

Doctrine; Ideology or cause: Part three

In MEK; Uniqueness and Superiority

First we look at their claimed ideology 'Islam': They claim that followers of all other ideologies, 'politically' and 'philosophically', including Marxists, compared to their 'Islam' are 'right versus left' and reactionariesⁱ. In one of their important books about how to learn Ideology, published after the Iranian revolution, we read: 'What is important is that Islam and monotheism view of revolutionary-Islam, without any doubt is **the only** belief system that can put revolutionary intellectuals above and on the left of all other ideologies.'ⁱⁱ

To feel and see themselves as superior is not restricted to a certain society, country or culture. There are many who in the past or present, due to their 'glorious past history' or 'present achievements' think, feel, or openly claim that they are superior to other nations, races, or followers of other belief systems. But what is unique about cults is that they see themselves as superior and above all people, nations and cultures; even when they are just a few people following a cult leader, without any past or present achievements that can be seen and accepted by others as a reason for greatness. They feel they are superior just because of their leader and his promise for the future, even before that leader can reach the point where Hitler or Stalin or Mao were. And they claim what they are teaching to their followers will change the lives of all human beings. As Rajavi pointed out in one of his speeches that he sees '*the rise of MEK as a new breeze {or new promise} for the whole world;*' He continued: '*What you are doing is not limited to our country or Iranian; without any doubt during past year, you have superseded all boundaries of human endurance and it will be more obvious in the future*'ⁱⁱⁱ.

Although MEK considers itself as followers of Shii Islam, one of the most tolerant interpretations of Islam, they are the same as Al-Qaeda in that they insist there is only one true interpretation of Islam and that is theirs as they are the 'only Muslim revolutionary' and only Muslim revolutionaries have the right to interpret 'Islam'. They claim: '*If you are looking for the truth; there is only one real and authentic Islamic movement, and that one is totally differently qualified from other Islamic movements who have an Islamic mask but their ideal society is a bourgeoisie one. ... But we believe without any doubt that all those who are not matched with true Islam, will eventually show their true face and will be rejected and the true one will show its face and will be established.*'^{iv} In a little book about how to learn ideology, they explain: '*Revolutionary ideology of Islam can be formularised and compiled only by Muslim revolutionaries; we repeat: formularisation of real monotheism's world view can be done only by real monotheists.*'^v Again in answering Shah's accusation that they are not Muslim, they reject Shah's Islam, along with other kinds of Islam by stating '*But the Islam of the Prophet Mohammad (Ppuh) is the only true Islam. The true Islam is a revolutionary Islam and is not compatible with or comparable to the weakness and spinelessness of the Muslim Ummat. The Islam which Prophet Mohammad brought would never provide land to Zionists for them to cultivate and produce food for their armies to better kill the hungry Palestinian masses. Under the Islam taught by Prophet Mohammad, the treacherous Shah and his exploitative guests would not serve themselves 50 year old French champagne with which to become intoxicated. The Islam which the prophet Mohammad brought is revolutionary and it is for precisely this reason that the Iranian Muslims are joining the revolution. ... We are revolting today, as Islam has always done, to break down the*

obstacles blocking Allah's path.^{vi} In the same book; they claim that a Muslim has to be a revolutionary otherwise he is not a Muslim: *'The truth is that true Muslim can be nothing but a revolutionary. Either a Muslim is a revolutionary or he is not a Muslim. The Koran gives no evidence or indication of any non-revolutionary Muslim.'*^{vii}

They don't stop at this point of introducing Muslims as 'revolutionary', but they also claim a Muslim has to be against Imperialism and America, and whoever doesn't match this description is betraying people and Islam. *'We declare that without a decisive revolutionary action against all manifestations of this devilish power (Imperialism under leadership of United States) there will be no chance of happiness for the people nor satisfaction of the Creator nor the introduction of the true face of Islam nor a move towards the monotheism and social unity and as Koran says: '... all that has been woven will come apart ... and we will be faced with dominance of a higher class or group over another... ' We declare that the ignoring of this main enemy by individuals or groups will lead to nowhere but treason and will cause the people to experience pressure and injustice again.'*^{viii} Later we will even see the struggle against Imperialism and United States at the time was their own monopoly. But, when after their failed uprising against the government they started their Terrorism (or as they later called it 'revolutionary terrorism' or 'arm struggle') suddenly the definition of revolutionary changed from being opposed to 'exploitation' or 'Imperialism' into being against 'Khomeini Regime'. Abrahamian explains: MEK *'had developed an all-consuming hatred for the clerical regime and, at the same time, the burning conviction that its own radical version of Shiism was the one and only true interpretation of Islam. It had begun to see the world as divided into two contradictory forces: on one side was the Mojahedin, the vanguard of the select, and those willing to accept its leadership; on the other side was Khomeini, the forces of darkness, and anyone refusing to accept the Mojahedin leadership...'*^{ix}

No tolerance: Either with us or against us:

In a small booklet, Rajavi explains what the principles of the revolution are and who is acting according to these principles. He explains: *'the first principle and fundamental law of struggle at this juncture is: "Armed revolutionary struggle under slogan of 'Death to Khomeini'"*^x Then as the second and final principle he says: *'The second principle is a united front against anti-human regime of Khomeini'*. By this principle he implies that all those who want to oppose Iranian establishment, have to become united within NCR (Political wing of MEK), and hopefully without any criticism. He adds: *'of course I don't want to use "interest of Imperialism and Reactionaries" as an excuse to stop any body from criticising NCR or MEK, but there is a difference between progressive criticism and destruction of NCR; **the only** democratic alternative against Khomeini regime.'*^{xi}

