepalese revolution got sidetracked and the complex inside struggles against this perversity became fruitless, another peak of struggle has not come around for this struggle.

But the other way around, the appearance of American post Marxism, Leninism, Maoism and now its Iranian role-playing has put the Revolutionary Internationalist Movement's struggle into a downfall deeper and wider than ever. Without having a principled, upfront and progressive struggle against this perversity that currently has taken over the RIM its success to fight against the current crisis is impossible.

Nonetheless the existence of the crisis within the international communist movement is a clear and definite problem in contrast with times when there was revolutionary China. But this crisis cannot – and should not be counted – as the definite ending of the wave of the proletarian revolutions beginning at the times of Marx and then Lenin, Mao and afterward. Waves of revolution are out there, and considering them finished brings about that famous saying of the ones who are mourning for one's death before his demise. Basically crisis in any phenomenon does not mean its ending; rather, it stands for the existence of the possibility of its destruction. For example, the widespread crisis within global imperialist capitalism ought not to be analysed by an uncertain reasoning.

If we consider the current situation of the Revolutionary Internationalist Movement we can see that it is in deep crisis in contrast with the times of People's War in Peru and Nepal. But this crisis ought not to be interpreted as the definite end of this movement's functioning. Still, there are lots of rounds and means for reconstruction and activating this movement once again, and of course it ought to be through being reliant upon principles to deal with shortcomings, weaknesses and deviations. Along with other faithful groups to the line of the RIM, our party feels obligated to struggle for this cause.

The post Marxism, Leninism, Maoism that the Revolutionary Communist Party (of the United States of) America and the central committee of the Communist Party of Iran (Marxist, Leninist, Maoist) have held up their banner is the deepest and most widespread form of deviant activity the RIM has ever had manifested in its theoretical dimensions. This deviant behavior is much more hazardous than the ones that have occurred in Nepal or Peru's earlier one. That is why we believe that within the framework of struggling against deviations that occur amongst the RIM associated groups, the most vital current struggle is fighting against this post Marxism Leninism Maoism.

Fourthly the major point of our argument against the line of the Revolutionary Communist Party of America's new constitution and statement's line and now the line brought up in central committee of CPI MLM is their putting out a new theoretical framework that is something beside the theoretical framework of Marxism, Leninism, Maoism, and thorough denial of its theoretical foundation that is referred to now under the title of a "previous unworkable foundation". Let us once again go over a quotation from this document:

"...the first round of the movement is due to the theatrical framework Marx had presented and was developed by Lenin and Mao. A new era needs a new framework that is based upon critical summation of the already achieved past. The new era we are facing is not a repeat of the previous round and hence cannot go forward based upon past foundations."

Here it is apparent that the "New theoretical framework" this document talks about is not a development within the theoretical framework of Marxism Leninism, Maoism to another level on the same pattern of evolution that this ideology has progressed within. Rather it is an absolute defiance and denial of that under titles such as "Previous base" and "New theoretical framework." Based upon this claim, the time for Marxism, Leninism and Maoism is over and it does not have usage as basis and foundation in the "new era." This matter has been presented in various manners in this document's different parts. Let us take a look at a statement taken from another part of the document:

"Based on critical summing up of the first round of the communist revolution, [1] Whatever that was incorrect and unscientific and does not match the objective reality any more must be thrown away; {2} Correct achievements and basic understandings should be kept, and all these ought to simultaneously take shape within the new framework from the beginning."

The achievements and basis of Marxist Leninist Maoist comprehension are not some set of bricks and clay from ancient ruined buildings that after pressing and pouring them down into a new block produce a brand new brick. A correct basic understanding of Marxism Leninism Maoism is the reliable foundation and base for communist revolution, and without having solid reliance on this foundation and base, further principled progression of the science of proletarian revolution is not attainable or possible.