Beside the point that we never found out what 'good' criticism is according to Rajavi, with these two principles Rajavi set the rules or defined revolutionaries and the opposition against the Iranian Regime. First was to fight with the government, therefore he rejected any peaceful means of struggle.^{xii} Second was to accept the leadership of NCR, meaning the leadership of MEK and Rajavi himself. Although immediately after 20th June 1981 few non-supporters of MEK joined NCR's coalition, soon they found out that by joining NCR they have to follow MEK and Rajavi himself, therefore they started leaving the so called coalition. Abrahamian explains this fact as: *'Critics were either squeezed out of the National Council or else silenced with the constant reminder that it was*

the Mojahedin, and not they, who were providing the bulk of the martyrs in the struggle against Khomeini. The Mojahedin used their martyrs' roll sheet as a trump card to silence friend and foe alike. Not surprisingly, some retorted that if political truth lay in the hands of those who provided the largest number of martyrs, then Khomeini, with his endless war against Iraq, could easily outdo the Mojahedin. ... Mojahedin's unabashed willingness to openly side with the Iraqi regime in the war against Iran disturbed some of their allies. This issue came to the fore in January 1983 when, in the midst of some of the most intense fighting of the war, Rajavi held a highly publicized meeting with Tariq Aziz, Iraq's deputy prime minister. Many observers suspected that it was predominantly Iraqi money that funded the expensive projects undertaken by the Mojahedin: their fighting forces, military bases, and radio station {and later their TV broadcast} on the Iraqi border;' ... First Banisadr {the first president of Iran who was the cofounder of NCR} left it and 'Then came the withdrawal of the Kurdish Democratic Party, many leftist groups, and most of the prominent intellectuals. By mid - 1985, ... The National Council, which had started with such high hopes, had become a mere shell.'^{xiii}

This was not the first coalition of MEK that failed because of their monopoly of words such as revolution or Islam and their intolerance toward any criticism and opposition, but it certainly was the last one. During Shah era and the first three years after the revolution while still they were a popular organisation, MEK was not completely isolated from wider society, therefore, they were able to somehow work with other opposition groups and organisations. During Shah's time, they had close relationships and cooperation with Marxist organisations as well as Islamic ones. After the revolution they were even claiming that they were champions of tolerance and were searching for other Islamic groups to create a political coalition against the ruling Islamic Republic party. Then immediately after their failed uprising of 20th June 1981, and changing into a clandestine organisation, isolated from people, first they called Bazargan (Almost their ideological father^{xiv}) as a traitor (for rejecting terrorist activities of the MEK.)^{xv} They eventually called all their old partners, who rejected their terrorism and collaboration with Iraq as 'traitors to revolution'. Then even those who accepted their terrorist tactics, but left the NCR for different reasons, were called Traitors, including Banisadr, the cofounder of NCR^{xvi}. Not only had they called all political opposition of the Iranian government inside of Iran a traitor for not accepting MEK's terrorism, they even called all other oppositions outside of Iran, either a traitor or a mercenary of Imperialism. By then, not only Islam and being revolutionary was their monopoly, but even being opposition to Iranian government was their monopoly. They called Amini, the old prime minister of Iran during Shah's era, an 'old servant of Imperialism'^{xvii}; Madani, once governor of Khozastan of Iran, a CIA mercenary for publishing an alternative program and inviting opposition forces outside of the country to create an alternative against the present government of Iran^{xviii}. They did the same thing against Nazieh, once oil minister of Iran, for the same crime. They didn't stop there; they even started attacking any Iranian intellectuals who dared to question or criticise their strategy or tactics; people such as Ahsan Naraghii^{xix} Abdol Karim Lahidgii.^{xx} Then it was the Iranian media outside of Iran's turn to taste (as once Rajavi said) 'revolutionary's sharpest language'; any media who dared not to accept MEK's policies, such as their tactic of Terrorism, or collaboration with Iraqi forces or Rajavi's marriage with his first lieutenant's wife, or even questioned their prophecy of overthrowing Iranian government in a matter of months or years, could taste the bitter wording of MEK and a few could taste even more. As an example; 'Iranshahr' was a very well known Iranian weekly against the Iranian government and sympathiser of MEK and NCR; as a matter of fact Rajavi gave one of his first interviews to

Iranshahr^{xxi}. Then when Iranshahr published Madani's program MEK started attacking the Iranshahr^{xxii}. It was not only Iranshahr; MEK attacked other publications who dared to criticise them or question them on their tactics or their strategy. Publications such as: Post e Iran; Iran Azad; Jahan; Ghyam; Payam Iran; Nejat Iran; Nehzat; Hamvatan; Sarbedaran.^{xxiii}

But it was not only Iranians inside or outside of the country who could not show any kind of disagreement with MEK, questioning or criticising them; they could not even tolerate any criticism of non-Iranian intellectuals or politicians. They called Persian BBC 'Ayatollah BBC' (i.e. working for Iranian government,) for giving some comments not favourable toward MEK.^{xxiv} They showed their anger against Middle East's editor of Le Monde for writing articles about NCR and its defectors^{xxv}.

Another example is their reaction toward Abrahamian's book; 'Iranian Mojahedin'; whoever who has read this book, can see how detailed and fair his research has been, almost all important facts mentioned there has been taken from MEK's publication mostly provided by MEK itself. Still when the book came out as part of it was criticising MEK for changing into a cult and their method of intimidation against those who criticise them; internally (within the organisation) they called him mercenary of Iranian Regime and later they wrote a book supposedly answering him back; though one who reads this book called 'Facts and Myths on the People's Mojahedin of Iran – Examples of the lies, distortions and fabrications in Ervand Abrahamian's Iranian Mojahedin;' will find out how hard they have tried to find contradiction within Abrahamian's book with no avail. 36 pages out of 93 pages of the book are mostly propaganda pictures of MEK as 'fact' of how strong Mujahedin are and how popular they are.

While I was in MEK I was writing another book answering other 'accusations'. The person who was writing the answer to Abrahamian's book, the chief editor of MEK's publication, showed his written book to me before it went to print. Although at that time I was under mind control and brainwashing of the organisation and could not judge anything under my own merit, still I could see how vain, baseless and superficial his arguments were. The main problem about the book was not what they called 'lies and fabrication,' but the truths that MEK was once proud of and then was trying hard not to talk about. Facts such as their terrorist acts against America, or articles published in their papers during 'ideological revolution', or the names of those who once were members of NCR, then left it and why they left it. Poor Tohidi the head of MEK's propaganda machine could not talk about these facts as if he could accept them; MEK's policy toward the west and the United States could be put in danger and if he were to deny them, MEK could be questioned among their supporters and within Iranian community abroad. Therefore he had no choice but to ignore them and instead of trying hard to find small misprints or wrong details and talk about MEK within pages after pages.

One of the characteristics of cults is that their doctrine, as well as their reality, and their memory of the past can change as easily as when the cult leader wishes so. They will collect old books and publications, they even reprint old papers^{xxvi} and they believe this is the new reality and as they themselves accept it as the only 'reality', they feel others should do the same, otherwise they call them traitor and liar. ... Therefore if for example at this juncture MEK claims that during Shah's time Americans were not killed by them, but by Marxists, this is the reality, not what they were claiming and were proud of in the first few years after the revolution when they were calling themselves 'the only real opposition to American Imperialism'. Therefore if one recalls or reminds them of their own

sayings, what they wrote and published themselves, he certainly is a 'liar' and 'fabricator'. In conclusion of their answer to Abrahamian's book, on page 75 they write: *'The Iranian Mojahedin inhibits a point-by-point denial. The present response is intended only to point to some of the more conspicuous examples of concoctions and prevarications purported by Mr. Abrahamian to be the results of scholarly research. Adopting Goebbels' approach, the author has deceitfully presented a chain of 'false and data', most of which have been falsified in contradiction to his stated objective of impartiality. Radical Islam: The Iranian Mojahedin categorically defies the author's self description as an objective scholar. It is, therefore, hoped that any reader, though critical of the Mojahedin for whatever reason, who wishes an accurate and comprehensive answer to a question regarding the Mojahedin, will reject the specious analysis by Ervand Abrahamian, **the patron of whose approach is obvious**, in favour of directly contacting a Mojahedin office or Moslem Iranian Students Societies (supporters of the PMOI) in different European and North American countries.'*

In positive response toward MEK's demand, I also ask any reader of Abrahamian's 'Iranian Mojahedin' to read MEK's response toward this book. Of course this is if they can find it, as by now for one reason or another, all its copies might have been recollected by MEK itself. Read it not to find Abrahamian's 'lies and fabrications,' as in this case you will be seriously disappointed, but to understand the position of the poor writer of this book; his dilemma in avoiding the real issues that hurt MEK badly, and instead magnifying small mistakes that could have been resolved easily by contacting Mr Abrahamian personally to correct them. Yes it is seriously worthy of seeing as there is not much to read, because in one hand, it is one of the clear printed examples of the reaction of destructive cults toward their critic and on the other hand it shows how confused members of cults are when they have to deal with the reality of the outside world.

Another example is late Professor Fred Halliday (Then Professor of Politics in London School of Economics), who once was very close to MEK as he judged them according to who Mojaheds were during the first three years after the revolution: *'a popular; pro democracy and freedom and tolerant'* organisation. As a result he used to be invited to MEK meetings and Rajavi's residence and even had an interview with him for the magazine of MERIP. His speech was printed in MEK's publication as 'support of Western progressive intellectuals for MEK'^{xxvii}. But then when MEK started collaborating with Iraqi dictator Saddam Hussein, Halliday criticised MEK for this collaboration as it was against the principle of nationalism, human rights, democracy and freedom, which by then Mojahedin were claiming they were for, as well as being an unpopular act within Iran while Iranian people were fighting against Iraqi's aggression. Halliday in his interview with 'New left review' magazine on page 35, explains MEK's reaction toward his criticisms: *'They {MEK} played an important, heroic, role in the struggle against the Shah, and fought bravely after the 1981 break with the Khomeini regime. But their organization is marked by dogmatic, undemocratic and authoritarian patterns of thought and practice, which condemn it to failure. I twice visited Masoud Rajavi during his time in France, and an interview I did with him, including some discussion of Islam and politics, was published in MERIP Reports in 1982. But in the middle of 1986 my contacts with the organization ended abruptly, after I had made some criticisms in the aftermath of Rajavi's departure from France to Iraq. They resorted to the usual accusations, saying that I was an 'agent'; it was not the first time this had been said to me, particularly by Iranians, nor will it be the last. I wrote a letter to Rajavi and the Mojahedin leadership laying out my reasons for criticizing them: the cult of the personality around Rajavi and his wife; the unnecessary, sectarian, destruction of the National Council of*

Resistance which had been, at the beginning, a broad alliance of different anti-Khomeini forces; the exaggeration, irresponsible to the point of being criminal in my view, of the immediate revolutionary potential in Iran; the dangers of their dependent alliance with Iraq; and the consequences of their inability to evaluate the situations in which they found themselves - in both Iran in 1981 and France in 1986, they left things too late and were caught off balance by the initiatives of their opponents. I never received acknowledgement or reply from the Mojahedin to that letter.'

MEK doesn't even have any respect for the defender of Human Rights, Nelson Mandela. When he travelled to Iran and met Iranian officials, they wrote an article against him and called his trip a 'disgraceful trip'^{xxviii}. They called independent think tanks, such as Middle East Watch, a mercenary of Iranian Regime for reporting not favourable toward the organisation.^{xxix} They called Talebani (present president of Iraq and one of the leaders of Kurdish resistance against Saddam Hussein) a mercenary of Iranian regime for standing against the collaboration of MEK with the Iraqi regime^{xxx}.

When they rejected whoever who was not fully in agreement with them, Rajavi wondered: *'be honest; do you know any movement or organisation or revolution, during recent era, who has sacrificed as much as Mojahedin and at the same time who has been attacked by poisoned arrows (he means verbal bitter attacks) from all directions?'*^{xxxi}

Deception; Stealth; End justifies Means:

'To tell deliberate lies while genuinely believing in them, to forget any fact that has become inconvenient, and then, when it becomes necessary again, to draw it back from oblivion for just so long as it is needed, to deny the existence of objective reality and all the while to take account of the reality which one denies - all this is indispensably necessary.' 1984; George Orwell

Deception and Stealth are other characteristics of all destructive cults' doctrines. In pursuit of their goals, all destructive cults believe the end justifies the means; and therefore they all legitimise some sort of deception and hiding who they really are and what they do believe in.

Lies, deception, stealth, and hypocrisy in destructive cults are not things that they are forced to employ and to be ashamed of doing, but completely the opposite. All of them, through different means, have changed the connotation of these words or behaviours from 'bad' into 'good' and have changed them into part of their doctrine. Therefore for members of a destructive cult, using these 'tools' in dealing with the outside world, is not only not bad, or something that they have to be ashamed of, but it is good and part of their ideological responsibility and cultic characteristic to use them. If they do not, they have something to criticise themselves for.