Now let us check out another sentence of this text:

"We need a new weapon for thinking that explains the objective realities of the material world and way to change it more comprehensively, deeply and correctly. The grand and revolutionary practice for building socialism in the twentieth century has prepared a rich reference resource for doing this and its critical summation has become a historical necessity."

Here the need for a new weapon for a framework that is something different from Marxism Leninism Maoism has been brought up very clearly and bluntly, as opposed to the need to advance the existing weapons of thinking further. Also the grand and revolutionary practice for building socialism in the twentieth century is only considered as a "rich reference resource" as opposed to an undividable part of the current communist weapons that are needed now. That is exactly the way in the "Three resource and three parts of Marxism" that German philosophy, the economics-politics of England, and France's socialism employ the three mental modern weapons-that is, Marxism, which forms all three parts that are philosophy, economics-politics and scientific socialism.

The document says in another place:

"Without reliance upon the new synthesis – i.e. without getting our hands on the new theoretical framework of communist theory – finding solutions for revolution related problems in today's world and Iran are not attainable.

Here the document does not argue that current theoretical framework for solving the problems of revolution in the world today and concretely in Iran is not complete enough that needs to develop further, but instead says that it is totally useless.

Up until here we face the strategic mental insistency of the document. This very strategic insistency in the statement and new constitution of the Revolutionary Communist Party of America has resulted in the elimination of Marxism, Leninism and Maoism from these very documents and other works of that party. The Communist Party of Iran (MLM)'s first step in regard to this insistency was eliminating the 3 photos (Marx, Lenin & Mao) from the first page of its paper Haghghat (Truth, such as Pravda). Then it eliminated *Marxism Leninism Maoism* from its new documents and published the Persian translation of the "Manifesto of the Revolutionary Communist Party of America" on its internet site and its publications. Now it has published the document that is being discussed right now by its central committee. The phrase *Marxism Leninism Maoism* is still being dragged along as its spare party title, a title that has lost its value and meaning. Sooner or later, this empty phrase will also get thrown away, unless once again this party stands on the line of Marxism Leninism Maoism.

But in the same ways that that the major documents of that Revolutionary Communist Party of America have mixed up their own strategic insistency upon post Marxism Leninism Maoism with taking a course based upon further developments of Marxism Leninism Maoism, so does the Central Committee document of the Communist Party of

Iran (Marxism Leninism Maoism). Regarding the documents of the RCP USA we have already said that taking such a course is presented in order to soften the heavy poignancy of the strategic insistency upon post Marxism Leninism Maoism within these documents. The same applies to the Central Committee of the CPI MLM statement. Let us pay attention to the following sentences of this document:

"If the communists do not scientifically rebuild their understanding on the basis of critical summing up from the positive and negative experiences of the previous proletarian revolutionaries and further develop Marxism's theoretical framework and bring it into practice, they will not be able to lead the people on a large scale toward understanding problems of the world and their revolutionary solutions."

"Real shortcomings and mistakes in theories and methodologies of the communist leaders from Marx to Mao were not the cause of failure in the first attempts for communist revolutions as opposed to the bourgeoisie's widespread might on the international level but they did act as helping agents."

"The theoretical framework Marx founded and was further developed by Lenin and Mao is not sufficient to address the Communist Movement's current crisis and lead another wave of socialist revolution to change the world."

The meaning of this sentence can be compared with phrases such as "new weapons for thinking", "previous foundations not working", etc.

"This new theoretical framework covers Marxist scientific theories continuing from Marx's time until Mao's and also cutting off from them."

The problem is not having both continuation and cutting off of the past, but it is the question of which one is imperative. If continuation becomes the major factor then the necessary theoretical framework mostly remains to be the theoretical framework founded by Marx and further developed by Lenin and Mao and not mainly a new theoretical framework.