They use deception to gain popular or political support, to recruit disciples, to solicit, to keep members within the cults' milieu, and they all use deception as an instrument of mind control. Therefore we can look at deception as part of their ideology, as an organisational tool or as a 'Mind control' tool. Here we are going to look at it as part of their doctrine or their ideology. Deception for destructive cults is important, as one can define a destructive cult as: *'Any cult that engages in outright deception to pursue its ends, whether religious or secular in its apparent orientation.'*^{xxxii}

Deception includes outright lying, leaving out important information, or distorting information. But what is a lie and deception? Scot Mowbray says: *'The lie is an essential social lubricant. We're not supposed to lie, and we do, which in some biologically determined way probably means we're supposed to.'*^{xxxiii} Any story we hear, any movie we see, if they are not all lies and the fantasy of the writer or the director, at least it has an element of lies in it and people accept it and like it. As they say: 'People will trade the truth for an entertaining story anytime.' In my view a lie is not a deception and harmful, if it doesn't represent itself as true and the whole truth. Also the lie which Mowbray call a 'social lubricant' is sometimes called a white lie^{xxxiv}, and is not as such harm to anybody or at least is a great distance from deception. Therefore one might ask, what is the lie which we call 'deception'? Is it as obvious as what we read in 1984; 'War is Peace, Freedom is slavery ..' namely the opposite of the truth? Or it is as complicated as the truth itself? After all truth is not the truth if it is not the whole truth^{xxxv}. This is why in many situations, people don't claim what they say or show is the whole truth; this is why they usually start their sentences with words like: 'I Think' ; 'I suppose'; 'As far as I know'; ... Therefore deceiving others is when people hoping to gain something, knowingly and intentionally lie (i.e. say what is the opposite of the truth) or hide part of the truth, or exaggerate part of the truth they prefer, or understate the part they dislike and sell their words as the whole truth. In some cases deceiving may happen not by hiding part of the information, but by giving too much information; confusing your audience, making it difficult for them to find part of the truth relevant to them or to the situation among tons of information and useless facts. Sometimes vague answers or generalization of the answer to a specific question can be deceiving. Generalities such as "We're just trying to help people to overcome their problems", evasive remarks, changing the subject, ... or using known remarks; such as: World's great religious leaders have been persecuted. ... And then deducing what they want can be deceiving, as well.

Carl Hausman teaches us *'there are three ways to lie: with words, with numbers, and with images.'*^{xxxvi} They can exaggerate numbers for example the number of their disciples, the amount of money they have solicited, or the number of people attending their gatherings. They can lie using images by not showing the whole truth or even using some photographic trickery to show what they want their audience to believe^{xxxvii}, or they can decorate the back of the room as they want and take a photograph and claim it has been taken somewhere else. And they can use words for distorting the truth. Say a popular idiom or expression, or an engaging or entertaining story, and while your audience are deeply attracted to their story, they conclude what they intend to gain from the story. For example Rajavi in his wedding with his third wife Maryam told his audience a very long story of Seemorgh; a famous Old Iranian story, a very entertaining and emotional one. And then he deduced from his story that Seemorgh (Queen of birds) is Maryam; he concludes, whoever is questioning his marriage to Maryam is a collaborator of Iranian government. In another situation, when he wanted all the opposition of the Iranian government abroad to accept MEK's policies, without any reservation or question, he gave another story; he said when your house is on fire, you should not quarrel with each other, first you have to face the fire, and then sort out other problems. Then he deduced from this expression that first we should get rid of the present government and then talk about our differences and the shape of the future government Of course nobody asked him why, with the same argument, he himself didn't postpone sorting out his differences with the Iranian government to end the Iran-Iraq war and withdraw Iraqi forces from Iran!

All cult leaders, especially destructive or extreme cult leaders, have to lie and deceive their audience to succeed. This is so true that one can say the greater a cult leader the greater a liar they need to be. Great lies are more acceptable than smaller ones as Hitler; the greatest in cult of personality says: 'The greater the lie, the greater the chance that it will be believed.'^{xxxviii} It is no wonder that many cult leaders use Hitler's lessons in recruiting and in mind control of their disciples: As David Koresh in his interview accepts benefiting from one of Hitler's tricks: 'Koresh; 'I guess you're right, ' he said. 'I guess it's kind of like Hitler. Hitler said if you told the people the same thing enough times, they'd believe you. You know, we've got a lot of work to do. ...'^{xxxix} It means enough repetition of a lie, makes it reality and the truth, and enough repeat of that makes it absolute truth. This is why if not all, but at least the main part of pretended ideology or doctrine of destructive cults is based on lies. At least the cult leader himself is well aware of the lie or lies and again for this reason, he or she is able to change any part of the cult's superficial beliefs to pursue their real goals. And again this is why 'the end justifies the means' will become an integrated part of a destructive cult's doctrine.

To show how the fundamentals and principles of a Cult's ideology can be easily changed to pursue the cult's political goal or to deceive disciples at any time, I will give a few examples from MEK. Word of caution; as stealth is another characteristic of all destructive cults one never can be sure what is true and real about them and what is not! Therefore there is no guarantee that what MEK claims today are what they believe and what they used to say were their deception. In my view neither should be taken seriously as the real ideology or doctrine of any cult is: 'survival of the cult and the leader' and 'following orders of the leader', everything else is sham, stealth, and deception, at least not real or not important.

Few examples of deception and hypocrisy of MEK

Stand against Imperialism and America:

Being anti-Imperialism was the most important part of their ideology for MEK from its birth and cause for their existence. It was even as important as being called a Muslim organisation. Therefore being flexible toward this principle and able to change or forget about it, shows the amount of toleration cults have toward their announced principles. In other words, if we take what they used to say as what is real and things that they say now as false or vice versa, either way it shows the amount of deception they are able to use for their political goals, recruitment and struggle for existence.

MEK, in a communiqué about the referendum of the Islamic republic, asked their supporters to give an affirmative vote, and they also announced what they expected from an Islamic republic. In part of their proclamation we read: '*Based on our true monotheistic viewpoint our minimum expectation of an Islamic Republic is the uprooting of the pervasive dominance of imperialism from our country. In other words regardless of the various forms of government, at this stage any order presenting itself as **Islamic must contain the qualities of being anti-imperialistic, anti-reactionary and anti-dictatorial. These qualities which make up the content of an Islamic Republic are those necessary conditions without which talk of true Islam cannot exist. For how can an order be called Islamic when the remains and traces of imperialism, exist? Aren't the imperialists the same international symbol of evil today?** Therefore the minimum required of a political group with Islamic Ideology is to oppose*

politically, economically, socially and culturally the effects of Imperialism which is under the leadership of the USA which is the same mischievous power which participates in the worst pillaging found in the history of mankind, the world power which along with its partners has the people of the world in its grip.^{xli} To describe Imperialism Rajavi says: 'This Imperialism that we talk so much about - well - what is it? The simple definition is the 'world-eater' and 'world - eaters' are the imperialists! Have you heard of cannibals? Well, these 'world-eaters' are worse! In this world there are two camps - one camp consists of imperialists, and in the other camp are the deprived nations and the people. There is no connection or relationship between these two camps except slavery and war. We are either held captive or rebel. In this connection there is no quarter given or mercy shown, look at the four corners of the world today, and you will understand! Who in recent years had slaughtered one million people in Indonesia? Who slaughtered three million in Vietnam? Who slaughtered tens of thousands in Chile? Who put his illegitimate baby in the Middle East that today is causing so much bloodshed {He means Israel}? ... By whose guns did our mothers and our sisters fall in their hundreds and thousands on the 17th Sharivar? (The massacre of people praying in Jaleh Square on the morning of Friday September 8th 1978) And who started the fire in the Rex Cinema? (The Rex Cinema in Abadan was burnt down with no survivors from the audience. It was a Savak operation) ... Yes these are the American world -eaters- the bosses of tyranny! ...^{xlii}

MEK's opposition against Shah's regime was, more than anything else, due to the claim that his regime was a 'puppet of Imperialism' and the United States. In MEK's statement during the Shah's regime they made it very clear: *'We know of no colonialism in the world but one, and its leadership is controlled by the two transgressor feedbags, the United States and Britain. The Shah and all servants of colonialism have their heads in these feedbags.'*^{xliii} MEK was very proud of its terrorism against American military advisors in Iran and after the revolution they used to proudly announce details of these operations^{xliii}. Rajavi, in one of his speeches after the revolution, announcing anti-Imperialism and anti-exploitation as principles of Islam explains: *'principles are those things that we can not tolerate them as small as thickness of a hair'*^{xliv}. *No person and no revolutionary organisation who acts according to an ideology are able to show tolerance in their principles. Of course this is when we believe in an ideological existence of man and organisation, or as Imam Hussein has said if we believe life is 'to believe and to fight for that belief'. This is what differs human beings from animals... now how can we show a small amount of tolerance as much as thickness of a hair toward Imperialism. How can we ignore well beings of our people, how can we coexist with Imperialism and its lackeys inside our country?*^{xlv} In the same speech Rajavi claimed: *'Our revolution is an anti-Imperialism revolution, therefore we have to finish this phase of our revolution before forwarding toward next stage which is anti-exploitation.'* He added: *'As I said when we talk about revolutionary Islam in this stage, when we talk about a revolution under leadership of Imam Khomeini, we mean a revolution which is anti-Imperialism, of course we have to pass this phase of the revolution as soon as possible to pave our way toward rejection of all kinds of exploitation.'*^{xlvi} During the American hostage crisis in Iran, parallel to hostage taker students in Tehran, MEK members attacked and captured the American consulate in Esfahan; though soon they had to hand it to revolutionary guards.^{xlvii} They congratulated 'Imam Khomeini' for cutting the relationship with America^{xlviii}; they asked the embassy to be changed into the Museum of American's crimes around the world^{xlix}. Even MEK's opposition toward the present establishment was due to their claim that 'the reactionary forces of the regime are paving the way for the return of the Imperialism.'¹ They claimed Ayatollah Behashtii, the secretary general of the Islamic republic party, was the person who could re-establish

the relationship with the United States. Therefore he was the first victim of MEK's terrorism as well. As by then being 'Anti Imperialism' was their own monopoly, Rajavi was not even prepared to accept the anti-American stance of the new Iranian government by comparing it with 'dog's barking.' He said: *'we can not call who ever who barks against Imperialism like a dog, as anti-Imperialism.'*^{li} He even claimed that Imperialism to avoid victory of MEK in Iran (as they know how much MEK is anti-Imperialism) was helping the present regime until they find their own alternative to substitute the regime.^{lii}

Then suddenly when MEK found out that they could not overthrow the government and they needed the support of 'Imperialism', in an interview with Liberation of France, Rajavi changed his 'ideological position' toward Imperialism. To legitimise his new stance against Imperialism he said: 'if Imperialism is not an imaginary and satanic (remember above he called Imperialism the evil of our time) creature, but a collection of political and economical and social relations, is it possible I beg you to let me know what Imperialism has done to us that Khomeini has not?'^{liiii}

Ervand Abrahamian explains this turn of principle as: *'Rajavi tried to reach as broad a Western public as possible by giving frequent interviews to such reputable newspapers as Le Monde, the Washington Post and the Christian Science Monitor. In these interviews, Rajavi toned down the issue of imperialism, foreign policy, and social revolution - the crucial term nezam-e tawhidi was hardly ever mentioned. Instead, he stressed the theme of democracy, political liberties, political pluralism, human rights, respect for 'personal property', the plight of political prisoners and of course, the need to end the senseless war.'*^{liiv}

From then on suddenly the slogan of 'Death to Imperialism' vanished from MEK's papers and publications. Old books and publications with reference to the anti-Imperialism stance of MEK were collected from supporters, with the excuse that the organisation wanted to create its own library and needed the books. They claimed terrorist activities of MEK, against America, occurred when Rajavi was in prison, therefore they were not responsible for those acts. {They didn't mention that till a few months back they were proud of those operations, reminding their audience about them every now and then in their papers.} They claimed they were the main victim of the Hostage taking in Tehran. {Therefore not to be blamed for that event, though they were responsible for capturing the American consulate in Esfahan and Tabriz}, ... They went as far as welcoming condemnation of violation of Human rights in Iran by Jimmy Carter,^{liv} forgetting that the same Jimmy Carter was rejected by them when he apologised for the 1953 coup in Iran. Saying: 'We beg Imam Khomeini, as before to clarify that America is the great Satan and first enemy of our revolution, giving a strong punch on Carter's mouth and disappoint him from any compromised relation with Iran.'^{lvi} Now everything was changed and suddenly in Rajavi's view 'Imperialism of America' of yesterday became the champion of human rights. When Bill Clinton was elected as president of United States, Rajavi sent him a message congratulating him for his election and calling his victory a victory for 'Democracy and respect for Human rights everywhere in the world.' He added: 'it is quite natural that all democratic forces and defenders of Human rights are happy and have common feelings toward your victory.'^{lvii}

But is this the end of the story of MEK with United States and Imperialism? Batoul Soltani, one of the defected members of the leadership council of MEK, recently in one of her interviews recalled: 'after

the explosion of the Twin Towers on September 11th Rajavi cheered saying “this was the reactionary Islam (Al-Qaeda), Now lets see what the revolutionary Islam (meaning MEK) will do?! You (members) have a lot of potential inside you and you should release it”.