In other parts the document says:

"Empirical elements of this theoretical development have been given to us by the two experiences of the Soviet and Chinese socialist revolutions. Without scientific dissection of this experience and through progressing communist theories in various levels and aspects such as philosophy, class struggle and economics-politics, advances are not possible. Scientific dissection means first our finding out what those experiences were as distinct from the international bourgeoisie's allegations. Second, we need to find out why they were defeated. To what degree was defeat related to the historical limits of the first steps of proletariat in changing the world, how much were they related to the bourgeoisie's power and how much related with mistakes of the communists and their wrong understandings in regard to socialist society and the world revolution."

"Not using these elements is like our wanting to rediscover the wheel. This is in fact a wheel that is already invented. No, we need to pull it out from primitive turning that

cannot answer contemporary complex problems to be able to organize major movements against it."

The strategic insistency of the line of new manifesto and constitution of the Revolutionary Communist Party of the US and now the line of the central committee of the CPI MLM of Iran is clearly apparent within this line's "new synthesis." New syntheses such as Gonzalo Thought or, a new path such as Parachanda Path or an ism such as Avakianism are not like following up and further developing Marxism Leninism Maoism. Rather it stands for a brand new post Marxism, Leninism, Maoism mental weapon and framework. This is exactly why we consider it as a line that is much more of a side-spinning deviation in contrast with what was exposed by the wrong line of the Communist Party of Peru called Gonzalo Thought and way deeper and further that the deviationist Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist) called the Parachanda's Path.

Different natural, social and mental phenomena, from their occurrence until their turning into other phenomena, go through different stages of development. These different stages of changing and development can in general be divided into the two types of quantitative and qualitative levels of changing and development. The process of quantitative to qualitative changing is an example of the fundamental law of development of every phenomenon, that is, the law of contradiction. This process contains the quantity, quality and also quantitative and qualitative unity of contradictions. In the quantitative level of changing, although the quantitative changes are the major aspects of changing in the phenomenon, there are also qualitative changing of types as well. Also, in the qualitative level of changing, while the qualitative changes are the major aspect of the phenomenon changing into another phenomenon, there also are quantitative changing of types as well. This is the way in which through the process of quantitative changing, the qualitative changes are accumulated as well, and also qualitative changes get accumulated eventually. During the qualitative level of changing, a qualitative leap takes place that changes the fundamental contradiction of the phenomena and turning it into a new phenomenon.

The theoretical framework founded by Marx is also not an exception in regard to this law. Since the time of Marx and Engels, this mental weapon has passed through two levels of progressive development that were Leninism and Maoism. This is not intended to underestimate the importance of the new qualities of Leninism and Maoism. Our intention is to clarify that in Marxism Leninism, the continuation of Marxism and generality of Marxism Leninism is the essence of changing. Breaking off from original Marxism is not the major factor. Also in Marxism, Leninism, Maoism, the continuation of Marxism, Leninism in Maoism and generality of Marxism, Leninism, Maoist is the essence of changing. Breaking off from Marxism, Leninism is not the major factor. This is why the different levels of Marxism, Marxism Leninism are fundamentally different levels of development of a single ideological weapon.

We can only talk about a new ideological weapon instead of Marxism, Leninism, Maoism when this ideological weapon has reached a further level of qualitative change and development after passing through its own stages of quantitative changes. Its life is over after its final synthesizing to lead to another ideological weapon. Only in such way does the "new synthesis" find its fundamental meaning and content.

Choosing titles such as "new synthesis", "new ideological weapon" and "new theoretical frame" presented by the RCP USA and CPI MLM are exactly expressing this theme that finally Marxism, Leninism, Maoism has reached its ultimate qualitative and quantitative stage of change and development, and with its final synthesis it opens into a new framework and ideological weapon.

But what is really going on?

The "new synthesis" of Avakian that is presented as the beginning point of this changing and fundamental development of thinking" is not even up unto a level and quality to make it known as a new ism within the process of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism's development to be presented as the Marxism-Leninism-Maoism-Avakianism. So, forget about having it counted as the beginning point of the final general synthesis of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and the beginning of an absolutely brand new ideology and weapon of mind. In practice, this synthesis is not even challenging and does not reflect militant struggle on the international level, nor in American society per se; this unexciting passive mass line is not comparable with the excitement of Gonzalo Thought and Prachanda Path at all.