If we don't appreciate the deception which is part of a cult's doctrine, we will always be confused what to do with them, and what part of their actions, sayings and behaviours should be taken seriously and what part as stealth. As an example let us look at the confusion among American forces when they faced MEK members. In RAND^{viii} report; pages 10 and 11, it has been stated: *'The MEK insisted that it dispatched a letter to DOS (U.S. Department of State) in February 2003 declaring its intention to be a neutral party during the impending invasion of Iraq and stating that it would not fire on coalition forces, even in self-defence. **It also claimed to have offered to fight on behalf of the coalition.**... Despite the MEK's statement to the contrary, both the official U.S. Army Special Forces history and the official U.S. Army history of OIF (Operation Iraqi Freedom) indicate that the MEK engaged coalition forces in battle, presenting a “formidable threat” and demonstrating “excellent fighting qualities.” Nevertheless on April 13, 2003, **in the face of collapsing Iraqi forces**, the MEK requested peace. U.S. Central Command (USCENTCOM) ordered the special operations unit that had received the request to demand that the MEK capitulate and be disarmed. However, the subsequent encounter between the special operations negotiating team and the MEK took a different turn. The MEK sent leaders who were fluent in English and who took pains to establish ties with the United States by claiming **–falsely, as it turned out–** that a large portion of the group had advanced degrees from American universities and family members residing in the United States. The MEK again insisted that it had not fired on coalition forces (despite at least one documented special forces casualty from MEK fire) and that **it had offered to fight on the coalition's behalf. The MEK also indicated a willingness to provide intelligence on Iran and to help secure the border with Iran.** Impressed by the MEK's description of itself and its apparent willingness to be of service to the coalition, on April 15, 2003, special operations officers agreed to a cease fire rather than to surrender ordered by USCENTCOM.'* RAND report in page 40 concludes: *'If coalition forces and particularly those involved in any type of negotiations with the MEK, had been apprised of the **group's long history of deception**, they would have been far less likely to have made the kinds of concessions that proved so troublesome later on. ... Had the U.S. military, in particular, been more wary, it is unlikely that the MEK would have been able to avoid the surrender demanded by USCENTCOM.'* Again on page 51 the report adds: *'In OIF (Operation Iraqi Freedom), coalition forces were not given the most basic information about ..., in their dealings with the MEK, coalition forces were at a distinct disadvantage from the beginning because they had had no instruction regarding its (MEK's) past activities or its **cult characteristics** and how those might present particular challenges relating to detainment. Had such information been available, U.S. military officers would have been much less likely to be taken in by the MEK's seemingly cooperative stance.'*^{lix}

It was not only American forces who were confused, members in camp Ashraf were too, as in a matter of days, their ideology, their history, their friends and foes, were changing so rapidly it was difficult for some to catch up. Batoul Soltani, an ex-member of the leadership council of MEK writes in her memoirs: *'When the American forces came, we were shocked to notice that the Organization called all the members and sent the women to the gates of the camp to welcome the American soldiers who were surprised wondering what was the MEK up to? Suddenly the organization changed its strategy and sat at the negotiating table with the US officers. The US general who had come to*

seize Ashraf, ordered a cease-fire on the American tanks and helicopters, he called his high officials and then the warfare scene turned into the negotiating table. The MEK used its tricks to function the hegemony on the members. Then Mozghan (representative of Rajavi in Camp Ashraf) came happily and said: "we won". The leadership council had told them that "the MEK's rank and files are like Indians and they didn't shoot a bullet when the Americans were bombing their camps."

Again I have to emphasise that this is the theorised deception within cult's doctrines that enables all members, in a matter of days or even minutes to switch from one side to the other. Even in their most essential, fundamental and basic beliefs, without any doubt, opposition or question, even in the absence of the leader himself (as in all negotiations with the U.S. forces Rajavi was not present^{ix}).

MEK's position toward Israel is interesting as well; they used to claim one of their main reasons for opposing the Shah's regime was its relationship with Israel. Even during their present struggle against the Iranian Regime they claimed one of the reasons they had not been able to overthrow the regime was due to Israel's assistance to 'Khomeini's regime'^{xi}. In 1982 when Israel attacked Lebanon Rajavi went as far as asking all its forces to help Palestinians,^{xii} and even asked the Iranian government to let their members cross Iraq's border toward Lebanon, to fight against Israel^{xiii}. Then again, when they felt they were in a death lock in their diplomacy within the United States^{xiv} and in their 'armed struggle' against Iran, and both might be resolved in dealing with Israelis in June 1994 Rajavi asked us to have a secret meeting with Israelis officials for the first time in Washington DC. This was later announced by Israel's Persian language radio, but was of course denied by MEK as it was still not acceptable by the supporters of the organisation.^{xv} MEK recently has gone as far as collaborating with Israel's Mossad; the same people that MEK used to blame for collaborating with Shah's Secret Police and being their advisors in the concept of torture^{xvi}.