Our intention here is not to absolutely discredit these synthesizers as if they do not contain any sort of positive and dynamic elements. Avakian's synthesis does contain positive and dynamic elements and on their own level, these very elements demonstrate the path of development of (Marxist-Leninist-Maoist) Communism's frame of thinking with all its shortcomings and deficiencies. This level of development ought to be understood correctly, and through drawing definite borders and limits upon it a correct scientific evaluation of it can be obtained.

On the absolutism of the role of theory:

We have famous formulas about the relations between theory and practice: one says that theory guides practice; and the other one says that practice is both the source for theory and the proof of correctness. Only with having both of these formulas can we become able to define the roles of theory and practice correctly.

There is an absolutist viewpoint about theory that is seen in the document of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Iran (Marxist-Leninist-Maoist). Let us pay attention to the following sentences of their document:

"Unlike the general understanding that theory should follow the steps taken by practice, theory must take steps before practice and become its guide. This is the job that is wanted by all the communists of the world"

"The advancements of the first round were due to the theoretical framework Marx had placed in front of him, which progressed further by the hands of Lenin and Mao. The new round also requires a new theoretical frame that is founded upon critical summing up of the outcomes and shortcomings of the preceding round's theories and practices."

The correct understanding is that practice is the source before producing the theory, and that after creating theory, again practice is the indication of its right or wrongness, Only based on such an understanding is there a correct understanding that theory to theory, or to practice [to practice], ends up idealism or empiricism.

Within this Practice – Theory – Practice, theory follows practice and practice also follows theory. There is not an absolute first or last position or a single line amongst them. But when we are looking upon a practice-theory-practice cycle from the general and final resolution of that major cycle, then correct dialectical materialism relies upon the priority of practice vs. theory. But theory is also important in its own way and does play the task of guiding the practice.

If we believe that the theory must always be taking steps ahead of practice, then how could we concretely define the source of theory and what would become the measure of its fallaciousness or correctness?

The act of the matter is that the formation of the communist theoretical frame – be it at the Marxist level – or Marxist Leninist – or Marxist – Leninist – Maoist stage up until now and also in the future-- is a continuous process. It jumps from practice to theory and from theory to practice and after passing each practical spiral path it becomes more developed.

Clearly, the highest point in the progression of the communist revolution in Marx's time, the Paris Commune, was not indebted to the theoretical framework placed in it upfront by Marx. In fact Marxists did not have a clear role in initiating and leading the Paris Commune. Instead Marx's theoretical progression and in particular, the theory of proletarian dictatorship, was very much indebted to the revolutionary practice at the Paris Commune, and Marx, through summing up this practice, developed the *Dictatorship of Proletariat* and built and structured it within Marxism.

The October Revolution was both built upon the theory of Leninism, but also this revolution itself played a decisive role into the elevation of Marxism into Marxism – Leninism. Also, the revolution in 1949 in China and the Chinese Cultural Revolution were from one side indebted to the Maoist theoretical structure, and on the other hand played their own decisive role in elevating Marxism – Leninism into, Marxism – Leninism – Maoism and, in guaranteeing this development.

Theoretical lethargy amongst many communist forces in the world is an undeniable fact of the matter. But even further than that, there is lethargy in practice. We, ourselves, are admitting existence of both of these diseases within our own party.

Giving primacy to theoretical lethargy and knowing that that is the major agent that causes passivity taking over practice can be correct in myriad cases. But it is also incorrect to fall into such absolutism as well. In many cases lethargy in practice develops prior to lethargy in theory.