ⁱ Please take note of the definition of left and right within Marxist culture as progressive versus regressive or reactionary; MEK considers itself as being 'true left' and other rivals as pseudo left or far left; Amuzesh va tashrih-e ettela'iyeh ta'yin-e mavaze'-e Sazeman-e Mojahedin-e Khalq-e Iran dar barahbar-e jariyan-e oportunistha-ye chppnama -An explanation of the communiqué defining the position of the People's Mojahedin Organization of Iran on the matter of pseudo-leftist opportunism- 1980; P:55 and also; MEK's publication; 'What is reaction and who is reactionary'; P: 86

ⁱⁱ MEK's publication; 'Advices for Ideological work'; P: 58

ⁱⁱⁱ MEK's Publication; 'Summing up of one year arm resistance - Internal report of first responsible of MEK'; Mojahed Brother, Masoud Rajavi; November 1982; P: 178

^{iv} Mojahedin Organization, Amuzesh va tashrih-e ettela'iyeh ta'yin-e mavaze'-e Sazeman-e Mojahedin-e Khalq-e Iran dar barahbar-e jariyan-e oportunistha-ye chppnama -An explanation of the communiqué defining the position of the People's Mojahedin Organization of Iran on the matter of pseudo-leftist opportunism- 1980, p: 40

^v MEK's publication; 'Advices for Ideological work'; spring 1979; P: 36

^{vi} The Statement of The People's Mojahedin Organization of Iran; In response to the recent accusations of the Iranian regime. MEK's publication, first edition 1977 by the liberation movement of Iran abroad; reprinted by MEK after the revolution; summer of 1979; P: 5

^{vii} The Statement of The People's Mojahedin Organization of Iran; In response to the recent accusations of the Iranian regime. MEK's publication, first edition 1977 by the liberation movement of Iran abroad; reprinted by MEK after the revolution; summer of 1979; P: 6

^{viii} MEK's publication; 'The Opinion of the People's Mojahedin of Iran About the Referendum and the way of establishing an Islamic Republic'; 1979; P: 14, 15

^{ix} Ervand Abrahamian; 'The Iranian Mojahedin'; Yale University Press; 1989; P: 260; 261

^x MEK's Publication; 'Struggle's Principles governing this juncture's revolution'; (who is acting according the principles); Question from Mojahed Brother Masoud Rajavi; March 1986; P: 16

^{xi} MEK's Publication; 'Struggle's Principles governing this juncture's revolution'; (who is acting according the principles); Question from Mojahed Brother Masoud Rajavi; March 1986; P: 20

^{xii} It is interesting to know how they define themselves these days as they have been forced to surrender their arms to American and accept being non-violent.

^{xiii} Ervand Abrahamian; 'The Iranian Mojahedin'; Yale University Press; 1989; P: 247, 248

-
- ^{xiv} Masoud Rajavi said many times that they are in debt to him for understanding modern Islam; for example, MEK's publication Mojahed 108.
- ^{xv} They printed a tick book against him and every now and then were calling him a traitor ... for example look at MEK's publication: Mojahed number 264 March 1985; Nashrieh 150 28/10/1988 ...
- ^{xvi} In case of Banisadr the amount of material printed in MEK's publication is un-imaginable, for example in Mojahed 223 15 pages out of 48 pages of the publication; Mojahed 224; 11 pages; Mojahed 225; 18 pages; Mojahed 226; 12 pages; Mojahed 227; 12 pages; Mojahed 228; 25 pages out of 48 pages of the publication. That was not enough; later they published 668 pages book against Banisadr. They did the same thing against Bazargan and later even against their close partner of the Shah's era Fedayeen.
- ^{xvii} MEK's publication; 'Nashrieh' number 73; 128/11/86
- ^{xviii} MEK's publication; 'Nashrieh' number 72
- ^{xix} An expert of UNISCO and winner of French Medal of Legion d' Honneur. MEK's publication; 'Nashrieh'; number 108; 18/9/1987
- ^{xx} An Iranian attorney who for years was MEK's attorney. They called him a traitor, for having an interview with Persian BBC and saying things not favourable to MEK. MEK's publication; 'Mojahed' number 361
- ^{xxi} reprinted in MEK's publication ; 'Nashrieh' No: 21; 8/1/1982
- ^{xxii} MEK's publication; 'Mojahed' number 172; From then on they put this publication under their permanent attack until publishers of the Iranshahr announced closure of the publication.
- ^{xxiii} For example look at MEK's publication 'Mojahed' Number 200
- ^{xxiv} For example MEK's publications: 'Boltan' number 34; 'Nashrieh' Number 84; 'Boltan' Number 195; 8/10/1991
- ^{xxv} MEK's publication; 'Mojahed' number 230 for his article dated 21/12/1984
- ^{xxvi} For example they called one of their members sent to Iran for act of suicide operation, presumed dead as a martyr, with her photos calling her great martyr and ... Then they found out that she was alive and was talking against cultic nature of MEK; they collected all those papers and reprinted it all over again, this time calling her a traitor. Recently Rajavi to white wash old publications that have been reprinted, has said that the Information ministry of Iran is printing some materials on behalf of MEK
- ^{xxvii} As an example MEK's publication 'Mojahed' number 172; 6/10/1983
- ^{xxviii} MEK's publication; 'Boltan'; number 213; 31/7/1992
- ^{xxix} MEK's publication 'Mojahed' 360
- ^{xxx} MEK's publication; 'Nashrieh' 71; 14/11/1986
- ^{xxxi} Masoud Rajavi in the celebration of Twentieth year of foundation of the organisation.
- ^{xxxii} Steven Hassan; 'Combating Cult Mind Control'; Park Street Press; 1988; P: 5
- ^{xxxiii} Scot Mowbray, 'Popular Science', August 2002; cited from: Dr. Haha Lung; 'Mind Control; The Ancient Art of Psychological Warfare'; Citadel Press Kensington; 2006; P: 166
- ^{xxxiv} Dr. Lung explains: 'Lying may be a natural talent for psychopaths, but the rest of us have to practice! It has been speculated that lying may be a survival skill determined by genetics to save your lives. Of course, getting caught lying can also get you killed! Despite that fact, a recent study determined that 91 percent of Americans lie regularly. Twenty percent admit they can't get through the day without telling a few premeditated "white lies."...' Dr. Haha Lung and Christopher B. Prowant; 'The Black Science; Ancient And Modern Techniques of Ninja Mind Manipulation.' Publisher: Paladin Press Book; 2001; P: 98
- ^{xxxv} Crowley says: 'The Truth must be falsehood unless it be the whole truth; and the whole truth is partly inaccessible, partly unintelligible, partly incredible and partly un-publishable - that is, in any country where truth in itself is recognized as a dangerous explosive.' The Confessions of Aleister Crowley, 1929 cited from: Dr. Haha Lung; 'Mind Control; The Ancient Art of Psychological Warfare'; Citadel Press Kensington; 2006; P: 179
- ^{xxxvi} Hausman, Carl. 'Lies we live By: Defeating Double - Talk and Deception'. London Routledge, 2000. Cited from: Dr. Haha Lung; 'Mind Control; The Ancient Art of Psychological Warfare'; Citadel Press Kensington; 2006; P: 175
- ^{xxxvii} For example in MEK they used to have many flags and slogans and photos in the demonstration, sometimes as many as the number of demonstrators, to make the photos so confusing and chaotic, and hard to judge the number of participants.
- ^{xxxviii} Adolf Hitler, Mein Kampf
- ^{xxxix} Marc Breault and Martin King; 'Inside the cult'; A Signet Book; 1993; P: 24
- ^{xl} MEK's publication: 'The Opinion of the People's Mojahedin of Iran about the Referendum and the way of establishing an Islamic Republic'; 1979; P: 13
- ^{xli} MEK's publication; 'The Speech given by brother Mojahed Masoud Rajavi'; on the 4th of Khordad (25th May 1979); Spring 1979; P: 12, 14
- ^{xlii} The Statement of The People's Mojahedin Organization of Iran; In response to the recent accusations of the Iranian regime. MEK's publication, first edition 1977 by the liberation movement of Iran abroad; reprinted by MEK after the revolution; summer of 1979; P: 2
- ^{xliii} MEK's publication 'Mojahed' no. 123 4/06/1981
- ^{xliiv} As always emphasises are mine; please take note how he describes principles and then how easily MEK ignored and changed them completely to survive.
- ^{xli v} MEK's publication; Rajavi's speech under title of 'Hokomat e Ali va Ghanon Asassi dolat e Islam; Ali's government and constitution of an Islamic government'; spring 1980; P: 86
- ^{xli vi} MEK's publication; Rajavi's speech under title of 'Hokomat e Ali va Ghanon Asassi dolat e Islam; Ali's government and constitution of an Islamic government'; spring 1980; P: 145
- ^{xli vii} MEK's publication 'Mojahed' no; 11; 19/11/1979
- ^{xli viii} MEK's publication; 'Mojahed' no: 36