In cases such as the Communist Party of Iran (MLM), we are facing a theoretical braggart's work. This theoretical bragging is one of the major problems of this party, such as being a very small organization, having an intense intellectual fabric, and being cut off from its social class base. It has distant relations with the fire of the movement in Iran that covers up its chronic struggle paralysis and baselessly feeds its leaders' ego that further and further expand its defects. Therefore it should be said that in the case of CPI MLM the major problem is its practical lethargy and not theoretical lethargy. This party's bragging is a form of theoretical lethargy as a tool to cover up this lethargy.

What is to be done?

We do possess the general theoretical framework of Marxism – Leninism – Maoism and the struggle to consolidate it on an international level as opposed to Mao Tse-tung Thought, began by the Communist Party of Peru in 1980 and through the first decade of the Revolutionary Internationalist Movement (from the time of the early 1984 conference of the Revolutionary Internationalist Movement's foundation until the grand gathering of the movement in late 1993) it went onward. Ratification of the resolution document that is called "Long Live Marxism-Leninism-Maoism" was a clear theoretical progression for the whole Revolutionary Internationalist Movement and, Maoist movements all around the world. The RCP USA and the document of the Central Committee of the CPI MLM absolutely ignore this progression.

During this times and before and after that also, theoretical and practical progressions of other sorts have also occurred in the both the practical and theoretical frames of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism by key forces within the movement that have also been adapted by movement associated forces on one scale or another and by the movement in general as a whole.

The Manifesto of RCP USA and the Central Committee document of the CPI MLM are from one side declaring their own theoretical achievements as the absolute and, on the other hand counting practical and theoretical achievements of the other RIM associated forces on a zero level. On the other hand theoretical and practical deviations have come around that have had severe effects on RIM as a whole and even further than that the whole international communist movement and international Maoist movement.

We believe that summing up these losses and achievements must be considered a key element in practice and also the theoretical development and progress of our movement. More than any other thing our movement is expected to perform such summing up, and if the movement does not come up with such summing up then it

cannot ever produce any correct summation. This summing up is the key theoretical element in the process of progressive rebuilding the whole Revolutionary Internationalist Movement.

The Manifesto of RCP USA and the Central Committee document of the CPI MLM do not consider the vital key role of this summing up and pass it up casually and with ignorance.

Based on this summing up we can – and we must – review the Chinese revolution and Mao Tse-tung, and this time not from the perspective of establishing international Maoism with paying attention only to their positive aspects – a level that already we have gone through – but from a critical perspective to look at its mistakes, shortcomings and possibly mistakes of the Chinese revolution and Mao Tse-tung himself. That is a work that never has been done before on an international level. This new review can and must contain a review of Lenin and Stalin's times based on how it was researched at Mao Tse-tung's time by him. It must also include going over Marx and Engels' time once again the way that was done by Lenin and Mao Tse-tung.

We can and we should work upon these necessary summations within existing conditions in countries and internationally, paying attention to the major tasks of struggle and reliance on the existing theoretical framework without claiming that it is complete. These summations must be combined with practical endeavors by every responsible individual in the movement and also by the movement as a whole.

The responsibilities and tasks of our main struggles in every society, state and also on the international level as a whole are determined by the objective national and global conditions, and are not based upon our own conditions. Absence from this field of struggle under any name or justification can have no other content and meaning but acting evasively in regard to our obligatory presence in the field of war.

The proletarian ideological science and ideology founded by Marx and further developed by Lenin and Mao can – and must – continue going through further developments. But this road to development is a way to go from theory to practice and practice into theory (constantly) and cannot – and must not – be gone through the *Mullah Sadra* fashion, that means sitting for many, many, many years inside a cave and through such procedure suddenly reach allegedly final theoretical goals.

We cannot – and must not – arrange a time table for Marxism-Leninism-Maoism's development to a higher level based on prophecy, or having that considered as the inevitable precondition for any form of progression within the international communist movement. But we can – and we must – struggle and work for this, this very development, by relying upon the above mentioned summations, digestion of global and scientific progressions in the world in correspondence with objective changes and developments in the world and different countries and, not waste our time reaching out to the theoretical delusional framework and mindset of post Marxism-Leninism-Maoism.