^{xlix} MEK's publication; 'Collection of MEK's announcements and political positions of People's Mojahedin of Iran'; Number II; March 1980; P: 127

^l MEK's publication; 'Collection of MEK's announcements and political positions of People's Mojahedin of Iran'; Number I; February 1980; P: 11

^{li} MEK's Publication; 'Summing up of one year arm resistance - Internal report of first responsible of MEK'; Mojahed Brother, Masoud Rajavi; November 1982; P: 31

^{lii} MEK's Publication; 'Summing up of one year arm resistance - Internal report of first responsible of MEK'; Mojahed Brother, Masoud Rajavi; November 1982; P: 19

^{liii} MEK's publication; 'Nashrieh' no: 27; 19/2/1982

^{liv} Ervand Abrahamian; 'The Iranian Mojahedin'; Yale University Press; 1989; P: 245; 246

^{lv} MEK's publication; 'Nashrieh' no: 95; 29/05/1987

^{lvi} MEK's publication 'Mojahed' no. 30

^{lvii} MEK's publication 'Bolton' no. 234; 25/12/1992

^{lviii} RAND; National Defense Research Institute; is a non-profit research organisation providing objective analysis and effective solutions that address the challenges facing the public and private sectors around the world. Its report; titled: 'The Mujahedin-e Khalq in Iraq; A Policy Conundrum 2009' was sponsored by the Office of the Secretary of Defense of the United States of America. The full report can be found in: <http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/MG871/>;

^{lix} As usual all emphasises are mine.

^{lx} As RAND's report has pointed out, when conditions become difficult suddenly MEK's leaders will vanish; as Rajavi flew to Paris after the failure of June 1981. In 2003, after Rajavis felt that their patron, Saddam Hussein, might lose power and fall from grace, Maryam Rajavi flew to Paris, and Masoud Rajavi vanished and up to now, November 20, no body except high ranking members of MEK knows where he is. *Is this still true? Should the date change?*

^{lxi} MEK's publication; 'Nashrieh', no: 9 16/10/1981

^{lxii} MEK's publication; 'Nashrieh' no: 43; 18/06/1982

^{lxiii} MEK's publication; 'Nashrieh' no: 43; 18/06/1982

^{lxiv} As MEK was named as a terrorist organisation by the United State's State Department's yearly report about terrorist organisations.

^{lxv} MEK's publication; 'Mojahed' no: 345; 06/06/1994

^{lxvi} As part of collaboration between MEK and Mossad, I can mention the MEK's claim of revealing information about Iran's nuclear site of Natanz that came from Mossad to them and supposedly not 'Iranian supporters within Iran' that they claimed so. Gareth Porter on March 2008 claimed: 'There are some indications, moreover, that the MEK obtained the documents (about nuclear activities of Iranian Government) not from an Iranian source but from Israel's Mossad. ... The Guardian's Julian Borger last February quoted an IAEA official as saying there is "doubt over the provenance of the computer (which was claimed had been found with information about Iran's Nuclear activities.)" Shahriar Ahy, an adviser to monarchist leader Reza Pahlavi, told journalist Connie Bruck that the detailed information on Natanz (Nuclear site in Iran) had not come from MEK but from "a friendly government, and it had come to more than one opposition group, not only the Mojahedin." Bruck wrote in the New Yorker on Mar, 16, 2006 that when he was asked if the "friendly government" was Israel, Ahy smiled and said, "The friendly government did not want to be the source of it, publicly. If the friendly government gives it to the U.S. publicly, then it would be received differently. Better to come from an opposition group." Israel has maintained a relationship with the MEK since the late 1990s, according to Bruck, including assistance to the organisation in beaming broadcasts by the NCRI from Paris into Iran. An Israeli diplomat confirmed that Israel had found the MEK "useful", Bruck reported, but the official declined to elaborate.' By Gareth Porter-IPS-Feb 29 *Gareth Porter is an historian and national security policy analyst. The paperback edition of his latest book, "Perils of Dominance: Imbalance of Power and the Road to War in Vietnam", was published in 2006.